

# 立命館大学大学院

## 2018年度実施 入学試験

# 博士課程前期課程

# 文学研究科

## 人文学専攻・教育人間学専修

※2019年9月入学 入学試験は、筆記試験の実施がないため掲載していません

入試方式	実施月	コース	専門科目		外国語(英語)	
			ページ	備考	ページ	備考
一般入学試験	9月	研究一貫	×		×	
	2月		P.3～		P.5～	
	9月	高度専門	P.1～			
	2月		P.3～			
社会人入学試験	9月	研究一貫	×			
	2月		×			
	9月	高度専門				
	2月					
外国人留学生入学試験	9月	研究一貫				
	2月					
	9月	高度専門				
	2月					
学内進学入学試験	9月	研究一貫				
	9月	高度専門				
学内進学入学試験 (大学院進学プログラム履修生対象)	2月	研究一貫				
	2月	高度専門				
APU特別受入入学試験	9月	研究一貫				
	9月	高度専門				

立命館大学大学院  
2018年度実施 入学試験  
博士課程後期課程

文学研究科  
人文学専攻・教育人間学専修

※2019年9月入学 入学試験は、筆記試験の実施がないため掲載していません

入試方式	実施月	外国語 ※英語と独語・仏語の うちから1科目の計2科目	ページ	備考
一般入学試験	2月	英語	P.10～	
	2月	独語	P.15～	
	2月	仏語	×	
外国人留学生入学試験	9月			
	2月			
学内進学入学試験	2月			

2019年度 立命館大学大学院文学研究科入学試験問題

2018年9月15日

博士課程前期課程 人文学専攻  
教育人間学専修

「専門科目」

●受験上の注意

- ① 試験中、冊子をばらしても構わないが、終了後再び綴じて提出すること  
(ホッチキスを貸与します)
- ② 全ての用紙に受験番号、氏名等を記入し、提出すること

●試験中の持込許可物件について

- ① 筆記用具、受験票、時計以外の持込は認めない

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	専門科目	<input type="checkbox"/> 研究一貫 <input type="checkbox"/> 高度専門		

<問Ⅰ・問Ⅱ・問Ⅲの中から2つを選択して解答しなさい。解答はすべて2頁以下に記入すること。>

問Ⅰ.【人間形成領域】次の2問の両方に解答しなさい。

1. 以下から2つの用語を選び、そこに内包されている教育人間学的な論点を整理しつつ解説しなさい。

- (1) デス・エデュケーション
- (2) イリンクス
- (3) ミメーシス

2. 「人間形成」——「人間を形づくること」もしくは「人間へと形づくること」——とは一体いかなる行為であろうか。

この問いを具体的に掘り進めていくための「問題群」を列挙しておく。①この行為の主体は誰であり、客体は誰であるか。また「形成する—形づくる」という行為のモデルは何か（例：粘土細工、盆栽、養殖 etc.）。②仮に主体を「大人」、客体を「子ども」と規定するなら、「大人」が「子ども」を「人間へと形づくる」ということは、「子ども」とはそもそも「人間」ではないことを意味するが、それでは「子ども」とは何者で「人間」とは何者か。③仮に「人間へと形づくること」が「大人にすること」を意味しているのであれば、「大人」とは何者か。また、「大人」になった時点で「人間形成」は「完了」することになるが、「完了」といった事態は果たして起こり得るものか。④「衰えること」や「老いること」、「死にゆくこと」といった、通常「大人」になった後に立ち現れる出来事や事態は、「人間形成」とどのような関係にあるのか。⑤「人間」とは無（白紙）の状態から他者によって「つくられる」ものではなく、もともと持っていた能力や資質を自ら顕在化させること、つまり「なる」ものだとは考えられないか。

以上挙げた問題群を手掛かりにしながら、具体的な思想家の名前やその言説も挙げて、「人間形成」とは何かについて論述しなさい。（必ずしも5つの問題群全てに言及する必要はない。）

問Ⅱ.【臨床教育領域】次の2問の両方に解答しなさい。

1. 以下から2つを選び、人物または用語を解説しなさい。

- (1) マルティヌス・ヤン・ランゲフェルト
- (2) シュタイナー教育
- (3) アクティブ・ラーニング

2. ソマティックスにおけるハンズオン（タッチ）の意義について説明しなさい。

問Ⅲ.【心理健康領域】次の2問の両方に解答しなさい。

1. 以下の5つの語句全てについて説明しなさい。

- (1) 還元主義
- (2) 固着
- (3) 自律神経系
- (4) 内発的動機づけ
- (5) レム睡眠

2. ストレスとなる出来事の特徴を3つ挙げて、それぞれを説明しなさい。

2019年度 立命館大学大学院文学研究科入学試験問題

2019年2月16日

博士課程前期課程 人文学専攻  
教育人間学専修

「専門科目」

●受験上の注意

- ① 試験中、冊子をばらしても構わないが、終了後再び綴じて提出すること  
(ホッチキスを貸与します)
- ② 全ての用紙に受験番号、氏名等を記入し、提出すること

