

受 験 番 号						氏 名	

2025年度  
放送大学大学院博士後期課程  
文化科学研究科 文化科学専攻  
**社会経営科学プログラム**  
筆記試験問題（英語読解試験）

試験日：2024年10月5日（土）

試験時間：9時30分～11時30分

注意事項

1. 試験開始の合図があるまで、この試験問題冊子は開かないでください。
2. 解答には、黒鉛筆かシャープペンシルを使用してください。
3. 配付されるものは、「試験問題冊子1冊」、「解答用紙2枚」及び「下書き用紙2枚」です。追加配付はしません。
4. 試験開始の合図の後、試験問題冊子を確認してください。試験問題冊子は、表紙、白紙、問題（4ページ）の順に綴じられています。試験問題冊子、解答用紙及び下書き用紙に落丁・過不足のある場合、あるいは印刷が不鮮明な場合には、手を挙げて試験監督員の指示に従ってください。
5. 試験問題冊子の所定欄に、受験番号及び氏名を記入してください。
6. 解答用紙の所定欄に、プログラム名、氏名、受験番号及び解答用紙の何枚目であるかを、解答用紙別に必ず記入してください。  
小問題及び選択問題がある場合、解答する際の番号の記入箇所は、解答用紙のマス目の外としてください。  
なお、問題文中に別途記入方法の指示がある場合はそちらに従ってください。
7. 解答用紙1枚につき、1,000字まで記入することができます。解答用紙2枚のうち、社会経営科学プログラムは1枚以内で解答してください。指定された字数に従って解答してください。
8. 試験問題冊子、解答用紙及び下書き用紙を綴じているホチキス針をはずしたり、中身を破り取ったりしてはいけません。
9. 試験問題冊子、解答用紙及び下書き用紙は試験終了後に回収します。試験問題冊子及び下書き用紙に解答を記入しても採点の対象にはなりませんので、必ず解答用紙に解答を記入してください。
10. 試験時間は2時間です。試験開始後40分を経過した後は、試験問題冊子、解答用紙及び下書き用紙を試験監督員に提出した上で、退室してもかまいません。ただし、試験終了5分前以降は退室できません。

## 筆記試験問題（英語読解試験）

以下の英文を読んで、下の設問(1)～(4)に全て答えなさい。なお、設問の番号を解答の冒頭に記すこと。

Hypothetical questions sometimes inspire the sociological imagination. Suppose that a being from a different planet arrived in Japan and wanted to meet a typical Japanese, one who best typified the Japanese adult population. <sup>(1)</sup>Whom should the social scientists choose? To answer this question, several factors would have to be considered: gender, occupation, educational background, and so on.

To begin, the person chosen should be a female, because women outnumber men in Japan; sixty-five million women and sixty-two million men live in the Japanese archipelago. With regard to occupation, she would definitely not be employed in a large corporation but would work in a small enterprise, since one in eight workers is employed in a company with three hundred or more employees. Nor would she be guaranteed lifetime employment, since those who work under this arrangement amount at most to only a quarter of Japan's workforce. She would not belong to a labor union, because less than one out of five Japanese workers is unionized. She would not be university-educated. Fewer than one in six Japanese have a university degree, and even today only about 40 percent of the younger generation graduate from a university with a four-year degree.

The identification of the average Japanese would certainly involve much more complicated quantitative analysis. But the alien would come closer to the 'center' of the Japanese population by choosing a female, non-unionized and non-permanent employee in a small business without university education than a male, unionized, permanent employee with a university degree working for a large company.

<sup>(2)</sup>When outsiders visualize the Japanese, however, they tend to think of men rather than women, career employees in large companies rather than non-permanent workers in small firms, and university graduates rather than high school leavers, for these are the images presented on television and in newspaper and magazine articles. Some academic studies have also attempted to generalize about Japanese society on the basis of

observations of its male elite sector, and have thereby helped to reinforce this sampling bias. Moreover, because a particular cluster of individuals who occupy high positions in a large company have greater access to mass media and publicity, the lifestyles and value orientations of those in that cluster have acquired a disproportionately high level of visibility in the analysis of Japanese society at the expense of the wider cross-section of its population.

