

(平成 26 年度前期日程)

# 英 語

90 分

## 注 意 事 項

1. 試験開始の合図までこの冊子を開かないこと。
2. 本問題冊子は 13 ページ、答案用紙は 2 ページである。
3. 各答案用紙の上の枠内には、受験番号を記入し、その右側の枠内には、受験番号の下 2 桁の数字を忘れずに記入すること。
4. 解答はすべて各答案用紙の所定の欄に記入すること。
5. 問題冊子および答案用紙は切りはなさないこと。
6. 答案用紙に記入する受験番号の数字の字体は、下記の例にならい、明瞭に記入すること。

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えよ。(80点)

Ours is the era of transnational corporations, global electronic outsourcing, just-in-time deliveries, the automation of jobs, corporate lay-offs and multiple rounds of job cutting. The term “globalization” has become a kind of cultural shorthand for capturing these tumultuous socio-economic changes, and — whilst the debate over globalism has been widespread in the social sciences — it is widely agreed that globalization has given rise to the emergence of a “new economy” in which financialization, communications and services come to the fore in the polished, expensive cities of the West.

The impact of multinational corporations, able to export industrial production to low-wage spots around the globe, and to restructure investment in the West away from manufacture to the finance, service and communications sectors, has spelt major changes in the ways people live their lives, how they approach work, as well as how they position themselves within the employment marketplace. Whilst employment has become much more complex than in previous periods as a result of the acceleration of globalization, one key institutional fact redefining the contemporary condition has been the rapid decline of lifetime employment. The end of a job-for-life, or of a career developed within a single organization, has been interpreted by some critics as heralding the arrival of a “new economy” — flexible, mobile, networked. Global financier and philanthropist George Soros argues that ( ① ) in the modern economy.

Reference to the “new economy” has become a stereotype within recent discussions of globalization, and I want to clarify its meaning here — as I am going to subsequently suggest that a better term is the “project-based economy”, a term especially relevant for grasping the widespread trend towards career reinvention. The new economy, as referenced by economists and sociologists especially, refers to the emergence of computer-based production technology, largely in the service, finance and communication sectors; the spread of new

information technologies, which underpin spatially dispersed global production and consumption; and new ways of organizing work, primarily around the imperatives of adaptability and flexibility.

All of these features of the new economy have spelt rapid change throughout both public and private life, and arguably nowhere more so than in people's fears over their professional self-worth, the splintering of personal identity and the fragmentation of family life. Indeed, it is in the shift from the traditional work contract (long-term job security, orderly promotions, longevity-linked pay and pensions) to the new work deal (short-term contracts, job hopping and options shopping, high risk-taking) that a new kind of economy nests. This is what I shall call the "project-based economy", one in which professionals move from a world of "lifetime careers" to a world of "project-based assignments". Robert Reich, Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley, captures well the new marketplace logics of project-based work: "It's a spot auction market. What you're paid is what you're worth at that particular time".

I mentioned earlier that globalization plays a key role in the emergence of the new project-based economy. いかにグローバルイズムが経済に浸透し、雇用や生活を再構成するかについては、<sup>(2)</sup>さらにもう少し考察する価値がある。 For this is an especially important point for grasping why and how the reinvention of careers has moved to centre-stage in professional life in our own time. Some writers have argued that time — specifically, a new and different conception of the temporal conditions of social life — is of key significance in this connection. Over a period since the Second World War, according to this argument, a faith in the durability of social relationships and trust in social and economic institutions has weakened. Experience — the idea that things, including human beings, develop and mature over time — has been sidelined, replaced instead with a focus on the here-and-now of the moment. The central institutional force driving this shift in perceptions of time is globalization. The culture of globalization, as the

American sociologist Richard Sennett puts it, is that of acute “short-termism”. It is not just that social life is speeding up with technological advances, nor that people are in a great hurry to live life to the fullest. It is rather that contemporary women and men now calculate that things—including human relationships—( ② ). Short-term thinking increasingly takes precedence over long-term planning—not only in politics, but in the workplace too. Authors such as Sennett see the flexibility demanded of workers by multinational corporations as demonstrating the corrosive power of globalization, promoting a dominant conception of individuals as dispensable, even ultimately disposable. And it is against this backdrop of globalism that Sennett cites statistics showing that average American college graduates today can expect in their lifetime to hold 12 positions or posts, plus they will be required to change their skills base at least three times. From this viewpoint, yesteryear’s job-for-life is replaced today by short-term contract work.