●試験中の持込許可物件について

- ① 筆記用具、受験票、時計以外の持込は認めない

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	専門科目	<input type="checkbox"/> 研究一貫 <input type="checkbox"/> 高度専門		

問Ⅰ・問Ⅱ・問Ⅲの中から2つを選択して解答しなさい。解答はすべて2頁以下に記入すること。

問Ⅰ.【人間形成領域】次の2問の両方に解答しなさい。

1. 以下の事項あるいは人物について、教育人間学的視点から簡潔に説明しなさい。

- ① 産婆術
- ② イニシエーション
- ③ 世界開放性
- ④ F. フレーベル
- ⑤ V. フランクフル

2. 哲学、教育学、心理学、社会学と教育人間学との学問的類縁性と相違点を説明しつつ、学問としての教育人間学の特徴およびその現代的課題と可能性について、考えるところを述べなさい。

問Ⅱ.【臨床教育領域】次の2問の両方に解答しなさい。

1. 以下の用語について、具体例を明示した上で説明しなさい。

- ① グローバル教育
- ② 虐待の連鎖
- ③ 群れ遊び

2. 「スピリチュアリティの教育」の特徴について、道徳教育・宗教教育との相違点に触れつつ説明したうえで、さらにその教育の意義について、考えるところを述べなさい。

問Ⅲ.【心理健康領域】次の2問の両方に解答しなさい。

1. 以下の用語について、簡潔に説明しなさい。

- ① 大脳辺縁系
- ② 多重知能理論
- ③ 否認
- ④ リラクセーション反応
- ⑤ 明晰夢

2. 教育人間学研究に心理学的アプローチを導入する際の効用と限界について、あなたの考えを述べよ。その際、教育人間学と心理学の歴史的展開についても必ず触れること。

2019年度 立命館大学大学院文学研究科入学試験問題

2019年2月16日

博士課程前期課程 人文学専攻  
教育人間学専修

「外国語」(英語)

●受験上の注意

- ① 試験中、冊子をばらしても構わないが、終了後再び綴じて提出すること  
(ホッチキスを貸与します)
- ② 全ての用紙に受験番号、氏名等を記入し、提出すること

●試験中の持込許可物件について

- ① 筆記用具、受験票、時計以外の持込は認めない

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	外国語 (英語)	研究一貫		

◇次に挙げる文章に関して、以下の問いに全て解答しなさい。

There is more than one tradition of anthropology and education, or more broadly of the ethnography of education, around the world. As the anthropology of education emerged in the 1950s in the United States, parallel literatures began to appear in Brazil and in Argentina (Gomes and Gomes, in press; Neufeld, in press). In the 1970s, when the US field was blossoming, ethnography of education likewise grew in popularity in Japan and in the United Kingdom (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995; Minoura, in press). Today, there is a Commission on Anthropology of Education within the German Educational Research Association (Wulf, in press), and the single largest concentration of anthropologists of education in any one institution may be the group of nine or more anthropologists in the Danish School of Education in Copenhagen (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press).

Yet scholarship that is not produced in the United States or the United Kingdom is often little known outside its own language zone and, even when published in or translated into English, may not be widely read outside its own region, or its significance appreciated. Indeed, US scholars demonstrate only shallow familiarity even with British scholarship (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995). Within the volume you are reading at the moment, although the editors have embraced international perspectives, less than 20 percent of the chapters are written by authors employed outside the United States.

(A)

This chapter alerts readers to the need to become familiar with world literatures in anthropologies of education and ethnographies of education. The “invisibility” of the scholarship that takes place beyond one’s borders might not matter if it were merely an extension of familiar research programs into other national settings or language zones. However, although there is arguably a family resemblance (van Zanten, in press), worldwide anthropologies and ethnographies of education vary enough in intellectual focus to merit the attention of English-language readers. For instance, some “pedagogical anthropology” in Germany, with its emphasis on human universals, strikes US readers as more akin to philosophy than to the anthropology they know. Scandinavian anthropologists pose questions about children’s lives in groups that are quite unlike the questions US scholars pose about identity and participation. The Mexican literature pays proportionately more attention to teachers than does the US literature, while in France both anthropologists and sociologists focus more frequently on higher education as a topic than do their US counterparts. Much of the extensive literature in Japan examines schools seen by the locals as ordinary and unproblematic, illustrating by contrast how much US scholars have been drawn to the story of failing students and schools.

