２０２０年度　大学院入学試験問題【Ⅱ期】
国際日本学研究科　国際日本学専攻（博士後期課程）

科　目：英　語　【言語・国際交流研究分野】（辞書使用不可）

［問題番号　Ｄ１］　田中　牧郎　教授　研究指導志願者対象

注意）解答用紙は，指定された用紙を使用しなさい。

　次の英文は、今から 100 年前の 1921 年に書かれたものである。ここから、言語接触における論点を２つ取り出し、それぞれの論点に即して、現在の日本語の状況を論じなさい。解答は日本語で書くこと。

　　Languages, like cultures, are rarely sufficient unto themselves. The necessities of intercourse bring the speakers of one language into direct or indirect contact with those of neighboring or culturally dominant languages. The intercourse may be friendly or hostile. It may move on the humdrum plane of business and trade relations or it may consist of a borrowing or interchange of spiritual goods—art, science, religion. It would be difficult to point to a completely isolated language or dialect, least of all among the primitive peoples. The tribe is often so small that intermarriages with alien tribes that speak other dialects or even totally unrelated languages are not uncommon. It may even be doubted whether intermarriage, intertribal trade, and general cultural interchanges are not of greater relative significance on primitive levels than on our own. Whatever the degree or nature of contact between neighboring peoples, it is generally sufficient to lead to some kind of linguistic interinfluencing. Frequently the influence runs heavily in one direction. The language of a people that is looked upon as a center of culture is naturally far more likely to exert an appreciable influence on other languages spoken in its vicinity than to be influenced by them.

　　Chinese has flooded the vocabularies of Korean, Japanese, and Annamite for centuries, but has received nothing in return. In the western Europe of medieval and modern times French has exercised a similar, though probably a less overwhelming, influence. English borrowed an immense number of words from the French of the Norman invaders, later also from the court French of Isle de France, appropriated a certain number of affixed elements of derivational value (e.g., *-ess* of *princess*, *-ard* of *drunkard*, *-ty* of *royalty*), may have been somewhat stimulated in its general analytic drift by contact with French, and even allowed French to modify its phonetic pattern slightly (e.g., initial *v* and *j* in words like *veal* and *judge*; in words of Anglo-Saxon origin *v* and *j* can only occur after vowels, e.g., *over*, *hedge*). But English has exerted practically no influence on French.

　　The simplest kind of influence that one language may exert on another is the "borrowing" of words. When there is cultural borrowing there is always the likelihood that the associated words may be borrowed too. When the early Germanic peoples of northern Europe first learned of wine-culture and of paved streets from their commercial or warlike contact with the Romans, it was only natural that they should adopt the Latin words for the strange beverage (*vinum*, English *wine*, German *Wein*) and the unfamiliar type of road (*strata* [*via*], English *street*, German *Strasse*). Later, when Christianity was introduced into England, a number of associated words, such as *bishop* and *angel*,

found their way into English. And so the process has continued uninterruptedly down to the present day, each cultural wave bringing to the language a new deposit of loan-words. The careful study of such loan-words constitutes an interesting commentary on the history of culture. One can almost estimate the rôle which various peoples have played in the development and spread of cultural ideas by taking note of the extent to which their vocabularies have filtered into those of other peoples. When we realize that an educated Japanese can hardly frame a single literary sentence without the use of Chinese resources, that to this day Siamese and Burmese and Cambodgian bear the unmistakable imprint of the Sanskrit and Pali that came in with Hindu Buddhism centuries ago, or that whether we argue for or against the teaching of Latin and Greek our argument is sure to be studded with words that have come to us from Rome and Athens, we get some inkling of what early Chinese culture and Buddhism and classical Mediterranean civilization have meant in the world's history.

Source: Edward Sapir, *Language* (Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1921)

2020年度　大学院入学試験問題【Ⅱ期】
国際日本学研究科　国際日本学専攻（博士後期課程）

科　目：英　語　【言語・国際交流研究分野】（辞書使用不可）

［問題番号　D2］　小森 和子 教授　研究指導志願者対象

注意）解答用紙は，指定された用紙を使用しなさい。

次の英文を読み、その内容を日本語で 500 字程度に要約しなさい。その上で、第二言語の語の意味推測に及ぼす第一言語の影響について、例を挙げながら自分自身の見解を述べなさい。