If downsizing, flexibility and job insecurity have become the mark of our times, how might this influence how women and men think about their working lives? How do such economic changes impinge upon people’s sense of professional identity? And how might the building of a long-term successful career be pursued in a world devoted to the short-term? Let me return briefly to Sennett’s arguments about the rise of the imperatives of flexibility and risk-taking in the globalizing world of work. Sennett’s contention, bluntly put, is that we have moved from a work world of rigid, hierarchical organizations, in which self-discipline shaped the durability of the self, to a brave new economy of corporate re-engineering, innovation and risk, in which demands for employment flexibility move to the fore.

According to Sennett, the rise of flexible capitalism—however much flexibility and risk-taking are said to give people more freedom to shape the direction of their professional and personal lives—actually leads to crushing new burdens and oppressions. Flexible capitalism is “flexible” only in as far as its

workers and consumers accept the dictates of a post-hierarchical world, accept that it is they, and they alone, who must strive to be ever-more flexible, and accept the abandonment of traditional models of work as well as standard definitions of success. This is a redefinition of success away from past achievements and towards future flexibility and readiness to embrace change.<sup>(4)</sup> This is, in short, makeover\*<sup>1</sup> culture lifted to the spheres of work and employment.

When people are inserted into a world of detachment and superficial cooperativeness, of weak ties and interchangeable relationships, and when all this is shaped by the pursuit of risk-taking and self-reinvention, the hold of traditional ways of doing things radically diminishes. This can be potentially liberating: employees find new thrills and spills in redefining work identities and creating fluid and innovative working relationships. ( ③ ) A working life that is fashioned largely through episodic encounters and short-term projects has little emotional consistency; and it is this drift of character, of the "corrosion of character", that Sennett fixes his attention firmly upon. According to Sennett, as the coherent working narrative breaks down, so does the symbolic texture of the self. In the 24/7\*<sup>2</sup> world of advanced globalization, the durability of a career is replaced by a kind of supermarket experience of the working life — an assemblage of scraps, random desires, chance encounters, the accidental and the fleeting. The fast, short-term, techy culture of globalization is unleashing — it is being suggested — a new paradigm of self-making in work and employment. In a world of short-term contracts, endless downsizings, just-in-time deliveries and multiple careers, the capacity to change and reinvent oneself is fundamental. A faith in flexibility, plasticity and incessant reinvention — all this means we are no longer judged on what we have done and achieved; we're now judged on our flexibility, on our readiness for personal makeover.

How does this brave new corporate world of short-termism affect professional identities? Acclaimed sociologist Zygmunt Bauman provides some

useful observations in this connection, particularly in his underscoring of the increasing fragility and liquidity of fears, anxieties and troubles that beset contemporary women and men. In his provocative book *Wasted Lives*, Bauman contends that the key anxiety of the twenty-first century is that of the fear of disposability. This is the fear people today have of being dumped, dropped, displaced, discarded and disowned. Bauman's contention speaks to the fear women and men have today of being made redundant, which can often come at a moment's notice. これは、文字どおり一晩のうちに、多国籍企業が活動を他国に移す世界において、<sup>(5)</sup>労働者が直面する不安をとらえた概念である。 And it is an idea that scoops up many contemporary fears concerning global electronic offshoring, outsourcing and other new forms of technological change.

Bauman's underscoring of the fear of disposability obviously chimes with a world of intensive globalization and expanding mobilities, of instant communications and of enforced mass migrations. Yet whatever the precise adequacy of this social diagnosis, I now want to argue that Bauman's contention concerning fear of disposability sheds light on new social forces motivating people to demand instant self-reinvention through career makeovers.

\*1 makeover: a complete transformation of the appearance of someone or something

\*2 24/7: working twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week

[Adapted from Anthony Elliott, *Reinvention*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2013, 40-44.]

I-1. 下線部(1)のように述べた後、筆者は“new economy”の意味をどのように明確化しているか。句読点を含めて60字以内の日本語で答えよ。

I-2. 下線部(2)を英語に訳せ。

I-3. 下線部(3)を日本語に訳せ。

I-4. 下線部(4)を日本語に訳せ。

I-5. 下線部(5)を英語に訳せ。

I-6. 本文中の空欄①, ②, ③に入れるのもっとも適切なものをAからEの中から選び, 記号で答えよ。

空欄①

- A. “communications” now substitute for “financialization”
- B. “financialization” now substitutes for “transactions”
- C. “globalization” now substitutes for “communications”
- D. “relationships” now substitute for “globalization”
- E. “transactions” now substitute for “relationships”

空欄②

- A. are becoming relevant
- B. are getting out of control
- C. do not last for long
- D. essentially stay the same
- E. repeat themselves

空欄③

- A. And yet nothing is more thrilling than creative jobs.
- B. But there is also something more unsettling at work.
- C. Moreover, anything can hinder each employee’s potential.
- D. There is nothing fluid about workers’ mutual ties, though.
- E. When this happens, however, something reassuring appears.