Literatures on the anthropology of education outside the English language zone not only offer a diversity of perspectives, but are simply too vast to ignore. Admittedly, US and British publishing dominates academia; the majority of academic journals on the subject of education – about 5000 of them – publish articles or at least abstracts in English. Nonetheless, there are another 3000 academic journals on the subject of education that do *not* publish so much as an abstract in English (analysis based on Ulrich’s *Periodicals Directory*, 2009). Or to use another indicator less constrained by the international pressure on academics to publish in English, there are articles on words glossed as “education” in 85 languages other than English in the collection of non-English language Wikipedias on the web (analysis based on Wikipedia, 2010).

Even as English appears increasingly to dominate academic discourse, many academic disciplines have recently renewed their interest in cross-national exchange and translation. In 2005, scholars from Brazil, Japan, and other countries founded the World Council of Anthropological Associations, an association of associations that includes the American Anthropological Association and also the International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (IUAES), an organization of individual scholars with roots in an earlier-era of internationalism (Ribeiro, 2005). There have also been recent efforts at translating anthropologies across national and linguistic borders (such as Barth *et al.*, 2005; Boškovic and Ericksen, 2008; Dracklé, Edgar, and Schippers, 2003; Ribeiro and Escobar, 2006). Meanwhile, in the realm of educational research, 2009 saw the founding of the World Educational Research Association, another association of associations (AERA, 2009).



## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	外国語 (英語)	研究一貫		

World literatures should interest us not only for intellectual reasons but also out of concern for equity. The US and British publishing industry dominates scholarship far out of proportion to the number of world English speakers, and in ways that arbitrarily constrict the global flow of knowledge. Decisions made by the keepers of bibliographical databases in the United States, such as ERIC and Thomson ISI, can affect tenuring decisions outside the United States and can render research invisible even within the researcher's home country (Larsson, 2006: 192). Universities in Europe increasingly use English as a language of instruction, as is already common in Anglophone Africa, and as a result publishers of English-language textbooks see increased profits, while students' ability to discuss scientific concepts in their maternal languages diminishes (Brock-Utne, 2001, 2007). Scholars from outside the English-language zone use shorthand labels to refer to US and British dominance in academia and publishing, calling it "the Anglophone world" (Boškovic and Ericksen, 2008: 10) or the "Anglo-Saxon world" (as in Meunier, 2007; Schriewer, 2009), even though the latter term would startle if not offend anyone who identifies as emphatically not Anglo-Saxon, and even though both terms collapse important differences between US and British scholarship while ignoring significant English-language publishing in places like India (cf. Hannerz, 2008).

This chapter will outline some of the barriers to the free global flow of ideas within anthropologies of education. It will consider the borders created by language zones – regions that share a common language usually because of former colonial relationships. It will note other regional variations that transcend language differences, including the difference between the global North and the global South. It will also consider national differences shaped by each country's unique history and social organization. The chapter will not attempt to survey the literatures nor to map every region and language zone, as we attempt in a forthcoming volume (Anderson-Levitt, in press). Rather, it will simply draw on chapters in that volume and on a number of collections and published literature reviews (e.g., Batallán, 1998; Jociles, 2007; Larsson, 2006; Maclure, 1997; Osborne, 1996; Rockwell, 1998; Rockwell and Gomes, 2009; Souza Lima, 1995) to illustrate how anthropologies of education vary around the world, and why this matters.

In spite of the focus of this volume as a whole on anthropology, this chapter includes ethnographers of education who do not identify themselves as anthropologists. It does so in part because the definition of academic disciplines varies across nations, as we shall see, and partly because certain non-anthropologists (such as Paul Willis, Hugh Mehan, and Michelle Fine) have greatly influenced anthropology of education. However, it does so also because many non-anthropological ethnographers define ethnography more or less as anthropologists would. Thus, the editors of the British-based journal *Ethnography of Education* refer to ethnography as "long-term engagement with those studied in order to understand their cultures" (Troman, 2010), echoing anthropologist Harry Wolcott's formulation that "the purpose of ethnographic research is to describe and interpret cultural behavior" (1987: 42–43). To rule out ethnographers on the basis of their disciplinary affiliation would have been premature in this initial scan of work around the world.

## ANTHROPOLOGY AND EDUCATION IN TRANSLATION

Of course, this chapter would not be possible were there not some communication among scholars around the world, or at least the means for establishing it. Books and articles do get distributed beyond their home countries, the web and email make texts much more widely available, and some scholars are privileged to attend international conferences. Scholars also move from country to country in an international job market, sometimes making it difficult to make a claim about which scholars "belong" to which part of the world. (For the purposes of this chapter, I consider scholars to belong to the country of the institution in which they currently work, regardless of their original nationality, first language, or early training, on the assumption that expectations of their place of employment tend to shape the topics and form of their publications.) Nonetheless, there are barriers to the flow of scholarly knowledge, and the first of these is the linguistic barrier.