L1 influences on L2 performance, known as transfer effects, have been documented in all linguistic sub-systems, including pragmatics and rhetoric, semantics, syntax, the lexicon, morphology, phonology, phonetics and orthography (Odlin,2003). Learners' L1 (or Ln) knowledge may affect formal linguistic aspects of L2 performance as well as semantic or pragmatic aspects (or meaning transfer). Whereas transfer of linguistic features has been studied intensively, relatively little is known about the way in which it may influence L2 processing. Odlin (1989:73), however, referring to the weak relativist position, suggests that 'language may have an important - but not absolute - influence on cognition', citing preliminary evidence from transfer studies indicating that languages influence their speakers' cognitive capacities, for instance, to notice, categorize or recall content - even something as specific as the content of a picture. In a similar vein, Koda (2003, 2005) emphasizes that transfer may affect L2 processing skills as well as linguistic features, and that the effects of the former may be more enduring than those of L1 linguistic features. In her view, L1 linguistic conditioning 'channels subsequent language development and also molds the cognitive procedures accommodating its structural and functional peculiarities. …[W]ord recognition, sentence parsing, and discourse processing systematically differ across languages' (Koda,2003:8-9).

The above quotation also underlines the fact that two or more languages and processing skills are involved in L2 reading. With respect to bilingual processing, Odlin likewise makes the point that there are fundamental differences in the knowledge base available to L1 and L2 learners. In his view, the knowledge base available in bilingual contexts is larger than that available in monolingual contexts, because bilinguals can draw on not one but two languages (Odlin, 1997:154). Bilingual processing differs in certain ways from monolingual processing, so that while it may have a facilitative effect on, for instance, text processing, bilingual processing may also cause an additional burden. With reference to reading, Koda writes:

In most instances, L2 learners are unfamiliar with word forms, both symbol and sound, but familiar with concepts through L1 words. Therefore, L2 word learning entails linking four, instead of three, lexical elements: symbol, sound, meaning, and L1 equivalent. (Koda, 2005:63).

She adds that the majority of L2 readers get much less information from each word in an L2 text than they would in their L1 because few if any of the words are as well known as L1 words. All in all, this means that at

every level there is more to be learned.

It is generally agreed that L2 acquisition is facilitated for learners whose native language (L1) is typologically similar to the target language (L2) due to the far greater possibility for positive transfer, which in turn frees up cognitive resources for other language learning tasks. As Koda (2005:43) notes, transfer effects tend to be more positive than negative because one is adding a further system rather than replacing one.

A key feature in relation to lexis is the role played by cognates. Sjoholm (1976), in a comparison of Finnish and Swedish students on an English as a foreign language (EFL) test, interpreted the Swedes' better performance as probably due to shared cognates. Ard and Holmburg (1983) reported similar findings in their American study comparing the performance of Spanish and Arabic English as a second language (ESL) learners at the same proficiency level on an English vocabulary test:

> There is little question that lexical similarities in two languages can greatly influence comprehension and production in a second language. Cognates provide not only semantic but also morphological and syntactic information, and while some of the information may be misleading, some can facilitate acquisition. (Ard & Holmburg, 1983:83)

They also observed that besides the benefits of recognizing cognates, another likely advantage for learners will be having additional time to concentrate on the unfamiliar words. It must, nonetheless, be noted that the presence of cognates does not always facilitate lexical processing and acquisition. Lexical similarities across languages can also be misleading for learners, as attested by the phenomenon known as 'false friends'. Evidence of such negative effects of cognates in connection with lexical inferencing is reported, for instance, in Haastrup (1991).

Positive transfer has been demonstrated not only at various linguistic levels, but also for language processing skills. Koda (2005:43) notes that many reading skill components developed in the L1 can be applied in an L2. For example, shared orthographic knowledge apparently provides long-term facilitation in L2 reading development, as it promotes mastery of L2 visual-information sampling skills. It also facilitates information integration from multiple sources by lightening the memory load.

Although the research presented above and related studies provide insight into positive transfer in lexical inferencing between closely related languages, they do not allow overall conclusions to be drawn about the degree to which such transfer occurs and under what conditions. What can be said is that readers appear more likely to report using L1 knowledge in L2 inferencing if their L1 is closely related to the L2, English; for example, Danish (Haastrup, 1991a, 2008) or French (Paribakht & Treville, 2007) in contrast to speakers of languages that are typologically more distant from English such as Persian (Paribakht, 2005). Relatively greater reported recourse to the L1 has also been found with low-proficiency learners of English in both closely related, e.g. Danish (Haastrup, 1991a) and distant languages, e.g. Arabic (Bengeleil & Paribakht, 2004). Overall, however, few studies reported L1 influences on lexical inferencing behavior and success. One of these is a study of Spanish-English bilinguals by Nagy *et al.* (1997), who found that 'L1' (Spanish) effects appeared to persist in L2 use in the form of Spanish syntactic knowledge. In spite of apparent low L2 learner awareness of L1 effects on their L2 acquisition and use, research on transfer in L2 reading suggests omnipresent and long-lasting, if sometimes quite subtle influences (Koda, 2005).