I-7. 下の1から10の文から、本文の内容に一致するものを3つ選び、番号で答えよ。

1. As a result of the acceleration of globalization, financial industries have been replaced by service industries in the West.
2. New information technologies have led multinational corporations to concentrate their production in polished modern cities.
3. Globalization creates fear in people concerning their personal identities and family life, and their belief in themselves as capable and effective workers.
4. There has been a shift in perceptions of time since World War II, and an increasing emphasis has been put on the durability of human relationships.
5. According to Sennett, globalization has brought about various improvements in working conditions, which have benefited the moral welfare of workers.
6. As flexibility and job insecurity become prevalent, people are getting more and more absorbed in pursuing successful careers over the long term.
7. Sennett suggests that, although flexible capitalism may allow us to shape our lives more freely, it also puts us under new pressure to change ourselves constantly.
8. Emotional consistency at one's workplaces is rarely established through short-term projects, which undermines working narratives.
9. The achievements of individual workers are getting less important these days, compared with their readiness to reinvent themselves as a group.
10. Zygmunt Bauman's book *Wasted Lives* has provoked women and men to anger because they face the fear of being displaced at any moment.



II 次の英文を読んで、以下の設問に答えよ。(70点)

When it came to solving the riddle of the peacock's tail, Charles Darwin's powers of evolutionary deduction were second to none — the more extravagant their feathered displays, he reasoned, the greater their chances of attracting a peahen. But when he tried to account for the human propensity\*<sup>1</sup> to weep, Darwin found himself at a loss. “We must look at weeping as an incidental result, as purposeless as the secretion of tears from a blow outside the eye,” he wrote in 1872.

In this Darwin was almost certainly wrong. In recent decades, scientists have offered several accounts of how the capacity for tears may have given the ancestors of humans an adaptive advantage. These range from the aquatic ape theory, according to which tears were an adaptation to saltwater living; to the notion that, by blurring our vision, tears may serve as a “white flag” to potential aggressors — a signal that the crier is incapable of harm. Then there are the straightforward biological theories, such as the claim that tears evolved to keep the eye moist and free of harmful bacteria.

But perhaps the theory enjoying the widest currency is the notion that tears are a form of social signalling that evolved from distress calls — a clear visual signal that someone is in pain or danger and needs help.

“Tears are highly symbolic,” says Ad Vingerhoets, a Dutch psychologist who has spent 20 years studying why and when we weep. “They signal helplessness, especially during childhood when humans are at their most vulnerable.”

Vingerhoets is not the only thinker to point to the social significance of tears. The psychiatrist John Bowlby highlighted the role of crying in engendering attachment between mother and child, while the British neurologist Michael Trimble recently linked crying to the human capacity for empathy — hence our propensity to weep during inspiring music.

However, in his new book, *Why Only Humans Weep*, Vingerhoets argues that

none of these explanations is sufficient. Although crying has been documented in apes, elephants and even camels, it seems that only humans produce emotional tears, and it is only in humans that crying behaviours persist into adulthood. The challenge is to explain why, given that tears also run the risk of signalling our presence to predators, animals that threaten us.<sup>(2)</sup>

Vingerhoets's explanation is novel: although in certain situations weeping can be risky, he suggests it is far less risky than screaming or emitting some other loud acoustic signal. This is particularly true in the case of interactions at close quarters, such as occur during the extended period of human childhood, when a tear may be all that is required to alert a mother to her baby's suffering.

"When other animals grow old, most no longer emit distress signals, presumably because it is too dangerous," says Vingerhoets. "By contrast, in humans there is a shift from the acoustic signal, emitted in all directions, toward the visual signal of tears, which especially fit closer, more intimate interactions."

In support of his theory, Vingerhoets points to the enlarged visual cortex in humans and old-world primates — a structure, he argues, that most probably evolved to read the nuances of facial musculature and other strong visual clues. In addition, crying is an emotional expression that signals appeasement in adults — something that he argues would have been advantageous for early humans by promoting social connectedness.

But of course crying is not only associated with the human need for attachment. Tears can also be moral, signifying our sympathy with an injustice. Moreover, as the cultural historian Thomas Dixon points out, tears are sometimes associated with joy and ecstasy rather than grief and sorrow.

