平成 26 年度実施
東北大学大学院情報科学研究科
博士課程前期・後期入学試験問題
（2014 年 8 月 28 日）

専門試験科目　第５群
（一般）

言語・メディア群

注意

○ 以下には、専門科目８問題が印刷されている。

○ 受験者は、そのなかから３問題を選んで、答案用紙に解答すること。

○ 言語系を志望する学生は，問題６～問題８のなかから，<u>２問題以上</u>を選択すること。

○ メディア系を志望する学生は，問題２～問題４のなかから，<u>２問題以上</u>を選択すること。

○ 問題１を選択した場合には、指定の解答用紙を使用すること。それ以外の問題を選択した場合は、答案用紙に問題番号を記入すること。

○ 問題５―１あるいは問題５－２を選択した場合には、辞書を使用しても構わない。ただし、辞書は出題者が用意したものを使用するので、必要な場合には試験官に申し出ること。

○ 試験終了後、答案用紙に加えて、この問題冊子も回収する。

東北大学大学院情報科学研究科　平成26年度実施上期（8月）入学試験

専門試験科目第5群　言語・メディア群

問題　1

「リスク」、「メディア」、「言語」の３語をキーワードとして、各自考えるところを６００字以上８００字以内の日本語でまとめなさい。その際、キーワードは３語とも用い、題名をつけて、首尾一貫した論理で記述しなさい。

※この問題を選択した場合には、指定された答案用紙に解答を記入すること。

問題　2

以下の文章を読んだ上で，ソーシャルメディアが広く普及している今日において人々に必要となるリテラシーについて，あなたの考えを英語または日本語で、解答用紙１枚程度で論じなさい。

「個人」という視点から，このソーシャルメディアとの付き合い方，つまりソーシャルメディア・リテラシーというものを考えてみたい。

まず始めに必要なリテラシーは，「アウトプット癖」である。

大げさな表現をすれば，古来アウトプット，つまり情報発信というものは崇高なものだった。価値あるものを世に発信する。共有するべき知的資産は，限られたものである。未だにほとんどの人の頭の中では，この「良質で限られたもののみがアウトプットされ，共有されるべき」という価値観が根付いている。

ソーシャルメディア・リテラシーでは，この価値観はまったく逆になる。まず何はともあれアウトプットするのである。まず発信するのである。それが価値あるものかどうかを自らの価値観だけで判断してはいけない。それが価値あるものかどうか。それは受け手が判断するのである。情報流通コストがほぼゼロになり，デジタル情報を蓄積するストレージの利用料も格安になった今，思いついた情報はまずオープンにするのである。

出典：小林慎和：ソーシャルメディア・リテラシー 未来を生き抜く必須スキル（個人編）
「日経ビジネスオンライン」(2011 年 4 月 19 日)
http://business.nikkeibp.co.jp/article/tech/20110415/219445/

問題　3

地域コミュニティにおけるメディアの役割について、あなたが特に重要だと思う点について、下記のなかから一つのメディアを取り上げ、具体的な事例をあげて、解答用紙1枚程度で、論じなさい。