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	外国語 (英語)	研究一貫		

The very task of defining “education” reveals the challenges of crossing linguistic boundaries; there is no one-to-one correspondence among terms across languages. Anthropologists of education in different parts of the world seem to agree on a broad definition of our object of study, “education,” as all deliberate and systematic interventions in learning, whether the intervention takes place in schools, at home, or in other settings (as Hansen defined it in the United States, 1979: 28). However, although Danes usually translate the English word “education” as *uddannelse*, the term *uddannelse* misses the focus on personal development denoted by another Danish word, *dannelse*, much like the German term, *Bildung*, and by the French terms *éducation* and *formation* (Anderson, 2009). Therefore, rather than labeling educational anthropology with the literal translation *uddannelsesantropologi*, Danish scholars increasingly call it “pedagogical anthropology” (as do German anthropologists of education; Wulf and Zirfas, 1994). In English, “pedagogy” is an old-fashioned term for teaching methods, but in Danish the word connotes “moral, social and cultural formation of educated persons” (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press). As we shall see in the following section, the word “anthropology” likewise challenges easy translation.

More generally, the organization of the world into languages makes some scholarship invisible outside its language zone. For example, much of the copious literature of Japan is never translated and therefore not read and cited outside Japan (Minoura, in press). Linguistic barriers may even divide single nations: Belgium and Switzerland each have two different faces, one directed toward the United States, the United Kingdom and perhaps toward Germany, the other toward the Francophone world.

(B) Translation is a partial solution, but translations flow asymmetrically; the prestige or power of a language can trump geographic proximity. For example, although France borders Germany, French publishers translate from English six times more often than they translate from German, just as Germany translates six times more often from English than from French (analysis of data from UNESCO, 2010). In general, translations flow from world centers, particularly from the English-language “super-center,” to the periphery, and not nearly so often in the other direction. Since 1932, over a million books have been translated from English into other languages, but only about 116,000 from other languages into English, whereas for most other languages, there is more import than export of translations (UNESCO, 2010; compare Heilbron, 1999). Thus, scholars who are monolingual in English experience the largest “blind-spot” vis-à-vis literatures originating outside their language zone.

Translating more works into English would help to remedy this great asymmetry. However, translation alone cannot guarantee that the new readers will understand and appreciate a work. Even when linguistic barriers are overcome, ideas can be lost in translation. One reason is that conventions of writing unfamiliar to an audience can obscure the significance of the work (e.g., see Uribe, 1997). For example, because of different conventions for scholarly writing, to European and Latin American readers US anthropology of education may seem to lack sufficient theoretical grounding, while to US readers European and Latin American work may seem overly theoretical and to lack empirical findings and discussion of research methods. As a result, each set of scholars may fail to take the other seriously.

## 【出典】

© 2011 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd  
 Levinson, B. and Pollock, M. (2011). *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education*.  
 Chichester, West Sussex [England]: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.17-21.  
 Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	外国語 (英語)	研究一貫		

1. (A)、(B) 2 箇所の全文を和訳しなさい。 \_\_\_\_\_
2. "Anglophone world" の問題性について説明しなさい。 \_\_\_\_\_
3. "education" の定義とその翻訳をめぐる問題性について説明しなさい。 \_\_\_\_\_

2019年度 立命館大学大学院文学研究科入学試験問題

2019年2月16日

博士課程後期課程 人文学専攻  
教育人間学専修

「外国語」(英語)

●受験上の注意

- ① 試験中、冊子をばらしても構わないが、終了後再び綴じて提出すること  
(ホッチキスを貸与します)
- ② 全ての用紙に受験番号、氏名等を記入し、提出すること

●試験中の持込許可物件について

- ① 筆記用具、受験票、時計以外の持込は認めない

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	後期課程	外国語 (英語)		

◇次に挙げる文章に関して、以下の問いに全て解答しなさい。

**RESEARCH THEMES SHAPED BY CANONS, CONTEXT, AND PLACE  
IN THE WORLD ECONOMY**

Ideas get lost in translation not only because of rhetorical conventions, but also because outside readers do not grasp the significance of the translated scholarship. They may not find the subject matter relevant because it does not correspond to research questions perceived as central in their own academic setting. This section points out some of the reasons why the most common research themes vary from place to place.

(A)

Often a research theme makes sense in the context of ongoing local conversations on particular topics. By virtue of who has trained whom, who sees whom in face-to-face meetings, who can publish easily in which venues, and who is reading whom, scholars tend to engage in research conversations with a particular group of colleagues, and their writing makes reference to those local conversations. Such conversations may point to different canons of literature that grow from historically different disciplinary roots, as noted above. Language barriers and persisting difficulties of accessing literature from other parts of the world also channel scholars into certain conversations and not others, as also noted above. As a result, for the handful of scholars who gain an international audience beyond their original publications in languages like French, German, Russian, or Portuguese, their translated work is read outside the context of the research and debates within the home country that shaped it (Larsson, 2006: 191).