The trouble with tears is that they are always "thick" with description. "Tears are intellectual things," argues Dixon. "They are produced both by thoughts and the lachrymal glands"<sup>\*2</sup>. In each age, different texts collaborate with different bodies to produce tears with different meanings."

To be fair, Vingerhoets is alive to the way that crying is both a product of

involuntarily neurophysiological\*<sup>3</sup> processes and cognition. Sometimes, as when we weep while chopping an onion, tears may signify nothing at all; at other times they may be an expression of profound grief or sadness.

The trouble is that quite often — as when people cry when driving alone, a common phenomenon according to Vingerhoets — our tears catch us unawares, prompting us to become upset where perhaps no upset is called for. In such cases, it seems, tears are mother to the emotion rather than the other way round.<sup>(3)</sup>

More than any other form of emotional expression, tears are also subject to shifting historical readings, symbolising piety and sensitivity in one age and hysteria and weakness in another.

Whatever the precipitant, however, there is a widespread belief that crying is cathartic\*<sup>4</sup>. However, even this may be a construct, says Vingerhoets. Although people frequently report feeling better after watching a Hollywood “tearjerker” with a friend, when asked to watch a similar movie in a laboratory setting they usually report no improvement in mood at all. For Vingerhoets this is further evidence of the social function of crying. “\_\_\_\_\_,” he says.<sup>(4)</sup>

But while we may prefer to cry in the presence of friends and family, this need not be the case. As the pious tears shed by monks in contemplation of God attest, we can also shed tears for distant and highly symbolic attachment figures.

大切なのは、私たちの無力さを認めてもらえているという気持ちであるようだ。<sup>(5)</sup>

\*<sup>1</sup> propensity: a natural tendency to behave in a particular way

\*<sup>2</sup> lachrymal gland: an organ at the upper outer edge of the eye that produces tears

\*<sup>3</sup> neurophysiological: relating to the functions of the nervous system

\*<sup>4</sup> cathartic: helping one to remove unhappy memories or strong emotions such as anger or sadness

II-1. 下線部(1) these の指す内容を日本語で記せ。

II-2. 下線部(2)を日本語に訳せ。

II-3. 下線部(3)を日本語に訳せ。

II-4. 本文中の下線部(4)に入れるのもっとも適切なものをAからEの中から選び、記号で答えよ。

- A. Catharsis is something we generally experience in groups
- B. In actual fact, tears are a means by which we can deepen our sense of humanity
- C. Sad American movies move us very much when we're alone
- D. Tears are less important when you are alone because there is no one to witness them
- E. You can't easily achieve a change in mood by making yourself cry

II-5. 下線部(5)を英語に訳せ。

II-6. 本文の内容に合うように文を完成させるのにもっとも適切なものをAからEの中から選び、記号で答えよ。

(1) Darwin's ability to deduce evolutionary reasons for natural phenomena was

- A. equal to any problem
- B. responsible for the modern understanding of why we weep
- C. so great that he was never at a loss
- D. unequal to the question of the peacock's tail
- E. without equal

(2) The double-underlined clause in paragraph 11 (they are always "thick" with description) is intended to mean that

- A. different ethnic groups shed tears that are chemically distinguishable
- B. each age has produced biological explanations and intellectual accounts that give tears meaning
- C. tears are a product of bodily functions
- D. tears are a product of complicated mental processes
- E. it would seem that tears can only be accurately described by multiple scientific theories

II-7. 下の1から10の文から、本文の内容に一致するものを3つ選び、番号で答えよ。

1. The main purpose of this passage is to emphasize how much Charles Darwin contributed to the study of evolution.
2. Humans tend to look aggressive when their eyes are filled with tears.
3. Ad Vingerhoets, John Bowlby and Michael Trimble all regard weeping as a way of communicating among humans.
4. Michael Trimble's recent theory of tears is thoroughly supported by Ad Vingerhoets.
5. It is thought that apes and humans are the only animals that shed emotional tears in adulthood.
6. According to Ad Vingerhoets, most animals including humans tend to rely on acoustic signals rather than visual ones when they get older.
7. Ad Vingerhoets is unique among many researchers in suggesting that weeping is sometimes much safer than screaming or other acoustic signals.
8. Thomas Dixon, a cultural historian, asserts that emotions such as joy or ecstasy never cause humans to shed tears.
9. We cannot weep without experiencing strong emotions.
10. In a lab setting a lift in spirits after viewing sentimental Hollywood movies is seldom observed.