(1) テレビ

(2) ラジオ

(3) 新聞

(4) ソーシャルメディア

(5) その他　（文中で何のメディアを取り上げたか明示しなさい。）

問題　4

以下の文章をふまえ、あなたが専門とする学問領域において「他者への共感」をどのように位置づけられるか、解答用紙1枚程度にまとめなさい（日本語で解答すること）。

トマス・パヴェル[1]は、虚構の世界というものは「わたし」とその「人生」とのあいだの「差」、「隔たり」に対する応答である、と興味深いことを言っている。われわれの一人ひとりは自分に与えられた「人生」を生きている。他者の目に映る、この「人生」を送っている者が、はたして「わたし」なのだろうか。どうもちがうようなのだ。この「人生」と「わたし」とのあいだには、隙間、ずれ、「遊び」があるのだ。ぴったりと重なり合っていたら、それこそわれわれが自分の肌を脱ぎ捨てることができないように（そんなことをしたら死んでしまう）、おのれの「人生」からほんのひとときであれ離れることはできないだろう。他人の立場に身を置いて、その人生を想像することはできないだろうし、そもそもそんな必要も感じないだろう。想像力が自由に動き回るためには、想像力が入りこめるだけのすきま、「遊び」が、われわれとわれわれ自身とのあいだに必要なのだ。他者となること、他者のなかに身を滑りこませること。よく考えれば、そんなことは誰でもやっている。遊んでいる子供たちがふつうにやっていることだ。［中略］すぐれた文学作品は、そこにわれわれが没入するとき、われわれが他者の身に自分を置くことを、そのようにしてわれわれのものとは異なる世界の風景を眺め、異なる社会を観察することを可能にしてくれる。そこに生きる人々もまた、われわれ同様に、喜びと悲しみ、希望や苦悩を抱えた人間なのだと実感させてくれる。文学作品を読むことで、われわれは宗教やジェンダーや人種や階級や国民性といった「差異」に出会い、それらを学びつつ、そのような差異を持った他者の感情、思考、世界の見方に触れることができる。そしてあらゆる差異を超えて、自分と同じ「内面」を備えた他者に、人間として「共感」することができる。他者への共感ということを考えるとき、文学がきわめて有効な手段であることは間違いない。

注1)　ルーマニア出身の文学理論家、小説家。

出典　小野正嗣『ヒューマニティーズ　文学』岩波書店、2012年［一部改変］。

問題　5

以下の問題５－１（ドイツ語)、問題５－２（フランス語）のうちから 一つ を選択して解答しなさい。なお、この問題を選択した場合には、辞書を使用しても構わない。ただし、辞書は出題者が用意したものを使用するので、必要な場合には試験官に申し出ること。

＊この問題を選択した場合には、解答用紙左上にある「問題番号」の欄に「５－１」あるいは「５－２」と記入すること。

問題　5－1

以下のドイツ語の文章を日本語に訳しなさい。

Früher war es das Fernsehen, das sich zum Beispiel während einer Naturkatastrophe als Medienplattform erwies. Nahezu alle Bürger bezogen Informationen von diesem Medium und konnten entsprechend reagieren. Das Fernsehen war ein Medium, dem man vertrauen konnte. Die Masse bezog nahezu dieselben Informationen. Die Demontage dieses Massenmediums, dazu zählen auch die Zeitungen, begann bereits vor mehr als zwanzig Jahren. 1985 kam es zu großen Veränderungen in der Marketingforschung. Es setzte ein Trend ein, die Masse der Konsumenten einzuteilen und nach bestimmten Vorlieben zu klassifizieren. Die Masse unterteilte sich mit einem Male nach bestimmten Vorlieben, wie Mangaliebhaber, Filmfreaks, nach Hobbys oder einem bestimmten Lifestyle. Mit dem raschen Aufleben des Internets Mitte der 1990er Jahre verstärkte sich dieser Trend zusehends. Man brauchte sich nun nicht mehr auf die Zeitungen oder das Fernsehen als alleinige Nachrichtenquellen zu verlassen. Ein neues Zeitalter mit neuartigen Nachrichtenstrukturen hatte begonnen.

問題　５－２

以下のフランス語の文章を日本語に訳しなさい。

À l'école et au collège, l'utilisation du téléphone portable pendant les heures de cours est interdite. L'élève ne peut donc pas l'utiliser ni en remplacement de sa calculatrice, ni pour consulter. Il pourra le faire pendant les heures d'interclasse ou de récréation, sauf mention contraire du règlement intérieur. Cette interdiction s'adressant aux enfants, les personnels ne doivent pas, pour leur part, entrer dans son champ d'application.

Au lycée, c'est le règlement intérieur qui s'applique. Le lycéen doit donc vérifier ce qui est édicté à ce propos dans le règlement intérieur qui lui est remis à la rentrée et qu'il doit approuver.

Les sanctions en cas d'utilisation sont également prévues par le règlement intérieur. Elles peuvent aller de la simple remarque jusqu'à la confiscation du téléphone, pendant une durée variable.