As an example, the question of how human beings learn, which was originally of interest to psychological anthropologists and now to cognitive anthropologists in the United States, attracts a surprisingly small amount of attention among US anthropologists of education (for a call to arms, see Varenne, Chapter 4, below). However, it is studied in Germany, as noted above, because of the disciplinary roots of Germany's pedagogical anthropology. Learning is also a topic of great interest within the international network of scholars working on cultural historical activity theory, who carry on a conversation distinct from the mainstream of educational anthropology that crosses many national boundaries, but which seems to be particularly prominent in countries such as Spain, Mexico, and Brazil (ISCAR, 2009).

Another example is the study of schooling that local participants take to be ordinary or reasonably successful. Ethnographic work in Japan, particularly among sociologists and psychologists, often describes the kind of schooling that local participants take as the implicit norm (Minoura, in press). This is generally public schooling that serves the middle-class, urban, ethnically Japanese population – the unmarked case – as opposed to schools perceived as failing or as serving mainly under-represented students. Similarly, in the United Kingdom, where much of the ethnographic work is conducted by sociologists, the unmarked case of schooling taken as normal is an important topic of research (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995).

Research themes also vary because of the distinctive historical, social, and political contexts of different nations. It is hardly surprising, for example, that in countries of conquest like Canada and the United States, anthropology of education has always included a focus on Indigenous education. There is a similar interest in Indigenous

populations in Mexico and Chile, other countries of conquest. Given the peculiar history of slavery in the United States, it is likewise not surprising that racial differences and racism preoccupy its researchers. Canada and the United States are also countries of massive immigration, and that is one explanation for the enormous interest in differences between school culture and home culture in these countries. Not by chance, the ethnography of education in France, the Netherlands, Italy, and Central Europe has shown increased interest in immigrants as the number of immigrants to Europe rises (e.g., Gobbo, in press; Eröss, in press). In several parts of Europe and now in Japan, intercultural education is a research focus, and the subjects are both indigenous minorities like Roma and new immigrants (Minoura, in press).

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	後期課程	外国語 (英語)		

US anthropologists of education are so driven by the local-political and historical need to alleviate racially and ethnically shaped inequities in the school system that the US literature, seen from the outside, appears to be fixated on the topic of school failure (Delamont and Atkinson, 1995). Thus, a review of articles published by the *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* from 1995 to 2005 found that 63% of the articles concerned schooling and, of those, 52%, or 39 articles, addressed success and failure; meanwhile, the 37 articles that were not about schooling tended to address culture and ethnicity, language, and identity (Jacquin, 2006). In contrast, research on social class, gender, and rural-urban inequities is less abundant in the United States, as is research on schooling that is perceived by the locals as serving mainstream populations.

The example of Denmark and other Scandinavian countries illustrates a different common theme shaped by a different political and historical framework. In the context of social welfare states concerned with the provision of “good childhoods” and socially safe environments for growing moral human beings, pedagogical anthropology in Scandinavia takes as its topic not schooling per se but rather the lives of children and youth (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press). It is only because “over 90 percent of all children between age 2 and 15 attend state-funded nurseries, kindergartens, schools, after-school centers, youth clubs and state-subsidized sport associations” that the ethnography of children leads to studies of life in schools and other institutions (Anderson, 2009: 3). The Danish focus is on integration into the group rather than on academic success and failure.

The place of a country in the world economy also results in variation in common research themes. Whereas in the United States and Europe, educational literature sometimes compares schools to oppressive places like factories or prisons, in the global South – for instance, in Mexico – public schools can sometimes be seen as a liberating force that offers a relatively equalizing experience in the context of strong gender, class, and ethnic distinctions outside school (Rockwell, 1998, although schooling for indigenous students is viewed with less enthusiasm in Rockwell and Gomes, 2009). Given the difference in perspective, readers from the global North might mistakenly interpret approaches from the global South as naive, while scholars from the South might find literature from the North too jaded.

Meanwhile, in the global South, economic constraints make it difficult to carry out ethnography, and local ethnographers must often rely on international donors for funding. In west and central Africa, for example, international donors tend to control research topics since they fund almost all scholarship except for master’s theses.

Because of donor interest, research in west and central Africa focuses much more heavily on gender disparities than does the anthropology of education in North America or almost anywhere else (Diallo, in press).

Finally, position in the world economy seems to influence how much scholars conduct comparative research outside their home country. Whereas anthropologists from much of the global North, have historically gone “abroad” more often than conducting research at “home,” ethnographers of education more typically conduct research “at home.” However, in certain countries a significant minority of ethnographers of education conduct studies outside their home countries. In general, it is in countries of the global North with a history either of colonialism or of international aid in which one finds some ethnographers of education studying learning or schooling abroad; this includes the United States, Japan, the Scandinavian countries and, to a limited extent, the United Kingdom and France.