While a few competing frameworks for understanding Japanese society are discernible, a discourse that is often labeled as *Nihonjinron* (theories of Japaneseness) has persisted as the long-lasting paradigm that regards Japan as a uniquely homogeneous society. The so-called group model of Japanese society represents the most explicit and coherent formulation of this line of argument, though it has drawn serious criticism from empirical, methodological and ideological angles. Put most succinctly, the model is based upon <sup>(3)</sup>three lines of argument.

First, at the individual, psychological level, the Japanese are portrayed as having a personality which lacks a fully developed ego or independent self. The best-known example of this claim is Doi's notion of *amae*, which refers to the allegedly unique psychological inclination among the Japanese to seek emotional satisfaction by prevailing upon and depending on their superiors. They feel no need for any explicit demonstration of individuality. Loyalty to the group is a primary value. Giving oneself to the promotion and realization of the group's goals imbues the Japanese with a special psychological satisfaction.

Second, at the interpersonal, intra-group level, human interaction is depicted in terms of Japanese group orientation. According to Nakane, for example, the Japanese attach great importance to the maintenance of harmony *within* the group. To that end, relationships between superiors and inferiors are carefully cultivated and maintained. One's status within the group depends on the length of one's membership in the group. Furthermore, the Japanese maintain particularly strong interpersonal ties with those in the same hierarchical chain of command within their own organization. In other words, vertical loyalties are dominant. The vertically organized Japanese contrast sharply with Westerners, who tend to form horizontal groups which define their membership in terms of such criteria as class and stratification that cut across hierarchical organization lines.

Finally, at the inter-group level, the literature has emphasized that integration and harmony are achieved effectively *between* Japanese groups, making Japan a ‘consensus society’. This is said to account for the exceptionally high level of stability and cohesion in Japanese society, which has aided political and other leaders in their efforts to organize or mobilize the population efficiently. Moreover, the ease with which the energy of the Japanese can be focused on a task has contributed in no small measure to Japan’s remarkably rapid economic growth during the half-century since the war. From a slightly different angle, Ishida argues that inter-group competition in loyalty makes groups conform to national goals and facilitates the formation of national consensus.

For decades, Japanese writers have debated on the essence of ‘Japaneseness’. Numerous books have been written under such titles as *What are the Japanese?* and *What is Japan?* Many volumes on *Nihon-rashisa* (Japanese-like qualities) have appeared. Social science discourse in Japan abounds with examinations of *Nihon-teki* (Japanese-style) tendencies in business, politics, social relations, psychology, and so on. Some researchers are preoccupied with inquiries into the ‘hidden shape’, ‘basic layer’, and ‘archetype’ of Japanese culture. These works portray Japanese society as highly homogeneous, with only limited internal variation, and give it some all-embracing label. Hamaguchi, for example, who presents what he calls a contextual model of the Japanese, maintains that the concept of the individual is irrelevant in the study of the Japanese, who tend to see the interpersonal relationship itself (*kanjin*) – not the individuals involved in it – as the basic unit of action. Amanuma argues that the Japanese core personality is based on the drive for *ganbari* (endurance and persistence), which accounts for every aspect of Japanese behavior. Publishing in Japanese, a Korean writer, Lee, contends that the Japanese have a unique *chijimi shikō*, a miniaturizing orientation which has enabled them to skillfully miniaturize their environment and products, ranging from *bonsai* plants, small cars, and portable electronic appliances to computer chips. The list of publications that aim to define Japanese society with a single key word is seemingly endless and, although the specific appellation invariably differs, the reductive impulse is unchanged.

出典：『An Introduction to Japanese Society by Yoshio Sugimoto, Cambridge University Press, 2010. Reproduced with permission of the Licensor through PLSclear.

- (1) 下線部(1)の問いかけに対する著者の答えとその理由を、本文に即して 100 字程度の日本語で説明しなさい。
- (2) 下線部(2)のような傾向はなぜ生まれたのか。本文に即して 100 字程度の日本語で説明しなさい。
- (3) 下線部(3)の “three lines of argument” の意味するところを、本文に即して 200 字程度の日本語で説明しなさい。
- (4) 本文は、これまでに書かれた日本人論にはどのような問題があると述べているか。全体の論旨を踏まえ 200 字程度の日本語で論じなさい。