

3 1

【国際商学部】

英語問題

2023(令和5)年度

【注意事項】

1. この問題冊子は「英語」である。
2. 試験時間は60分である。
3. 試験開始の合図まで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。ただし、表紙はあらかじめよく読んでおくこと。
4. 試験開始後すぐに、以下の5および6に記載されていることを確認すること。
5. この問題冊子の印刷は1ページから7ページまでである。
6. 解答用紙は問題冊子中央に2枚はさみこんである。
7. 問題冊子に落丁、乱丁、印刷不鮮明な箇所等があった場合および解答用紙が不足している場合は、手をあげて監督者に申し出ること。
8. 試験開始後、2枚ある解答用紙の所定の欄に、受験番号と氏名を記入すること（1枚につき受験番号は2箇所、氏名は1箇所）。
9. 解答は必ず解答用紙の指定された箇所に記入すること。解答用紙の裏面に記入してはいけない。
10. 問題番号に対応した解答用紙に解答していない場合は、採点されない場合もあるので注意すること。
11. 問題冊子の中の白紙部分は下書き等に使用してよい。
12. 解答用紙を切り離したり、持ち帰ってはいけない。
13. 試験終了時刻まで退室を認めない。試験中の気分不快やトイレ等、やむを得ない場合には、手をあげて監督者を呼び、指示に従うこと。
14. 試験終了後は問題冊子を持ち帰ること。



[I] 次の文章を読み、設問に答えなさい。

*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

The term culture can be considered at different levels. For example, societies or countries can have *identifiable cultures. Michelle Gelfand has shown how national cultures can vary in how “ A ” or “ B ” they are. A cultures in countries like Japan or Pakistan have very clear expectations about how people should behave and sanction people when they don’t comply. In contrast, countries with B cultures, like the United States or Israel, have fewer expectations about the appropriate behavior and greater *tolerance of behaving in different ways. We all appreciate that there is such a thing as “national culture.” Expectations for how people should behave in Japan are different from Australia. But our focus here is on understanding and recognizing culture at an *organizational level.

Broadly speaking, organizational culture refers to the expectations that organizational members share about how to think and act. These expectations are determined on the basis of shared assumptions, values, and beliefs that define what is important, as well as on *norms that define the appropriate attitudes and behaviors of organizational members. These social expectations act as important guides for how members should behave when no one is watching. In sum, organizational culture represents shared values that define what is important and norms and shared expectations that define appropriate attitudes and behaviors for organizational members—how to behave.

One helpful way to think about organizational culture has been suggested by Ed Schein, perhaps the most important scholar of organizational culture. He suggests that we think about culture as occurring at three different levels: (1) basic underlying assumptions and beliefs about the organization that may be unconscious or taken for granted, (2) norms and values that can be *espoused (*e.g., talked about) or *enacted (actually practiced), and (3) cultural *artifacts such as company symbols, dress, and language that are visible but sometimes hard to *decipher. In his seminal book, Schein begins by claiming that “the only thing of real importance that leaders do is to create and manage culture.” He finishes some three hundred pages later by concluding that “the unique and essential feature of leadership is the *manipulation of culture.”

Norms are clearly a key aspect of organizational culture and *dictate how people are expected to behave. Depending on the organization, these norms may include important things such as how we deal with each other, treat customers, handle *disagreements, or try to do new things or innovate. For instance, in some organizations people are expected to be polite and never challenge the boss. Many years ago, at *General Motors there was something referred to as the “GM nod” which referred to the tendency of people to nod agreement to a proposal but

then fail to support it. This behavior was identified as one of the cultural reasons GM failed to correct an *ignition switch problem that caused the deaths of more than a hundred people. In contrast, in some organizations, such as *Intel or *McKinsey, exactly the opposite behavior is expected. Employees at Intel are taught “*constructive *confrontation,” whereby they are expected to challenge others whenever they disagree. At McKinsey, all employees are taught that they have “an obligation to *dissent” if they disagree with others, even if the other person is a senior executive. The difference between GM and Intel or McKinsey is in the expected behavior—the norms that define the culture.^(D)