## LESSONS

Across many parts of the world, scholars conduct anthropologically or sociologically informed ethnographic studies of learning and of schooling. These studies are similar enough that we can identify, if not a common subdiscipline, at least a set of family resemblances (van Zanten, in press). The family resemblances include a commitment to analyzing issues in local context, to grasping the meaning made by local participants, and to conducting relatively long-term participant observation to gain those insights. The researchers in question tend to offer social and cultural explanations rather than purely psychological analyses, and many of them, aware of the misuse of the culture concept to reinforce stereotypes, offer sophisticated concepts of culture as a dynamic and creative process (e.g., Neufeld and Thisted, 1998; Rockwell, 2007).

(B)

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	後期課程	外国語 (英語)		

However, there is enough variation across language zones and regions that we cannot afford to ignore the literatures beyond our local boundaries. One reason is that, because languages of publication vary, anthropologies of education in different parts of the globe offer terminology and metaphors that may not translate easily into our home language, for instance, *el trabajo docente* ("the work of teaching," Rockwell and González, in press) or *dannelse* or *Bildung* ("education with a focus on personal development"). We thus have much to learn from fresh definitions and fresh concepts. Another reason is that, because specific research techniques vary, we can look to other people's anthropologies of education for sophisticated models of desirable methods, from narrative inquiry to teacher research. A third reason is that, because common research themes vary, anthropologies of education around the world can suggest research questions that help us break out of conversations that have become too fixated on one way of seeing a problem.

The last point is particularly important. Without the broader comparative perspective, we tend to focus too narrowly on a few nationally relevant questions, such as race and ethnicity in the United States, failing to realize that "the analytic categories used to construct ethnographic texts are not autonomous; they are rooted in the societies in which they are first used, and they reflect actual ways of constructing difference in those societies" (Rockwell, 2002: 3). Dialogue with colleagues doing related but not

identical kinds of work in other parts of the world can make us aware of our own taken-for-granted paradigms and can provoke us to ask questions we had not previously thought of asking. For example, would more emphasis on what local participants take to be normal, unproblematic schooling provide Americans with fresh models, or solutions, or templates for providing quality education for all? Meanwhile, would more attention to ethnicity or "race" be salutary in Germany? Would it be useful in France or the United States or China to reflect more on school as liberating? Would it meanwhile behoove educators in west Africa to beware the oppressive side of schooling?

Besides raising questions about the subdiscipline, this chapter also raises questions of broader significance to the study of academic disciplines, higher education, and the flow of academic knowledge in general. Further study of who cites whom and of how ideas get transformed as they cross borders would raise our self-consciousness about our own enterprise as scholars and teachers.

This chapter underlines the need for several practical steps to improve communication across linguistic and economic barriers. Beyond the need to translate more work into English, I would emphasize the importance of requiring doctoral students to establish a reading knowledge of at least one language besides English, and to demonstrate that knowledge by making use of relevant literature published in that language, because there will always be research that does not get translated. We should learn and ask our students to learn to consult on-line research reports and reviews such as the open access *Reseñas Educativas/Resenhas Educativas*, edited by Gustavo Fischman, for books in Spanish and Portuguese ([edrev.info/indexs.html](http://edrev.info/indexs.html)); Spain's open access database to research articles, "Summarios ISOC, Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades" ([bddoc.csic.es:8080/isoc.html](http://bddoc.csic.es:8080/isoc.html)); France's open access link to journal articles ([revues.org](http://revues.org)); and the English-language *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* (indexed at [www.soc.nii.ac.jp/jasca/publication-c/frame-c.html](http://www.soc.nii.ac.jp/jasca/publication-c/frame-c.html)). As suggested at an open editorial forum on "Transnationalizing Scholarly Communication" at the 2009 meeting of the American Anthropological Association, we should recruit truly international editorial boards for journals and book series, and could practice the occasional acceptance of articles reviewed by panels of reviewers from the author's home country rather than by the journal's regular reviewers. Publication of reviews of the literatures from many regions and language zones on a regular basis, as the journal *Current Anthropology* used to do, would also be helpful. Finally, equitable indexing of articles and books in multiple languages will become even more important as multilingual bodies of literature burgeon. Anthropologists of education need to work with librarians and scholarly organizations to develop search engines and indexes that can help scholars find their way through an increasingly vast world literature (Brenneis, 2009). Ultimately, the most effective way to translate ideas across borders may be to form transnational research teams (Victor Zúñiga González, personal communication), but not all scholars will find the resources to conduct such studies.