出典 *Direction de l'information légale et administrative* (le 03.05.2013)　［一部改変］

問6

言語習得研究の２つの手法に関する以下の英文を読んで、問いに答えなさい。

Since at least the early part of the 20th century, researchers have investigated language acquisition by analyzing children's spontaneous speech. During the first half of this century, a number of psychologists kept diaries in which they recorded details about children's language development, particularly children's acquisition of vocabulary items. Starting in the early 1960s, researchers took advantage of the availability of inexpensive audio tape recorders and began to record and analyze children's spontaneous speech. Most of these studies were longitudinal, in-depth studies of a few children (cf. Brown 1973; Clark 1978). Working without the aid of computers, these researchers made remarkably rich, accurate, and robust discoveries about how children acquire syntax. In the 1980s the widespread availability of inexpensive computers and optical scanners made it possible to put into computer-readable format the transcripts of children's spontaneous speech collected by these and other researchers (see MacWhinney and Snow 1985 for a description of the Child Language Data Exchange System or CHILDES). The availability of computer-readable transcripts has greatly increased the number of researchers who use children's spontaneous speech data to refine or test theories about the acquisition of syntax.

Most researchers investigating the acquisition of syntax seek to characterize the development of syntactic competence, rather than the development of performance factors that may influence or limit production. Unfortunately, no currently available method allows us to study competence directly in either the child or the adult. Perhaps the greatest advantage of (A)<u>using spontaneous speech to assess syntactic development</u> is that, of all the methods currently available to language acquisition research, studies of spontaneous speech are the least likely to be affected by extraneous experimental task demands. This is particularly an advantage when investigating the earliest stages of acquisition. Procedures that are used to elicit constructions may influence the utterances that children produce. Tasks that involve assessing syntactic competence by assessing comprehension (e.g., act-out tasks, picture selection tasks) must address the possibility that children may understand the utterance without having mastered the aspect of syntax that is being assessed or that, conversely, children may fail to understand an utterance that is generated by their grammar because of additional task demands or limitations or their parser. Another advantage of spontaneous speech studies is that they are well suited for longitudinal studies of language acquisition. Cross-sectional investigations of syntax acquisition must deal with the practical and theoretical problems raised by the possibility that individual children may develop language at different rates and, perhaps, in different ways. Although, in theory, methods other than spontaneous speech studies can be used to study syntax acquisition longitudinally, in practice most researchers are concerned that repeated administration of the same test may influence children's performance on the test. Such problems do not arise for longitudinal spontaneous speech studies: because in spontaneous speech studies children are allowed to say and do whatever they want, one can record a child as many times as one wants.

One problem with using children's spontaneous speech to test theories about syntactic development is that it is possible that a child might simply choose not to produce a particular syntactic construction, even though she has acquired it (i.e. even though the construction can be generated by her grammar). With spontaneous speech studies, one may need to record many hours of speech in order to collect enough spontaneous examples of a syntactic construction to be able to analyze its acquisition. This is particularly likely for constructions that are rare in the input. The problem of what to do about syntactic constructions that children rarely use is alleviated somewhat if the transcripts of children's spontaneous speech are computerized. If the transcripts are computer-readable, researchers can use a computer to cull those lines that are likely to contain utterances that exhibit the aspect of syntax under investigation. Another way of getting around this problem is to use an elicitation procedure to prod children into producing syntactic constructions that they rarely produce spontaneously. (B)<u>Asking a child to judge the grammaticality of utterances is yet another way of teasing apart whether a child does not use a construction because it is not part of her grammar or because she chooses not to</u>. Unfortunately, the task demands associated with eliciting grammaticality judgments are particularly high and, thus, grammaticality judgments generally cannot be used to investigate early syntactic development.