At *Zappos and *Nordstrom, amazing customer service is expected and employees are encouraged through norms and values to try to do whatever they can to help a customer, even if it means referring them to a competitor. At Nordstrom, for example, the employee handbook (*i.e., an artifact) consists of a single page with just one rule, “Use your good judgment in all situations. There are no other rules.” What this means is that employees are expected through norms and values to do whatever they can within reason to satisfy a customer, even if it means accepting returned *merchandise with no questions. Other companies may have different norms and values, whereby the customer is less important. For example, think about the last time that you called a customer service hotline and waited for twenty minutes while a recorded voice reminded you that “your call is very important to us.” The espoused value is customer service. The real norm is that customers aren’t that important.^(E)

But where should a leader interested in building and shaping culture begin? Although there is a great deal of research on all three of Schein’s levels, from a leadership perspective, it is most useful to focus on norms and values because these can be shaped and managed directly. From this perspective, cultural norms and values can be *reinforced by leaders and the systems that those leaders put into place (e.g., what is measured and rewarded in performance *appraisal systems).

(出典 Charles A. O’ Reilly III, Michael L. Tushman, “Lead and Disrupt : How to Solve the Innovator’s Dilemma, Second Edition” (Stanford University Press, 2021) 一部改変)

注

identifiable (*adj.*) < identify (*v.*)

tolerance: the willingness to accept or tolerate, especially opinions or behavior that you may not agree with, or people who are not like you.

organizational (*a.*) < organization (*n.*)

norm: standard of behavior that are typical of or accepted within a particular group or society.

espouse: to support an idea, belief etc.

e.g.: for example.

enact: put into practice.

artifact: an object made by human being, typically one of cultural or historical interest.

decipher: to find the meaning of something that is difficult to read or understand.

manipulation (*n.*) < manipulate (*v.*): handle or control (a tool, information, etc.) in a skillful manner.

dictate: to tell someone exactly what they must do or how they must behave.

disagreement: lack of consensus or approval.

General Motors (GM), Intel, McKinsey, Zappos, Nordstrom: names of companies.

ignition: the electrical system of the vehicle that makes the fuel begin to burn to start the engine.

constructive: useful and helpful or likely to produce good results.

confrontation: a situation in which there is a lot of angry disagreement between two people or groups.

dissent: refusal to agree with an official decision or accepted opinion.

i.e.: that is to say.

merchandise: goods that are bought or sold.

reinforce: to give support to an opinion, idea, or feeling, and make it stronger.

appraisal: an act of assessing something or someone.

- (1) 空欄 と空欄 に入る組み合わせとして最も適切なものを、次の(ア)～(エ)のうちから一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (ア) local global
(イ) pessimistic optimistic
(ウ) tight loose
(エ) defensive aggressive

- (2) 下線部 (C) について these の意味を明確に示しながら、日本語に訳しなさい。

- (3) 下線部 (D) の具体的な内容について、本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

- (4) 下線部 (E) のように筆者が主張する理由を、本文に即して日本語で説明しなさい。

- (5) Schein による organizational culture の 3 つの類型を日本語で示しなさい。その上で, leader が organizational culture に関して取り組むべき類型と具体的な施策についての筆者の主張を, 日本語で説明しなさい。



〔 Ⅱ 〕 次の文章を読み、設問に答えなさい。

*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

In July 2008, with the country's financial system in meltdown, the US government poured \$200 billion into Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, the *mortgage lenders, and nationalized them. On witnessing this, the Republican Senator Jim Bunning of Kentucky famously denounced the action as something that could only happen in a “socialist” country like France.

France was bad enough, but on 19 September 2008, Senator Bunning's beloved country was^(A) turned into the Evil Empire itself by his own party leader. According to the plan announced that day by President George W. Bush and subsequently named TARP (Troubled Asset Relief Program), the US government was to use at least \$700 billion of taxpayers' money to buy up the “*toxic assets” choking up the financial system.

President Bush, however, did not see things quite that way. He argued that, rather than being “socialist”, the plan was simply a continuation of the American system of free enterprise, which “rests on the conviction that the federal government should interfere in the market place only when necessary”. Only that, in his view, nationalizing a huge *chunk of the financial sector was just one of those necessary things.