(B)

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	コース	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	前期課程	外国語 (英語)	研究一貫		

The very task of defining “education” reveals the challenges of crossing linguistic boundaries; there is no one-to-one correspondence among terms across languages. Anthropologists of education in different parts of the world seem to agree on a broad definition of our object of study, “education,” as all deliberate and systematic interventions in learning, whether the intervention takes place in schools, at home, or in other settings (as Hansen defined it in the United States, 1979: 28). However, although Danes usually translate the English word “education” as *uddannelse*, the term *uddannelse* misses the focus on personal development denoted by another Danish word, *dannelse*, much like the German term, *Bildung*, and by the French terms *éducation* and *formation* (Anderson, 2009). Therefore, rather than labeling educational anthropology with the literal translation *uddannelsesantropologi*, Danish scholars increasingly call it “pedagogical anthropology” (as do German anthropologists of education; Wulf and Zirfas, 1994). In English, “pedagogy” is an old-fashioned term for teaching methods, but in Danish the word connotes “moral, social and cultural formation of educated persons” (Anderson, Gulløv, and Valentin, in press). As we shall see in the following section, the word “anthropology” likewise challenges easy translation.

More generally, the organization of the world into languages makes some scholarship invisible outside its language zone. For example, much of the copious literature of Japan is never translated and therefore not read and cited outside Japan (Minoura, in press). Linguistic barriers may even divide single nations: Belgium and Switzerland each have two different faces, one directed toward the United States, the United Kingdom and perhaps toward Germany, the other toward the Francophone world.

(B) Translation is a partial solution, but translations flow asymmetrically; the prestige or power of a language can trump geographic proximity. For example, although France borders Germany, French publishers translate from English six times more often than they translate from German, just as Germany translates six times more often from English than from French (analysis of data from UNESCO, 2010). In general, translations flow from world centers, particularly from the English-language “super-center,” to the periphery, and not nearly so often in the other direction. Since 1932, over a million books have been translated from English into other languages, but only about 116,000 from other languages into English, whereas for most other languages, there is more import than export of translations (UNESCO, 2010; compare Heilbron, 1999). Thus, scholars who are monolingual in English experience the largest “blind-spot” vis-à-vis literatures originating outside their language zone.

Translating more works into English would help to remedy this great asymmetry. However, translation alone cannot guarantee that the new readers will understand and appreciate a work. Even when linguistic barriers are overcome, ideas can be lost in translation. One reason is that conventions of writing unfamiliar to an audience can obscure the significance of the work (e.g., see Uribe, 1997). For example, because of different conventions for scholarly writing, to European and Latin American readers US anthropology of education may seem to lack sufficient theoretical grounding, while to US readers European and Latin American work may seem overly theoretical and to lack empirical findings and discussion of research methods. As a result, each set of scholars may fail to take the other seriously.

## 【出典】

©© 2011 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Levinson, B. and Pollock, M. (2011). *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education*. Chichester, West Sussex [England]: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.17-21.

Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.



2019年度 立命館大学大学院文学研究科入学試験問題

2019年2月16日

博士課程後期課程 人文学専攻  
教育人間学専修

「外国語」(独語)

●受験上の注意

- ① 試験中、冊子をばらしても構わないが、終了後再び綴じて提出すること  
(ホッチキスを貸与します)
- ② 全ての用紙に受験番号、氏名等を記入し、提出すること

●試験中の持込許可物件について

- ① 独語辞書の持込は認める  
(電子辞書・専門用語辞書は不可)
- ② 上記①の他には、筆記用具、受験票、時計以外の持込は認めない

## 文学研究科入学試験答案用紙

専攻・専修名	課程	科目	受験番号	氏 名
人文学専攻 (教育人間学専修)	後期課程	外国語 (独語)		

以下の文章は、教育人間学研究に多大な影響を与えた生物学者アドルフ・ポルトマン  
(Adolf Portmann) の著作からの一節である。よく読んで文末の設問に答えなさい。

*Die physiologische Frühgeburt*

- ① Ein hilfloser Nestflüchter – so erscheint der neugeborene Mensch dem Zoologen. Ist es uns bewußt, daß diese Tatsache die Regel der Säugetiere durchbricht? Suchen wir einmal in Gedanken den Geburtszustand zu erfinden, wie er sein müßte, wäre der Mensch wirklich völlig dem Bildungsgesetze seiner Gestaltverwandten unterworfen. Ein solcher Versuch ist nicht nur eine müßige Konstruktion; er dient der Feststellung einer Möglichkeit, an der erst das Seltsame unserer wirklichen Entwicklung gemessen werden kann. Unsere Überlegung sucht nur nach einer Vergleichsbasis, sie erarbeitet ein Modell; sie will nicht etwa den Entwicklungszustand irgendeiner Ahnenform darstellen.