Sometimes the fact that children are able to say whatever they want makes it difficult for the researcher to figure out exactly what they actually say. Because transcripts of spontaneous speech provide only limited information about the phonetic form or nonlinguistic context of utterances, the problem of interpreting children's utterances is magnified if the person analyzing the transcripts does not have access to videotapes or audiotapes of the transcribed sessions. The problem of interpreting a child's utterance is reduced if the range of possible topics is reduced as is the case in elicited production and imitation studies. Another potential problem with spontaneous speech studies stems from the fact that most spontaneous speech studies are longitudinal investigations of the linguistic development of a small number of children. The implicit assumption underlying such studies is that the syntactic development of all children is essentially the same and, therefore, that it is perfectly acceptable to study just one or two children. The conclusions drawn from in-depth studies of a few children's spontaneous speech will be flawed if the assumption is incorrect and the syntactic development of the particular children being studied is unusual. If a large number of children are studied, one is less likely to encounter this problem. (C)<u>The availability of longitudinal, computer-readable transcripts of children's spontaneous speech makes it feasible for researchers to do in-depth longitudinal studies of many children</u>.

[出典：Stromswold, Karin (1996) "Analyzing Children's Spontaneous Speech," *Methods for Assessing Children's Syntax*, The MIT Press.（一部改変）]

問１　下線部(A)に関して、幼児の統語的発達の過程を評価する上で自発的発話を用いる研究が、子どもの言語能力を実験によって引き出す研究よりも優れているとされる点を、本文に即して２つ列挙し、簡潔に説明しなさい。

問２　下線部(A)に関して、幼児の統語的発達の過程を評価する上で自発的発話を用いる研究の欠点とされるものを、本文に即して３つ列挙し、簡潔に説明しなさい。

問３　下線部(B)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問４　下線部(C)に関して、longitudinal computer-readable transcripts は、幼児の統語的発達の過程についての研究に内在するどのような問題をどのように解決できる可能性があると筆者は論じているか、本文に即して説明しなさい。

問７

次の文章は、音声言語（例えば英語）と手話言語（例えばアメリカ手話 American Sign Language ; ASL）を比較したものである。これを読んで、下記の問いに答えなさい。

Signing certainly appears to be very different from speaking, so the question might linger as to just how similar language is in the two modalities: the manual/visual mode and the oral/aural mode. The answer is that the two are much more alike than might be suspected, although there are some inevitable differences. The structure of a spoken language involves a number of layers of organization: a division of utterances into (individually meaningless) sounds, grouped together in systematic ways into words (*phonology*); an internal organization of words by which pieces of their form convey components of their meaning (*morphology*, as when we analyse the single word *bakers* as *bake* + *-er* + *-s*); and the system that combines words into phrases and clauses (*syntax*). These same levels of organization are characteristic of signed languages as well, and the parallels are quite precise.

In phonology, a specific language makes use of sounds drawn from a particular inventory, selected from the rather larger range of sounds found across all of the world's languages. These sounds, in turn, can be seen as organized on a small number of dimensions such as place and manner of articulation, activity of the vocal folds,[注1] and so on. Sounds are combinable within the scope of language-particular regularities that are based on this categorization. Thus English allows a combination of the fricative consonant [s] plus a voiceless stop consonant [p, t] or [k], possibly followed by a liquid [r, l] at the beginning of a word, but nothing more complicated than that (and even here, combinations with [t] followed by [l] are excluded). Georgian,[注2] in contrast, allows much more complex combinations, such as the initial sequence of consonants in the (monosyllabic!) word [gvprt$^{s'}$k'vnis] 'he is bleeding us,' but does not allow the initial combination [sp] found in English *spot*.

A signed language like ASL has a similar organization, though obviously not one based on sounds. Ever since the pioneering work of William Stokoe in the early 1960s, it has been known that ASL signs can be broken down into distinct components such as handshape, location, movement, orientation, and a few others. Each of these dimensions provides a small number of values. A specific sign involves a particular handshape, made at a particular location with a particular orientation, perhaps involving a particular movement, and so on. The ways in which these components can be combined are governed by language-particular rules based on their internal organization.

In general, the components of signs are not meaningful in themselves. It is signs as wholes, like words, that are associated with meanings. The components of signs, and their language-particular modes of combination, thus function as an organization entirely comparable to the phonology of spoken languages. While it seems somewhat strange to talk about the ‘phonology’ of a language that does not involve sound, the structural similarities of organization of language in the two modalities have led to this as standard terminology.