Mr Bush's statement is, of course, an ultimate example of political double-speak—one of the biggest state interventions in human history is dressed up as another *workaday market process. However, through these words Mr Bush exposed the *flimsy foundation on which the myth of the free market stands. As the statement so clearly reveals, what is a necessary state intervention consistent with free-market capitalism is really a matter of opinion. There is no scientifically defined *boundary for free market.

If there is nothing sacred about any particular market boundaries that happen to exist, an attempt to change them is as legitimate as the attempt to defend them. Indeed, the history of capitalism has been a constant struggle over the boundaries of the market.

A lot of the things that are outside the market today have been removed by political decision, rather than the market process itself—human beings, government jobs, *electoral votes, legal decisions, university places or *uncertified medicines. There are still attempts to buy at least some of these things illegally (bribing government officials, judges or voters) or legally (using expensive lawyers to win a lawsuit, donations to political parties, etc.), but, even though there have been movements in both directions,^(B) the trend has been towards less marketization.

For goods that are still traded, more regulations have been introduced over time. Compared even to a few decades ago, now we have much more stringent regulations on who

can produce what (*e.g., certificates for organic or fair-trade producers), how they can be produced (e.g., restrictions on pollution or carbon emissions), and how they can be sold (e.g., rules on product labelling and on refunds).

Furthermore, reflecting its political nature, the process of re-drawing the boundaries of the market has sometimes been marked by violent conflicts. The Americans fought a civil war over free trade in slaves (although free trade in goods—or the tariffs issue—was also an important issue). The British government fought the Opium War against China to realize a free trade in opium. Regulations on free market in child labour were *implemented only because of the struggles by social reformers. Making free markets in government jobs or votes illegal has been met with stiff resistance by political parties who bought votes and dished out government jobs to reward *loyalists. These practices came to an end only through a combination of political activism, electoral reforms and changes in the rules regarding government hiring.^(C)

Recognizing that the boundaries of the market are ambiguous and cannot be determined in an objective way lets us realize that economics is not a science like physics or chemistry, but a political exercise. Free-market economists may want you to believe that the correct boundaries of the market can be scientifically determined, but this is incorrect. If the boundaries of what you are studying cannot be scientifically determined, what you are doing is not a science.

Thus seen, opposing a new regulation is saying that the *status quo, however unjust from some people's point of view, should not be changed. Saying that an existing regulation should be abolished is saying that the domain of the market should be expanded, which means that those who have money should be given more power in that area, as the market is run on one-dollar-one-vote principle.

So, when free-market economists say that a certain regulation should not be introduced because it would restrict the “freedom” of a certain market, they are merely expressing a political opinion that they reject the rights that are to be defended by the proposed law. Their ideological *cloak is to pretend that their politics is not really political, but rather is an objective economic truth, while other people's politics is political. However, they are as politically motivated as their opponents.

Breaking away from the illusion of market objectivity is the first step towards understanding capitalism.^(D)

(出典 Ha-Joon Chang, “23 Things They Don't Tell You About Capitalism ” (Penguin Books, 2010) 一部改变)

注

mortgage lender: 住宅ローンの貸し手.

toxic asset: 不良資産.

chunk: 塊.

workaday: 平日.

flimsy: 曖昧な.

boundary: 境界.

electoral: 選挙の.

uncertified: 非認可の.

e.g.: 例えば.

implement: 実施する.

loyalist: 支援者.

status quo: 現状.

cloak: 装い, 見せかけ.

(1) 下線部 (A) にある beloved country と Evil Empire がそれぞれ何を指すのか, 本文の中から探し, 英単語一語で書きなさい。

(2) 下線部 (B) は何を指すのか, 日本語で説明しなさい。

(3) 下線部 (C) の意味を次の(ア)~(エ)のうちから一つ選び, 記号で答えなさい。

(ア) accept

(イ) seize

(ウ) distribute

(エ) collect

(4) 下線部 (D) を日本語に訳しなさい。また, それに対するあなたの見解を日本語で述べなさい。