Das Neugeborene aller hoch organisierten Säugergruppen ist ein Nestflüchter mit weit ausgebildeten, leistungsfähigen Sinnesorganen. Seine Gestalt ist, von geringen Proportionsverschiebungen, besonders der Kopfgröße, abgesehen, ein verkleinertes Abbild der Reifeform, und sein Verhalten wie seine Bewegungsweise entsprechen weitgehend dem Gebaren der Eltern. Auch verfügt es über die Elemente der für die Art kennzeichnenden sozialen Kommunikationsmittel. So ist der Geburtszustand bei den Huftieren, den Robben und Walen, ebenso bei den Affen. Wie wir sahen, gilt diese Aussage im Blick auf die gestaltliche Ausformung auch für die Menschenaffen, von denen noch besonders zu berichten sein wird. Auch manche spezialisierten Nager mit reduzierter Jungenzahl und langer Tragzeit (im Verwandtenkreis der Stachelschweine), sowie die extrem spezialisierten Ameisenbären und Faultiere Südamerikas, die nur ein Junges werfen, folgen demselben Gesetz.

- ② Für ein echtes Säugetier von Menschentypus müssen wir im Sinne dieser Definition ein Neugeborenes fordern, das in den

Proportionen seines Körpers dem Erwachsenen ähnlich ist, das die artgemäße aufrechte Körperhaltung einnehmen kann und das wenigstens über die ersten Elemente unseres Beziehungsmittels, der Wortsprache (und Gebärdensprache), verfügt. Es gibt dieses theoretisch geforderte Stadium in der Tat in unserer Entwicklung: etwa ein Jahr nach der Geburt wird diese Stufe erreicht. Nach einem Jahr erlangt der Mensch den Ausbildungsgrad, den ein seiner Art entsprechendes echtes Säugetier zur Zeit der Geburt verwirklichen müßte. Würde also dieser Zustand beim Menschen auf echte Säugerweise gebildet, so müßte unsere Schwangerschaft etwa um dieses eine Jahr länger sein, als sie tatsächlich ist; sie müßte etwa 21 Monate betragen. Dieser Zahl von 21 Monaten darf natürlich nicht ein allzu absoluter Wert zugesprochen werden. Es kommt doch sehr darauf an, welchen Grad der Annäherung an die Reifeform man in unserer Konstruktion fordert: je nachdem wird man ein paar Monate mehr oder weniger «verlangen» müssen. Entscheidend für unsere weitere Untersuchung ist die Notwendigkeit der Forderung einer um ungefähr ein Jahr verlängerten Tragzeit für ein menschenähnliches Säugetier, für einen echten Tiernmenschen oder ein Menschentier!

- ③ Dabei schweift unser Denken nicht etwa ins Unmögliche und Phantastische aus. Solche lange Tragzeiten kommen vor. Der indische Elefant wirft sein Junges nach 21–22 Monaten, und dieses bewegliche Elefantenkind von fast 1 m Schulterhöhe und etwa 100 kg Gewicht ist ein Musterbeispiel für alle die eben präzisierten Forderungen. Die Tragzeit des Pottwals soll etwa 16 Monate betragen; auch er bringt ein weit ausgebildetes Jungtier zur Welt: das «Kleine» ist bei der Geburt 4 m lang. Wir ziehen vorläufig nur die Folgerung, daß die wirkliche Dauer der menschlichen Schwangerschaft sehr viel kürzer ist, als sie für eine typische Säugerentwicklung bei unserer Organisationsstufe sein müßte.

Daß der menschliche Geburtszustand eine Art «physiologischer», d. h. normalisierter Frühgeburt ist, das wird kaum ernsthaft bestritten werden, und die Feststellung ist in dieser Form auch nicht neu. Aber der Gegensatz zur Entwicklungsnorm höherer Säuger ist nicht erkannt worden: Durch die suggestive Wirkung der Gemeinsamkeiten von Menschen und Menschenaffen ist das Problem überblendet worden, das die Schwangerschaftsdauer beim Menschen uns in Wahrheit aufgibt. Es fehlte ein Bezugssystem, um die Besonderheiten unserer Ontogenese eindrücklicher zu sehen.

Manche Eigenarten der Entwicklungsvorgänge, welche der

Geburt des Menschen folgen, werden verständlicher, wenn wir einmal diese Geschehnisse im Lichte unserer Folgerung anschauen; das frühe nachembryonale Wachstum ganz besonders. Das Wachstum der Säuglingsperiode ist beim Menschen durch eine sehr intensive frühe Massenzunahme ausgezeichnet; es steht in schroffem Gegensatz zur Langsamkeit aller späteren Körperbildung, die man immer wieder als für den Menschen ganz besonders charakteristisch bezeichnet hat.

## 【出典】

© 1969 by Schwabe & Co Basel

Portmann, A. (1969). *Biologische Fragmente zu einer Lehre vom Menschen*. Dritte, erweiterte Auflage. Basel, Stuttgart:

Schwabe & Co., pp.57-60.

Reproduced with permission of the publisher.

## 設問 1

文中の下線部①と②と③を日本語に訳しなさい。

## 設問 2

文章全体の内容を踏まえて、*Die Physiologische Frühgeburt* の概念を説明し、併せてその概念の教育人間学的意義について、教育人間学の学問的特質を際立たせつつ論じなさい。