Many spoken words are morphologically complex, like *bakers*. This complexity comes in several flavours. *Compounding* allows for the creation of a new word out of existing ones, like *doghouse*; *derivation* allows for the formation of a new word on the basis of another, as when we form *inflatable* from *inflate*; and *inflection* is responsible for the variation among forms of the same word used under different syntactic conditions, such as the singular and plural forms of nouns (*dog/dogs*) or present and past tenses of a verb (*wait/waited*). Most such cases in most spoken languages involve the addition of extra, affixal material to mark a morphological difference, but in some the marking is by some other means. Thus, *man/men* is parallel to *dog/dogs* but marks the plural by a difference in the vowel, just as *sit/sat* marks past tense by such a difference.

ASL also has complex words, parts of which correspond to parts of their meaning. Unlike English, ASL does not make basic distinctions of tense in its verbs, but rather distinctions of aspect, a category that characterizes the way an event or state transpires or is distributed across time. ASL verbs can be inflected for a large number of distinct aspects, primarily by varying the movement component of the sign. Derivational morphology is also present in ASL to some degree, for instance in the form of a suffix that can be added to verbal signs to make nouns referring to someone who carries out the action of the verb: an exact parallel to pairs like *bake/baker*. And ASL, like most signed languages, makes extensive use of compounding to create new signs out of combinations of existing ones.

The organization of a simple sentence of English into *constituents* is sketched below:

$[_{S}$ $[_{NP}$ A man $[_{S}$ $[_{NP}$ who $[_{VP}$ likes $[_{NP}$ long-haired cats]]]] $[_{VP}$ offered $[_{NP}$ his hand] $[_{PP}$ to $[_{NP}$ Felix]]]]

The organization of sentences into constituents in ASL is not as transparent as is (often) the case in English, because signs can appear in somewhat freer order in ASL than English words. In this respect, ASL is similar to languages like Latin, which also allows rather free word order.

Part of what allows for this freedom of order in spoken languages is the fact that the relations between words in the sentence may be indicated by other means. In Latin, the subject and direct object have different case forms (e.g., nominative versus accusative), allowing the listener to tell whether the dog is biting the man or *vice versa* regardless of the order of the words, unlike the situation in English. In ASL, verbs of transfer, such as ‘GIVE’, indicate the subject and object by the path of movement of the sign. As a result, expressions directly referring to these individuals can come in any order without impairing the intended meaning. With verbs that do not indicate their subject and object in this way, word order is much stricter.

出典　Stephen Anderson. 2012. *Languages: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. [一部改変]

注 1　声帯
　2　グルジア語

問 1　下線部を日本語に訳しなさい。

問 2　なぜ手話にも phonology があるといえるのか、本文に即して説明しなさい。

問 3　morphology に関する ASL と英語の異同を本文に即して論じなさい。

問 4　syntax に関して ASL にはいかなる特徴があるか。本文に即して論じなさい。

問８

次の文章は形容詞の分布について論じた文章である。これを読んで後の問いに答えなさい。

As it turns out, determining exactly what is constitutive of the grammatical category 'adjective' is not entirely straightforward. There are a number of distributional tests that distinguish adjectives from other categories, as we will see below, but (A)<u>it is not the case that all terms that are traditionally classified as adjectives in a particular language satisfy all of these tests, and it is likewise not the case that the tests apply uniformly across languages to terms that otherwise share the semantic properties that are traditionally thought to be associated with adjectives</u>. To keep things simple, I will focus primarily in this section on adjectives in English, with a few comments here and there about the behavior of adjectives in other languages. The reader should keep in mind, however, that although all languages have terms that share the semantic properties of English adjectives, the distributional patterns of these terms can vary.

The first identifying feature of adjectives involves their use as predicate terms. Like verbs, adjectives may supply the main predicate term in a sentence, and may even introduce their own arguments, as shown by examples like (1) and (2).

(1) a. That stone is weighty.
    b. That stone weighs a lot.
(2) a. The country is dependent on foreign oil.
    b. The country depends on foreign oil.