Source: Marjorie Bingham Wesche and T. Sima Paribakht (2010) *Lexical Inferencing in a First and Second Language: Cross-linguistic Dimensions*, Multilingual Matters.

２０２０年度　大学院入学試験問題【Ⅱ期】

国際日本学研究科　国際日本学専攻（博士後期課程）

科　目：英　語　【言語・国際交流研究分野】（辞書使用不可）

[問題番号　Ｄ３]　佐藤　郡衛　特任教授　研究指導志願者対象

注意）解答用紙は，指定された用紙を使用しなさい。

次の英文を読み、500 字程度で要約し、日本の教育改革との関連について自分の見解を述べなさい。

According to educational psychologist Howard Gardner, many of today's students do not actually understand what they learn. For many students, education has become nothing more than drill and response; there is no relevance for the materials the students are expected to learn (Gardner, 1991). As a result, teachers are accustomed to students inquiring, "Why do I need to know this? When will I ever use this?"

Piaget and other psychologists believe that the learner must be active to be engaged in real learning (Piaget, 1954, 1974). Learning becomes active when students are able to connect new knowledge with their prior understanding. Constructivists take this notion a bit further stating that a meaningful context that brings the real world into the classroom learning environment is key to promoting learning (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989). Learning is a process of interacting with the outside world, and continually reanalyzing and reinterpreting new information and its relation to the real world (Brown et al., 1989; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Traditional learning situations in which students are passive recipients of knowledge are inconsistent with the learning situations of real-life (Lave, 1988). In order to make student learning relevant to real life experiences, learning environments must be authentic.

Authentic learning is a pedagogical approach that allows students to explore, discuss, and meaningfully construct concepts and relationships in contexts that involve real-world problems and projects that are relevant to the learner (Donovan, Bransford, & Pellegrino, 1999). The term authentic is defined as genuine, true, and real (Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary, 1998). If learning is authentic, then students should be engaged in genuine learning problems that foster the opportunity for them to make direct connections between the new material that is being learned and their prior knowledge. These kinds of experiences will increase student motivation. In fact, an "absence of meaning breeds low engagement in schoolwork and inhibits [learning] transfer" (Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage, 1995). Students must be able to realize that their achievements stretch beyond the walls of the classroom. They bring to the classroom experiences, knowledge, beliefs, and curiosities and authentic learning provides a means of bridging those elements with

classroom learning. Students no longer simply learn rote facts in abstract or artificial situations, but they experience and use information in ways that are grounded in reality. The true power of authentic learning is the ability to actively involve students and touch their intrinsic motivation (Mehlinger, 1995).

Authentic instruction will take on a much different form than traditional methods of teaching. The literature suggests that authentic learning has several key characteristics.

- Learning is centered on authentic tasks that are of interest to the learners.
- Students are engaged in exploration and inquiry.
- Learning, most often, is interdisciplinary.
- Learning is closely connected to the world beyond the walls of the classroom.
- Students become engaged in complex tasks and higher-order thinking skills, such as analyzing, synthesizing, designing, manipulating and evaluating information.
- Students produce a product that can be shared with an audience outside the classroom.
- Learning is student driven with teachers, parents, and outside experts all assisting/coaching in the learning process.
- Learners employ scaffolding techniques.
- Students have opportunities for social discourse.
- Ample resources are available. (Donovan et al., 1999; Newman & Associates, 1996; Newmann et al., 1995; Nolan & Francis, 1992).

The North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL) states that authentic tasks often "involve multiple disciplines...bear a strong resemblance to tasks performed in non-school settings and require students to apply a broad range of knowledge and skills ...[and] often, fill a genuine need for the students and result in a tangible end product" (Authentic tasks, 2000).

Examples of student learning in a traditional classroom might involve students reading a textbook and answering a few questions related to the lesson content. Perhaps in a mathematics class students would be solving problems in a workbook. However, if students were engaged in an authentic lesson related to solving the city's problems with air pollution the classroom environment probably would look quite a bit different. Students could work in groups and divide up the various tasks that need to be accomplished to solve this real-world issue. Perhaps you would find a group of students looking through newspapers to gather data related to the local weather, while another group searched the Internet for information about air pollution, as other students collected data about the city's population. These students would simultaneously be engaged in science, mathematics, and reading. They would also be utilizing their technical skills and search skills as well as exercising their skills in social communication.

Clif Mims (2003) "Authentic Learning: A practical introduction and guide for implementation" (A Middle School Computer Technologies Journal, a service of NC State University, Raleigh, NC, Volume 6, Issue 1, Winter 2003)