However, only adjectives can serve as the complements of the epistemic verbs *seem* and *appear*, as shown by the following contrasts (* denotes syntactic ill-formedness):

(3) a. That stone seems/appears weighty.
    b. *That stone seems/appears weigh a lot.
(4) a. The country seems/appears dependent on foreign oil.
    b. *The country seems/appears depend on foreign oil.

This test doesn't uniquely pick out adjectives, however: nouns (or rather noun phrases) can sometimes appear as the complement of *seem* and *appear*, especially when their meanings are in some sense scalar or evaluative. This is illustrated nicely in the following lines from *The Ship of Fools* by Sebastian Brandt (which appear on p. 294 of the 1962 edition of Edwin Zeydel's 1944 translation, published by Dover):

(5) He seems a burden, seems a pest
To all his brood, a hateful guest,
And yet it almost serves him right,
For he's a dull and witless wight.

A second diagnostic, which distinguishes adjectives from both nouns and verbs, is the possibility of direct composition with degree words like *rather, very, too, so, enough, how*. For example, of the related terms *dependent*, *depend* and *dependence*, only the first can directly combine with the excessive degree marker *too*:

(6) a. The country is too dependent on foreign oil.
b. *The country too depends on foreign oil.
c. *The country has too dependence on foreign oil.

(6b-c) can be repaired by combining *too* with *much*, but this only serves to illustrate the point that it is only the adjectival form *dependent* that can directly combine with the degree word. It should be emphasized, though, that adjectives accept composition with degree words only to the extent that they are associated with concepts that are, or can be, thought of as scalar, in a sense to be discussed below.

Perhaps the most central diagnostic for the class of adjectives is the one that is implicit in Huddleston and Pullum's functional/semantic characterization of adjectives as expressions that "alter, clarify, or adjust the meaning contributions of nouns": adjectives can directly compose recursively with nouns, forming more complex constituents, which may then combine with other elements (e.g., a determiner or possessive nominal) to form a noun phrase, as in (7a-c).

(7) a. a blue ball
b. a round blue ball
c. a large round blue ball

Such uses of adjectives are referred to as instances of attributive modification. English includes a number of adjectives that have only attributive uses, such as *former, mere,* *principal* and *main*:

(8) a. This is our former/principal/main objective.
b. *This objective is former/principal/main.

The existence of expressions like these has led some researchers to hypothesize that the attributive use of adjectives is in some important sense basic, a point to which we will return in detail below. However, like the other tests, this one also has exceptions, though they are few and appear to be systematic. For example, there is a class of adjectives which includes *asleep, awake, alone* (sometimes called *a*-adjectives, for obvious reasons) which can appear as complements of *seem* and *appear*, but are barred from attributive position:

(9) a. *Kim photographed two asleep/alive polar bears.
b. Kim photographed two sleeping/living polar bears.

There are, in addition, languages which require noun-modifying adjectives to first combine with a predicative element, effectively turning them into relative clauses (and calling into question their status as adjectives to begin with; see Baker 2003). Cases like these show that the possibility of attributive modification is not a necessary condition for adjective status, but it is generally agreed that it is a sufficient one.

Interestingly, it is not the case that attributive adjective ordering is fully unrestricted. For example, the default order of the adjectives *numerous, inefficient* and *American* as attributive modifiers is as in (10a), while orders in which *numerous* is non-initial are ungrammatical (10b-c).

(10) a. There are numerous inefficient American cars on the road.
b. *There are inefficient numerous American cars on the road.
c. *There are inefficient American numerous cars on the road.

These ordering restrictions are robust cross-linguistically, holding both in languages like English, where adjectives precede nouns, and in a mirror-image fashion in languages in which nouns precede adjectives, though $_{(X)}$the underlying reasons for the distribution are not well-understood.

The examples in (11), discussed originally by Bolinger (1967), show a sensitivity to the relative order of the noun and the adjective.

(11) a. The visible stars include Capella, Betelgeuse and Sirius.
b. The stars visible include Capella, Betelgeuse and Sirius.

(11a) is truth-conditionally ambiguous: it can be understood as a claim about which stars are visible at the time of utterance, or as a claim about which stars are intrinsically visible (e.g., capable of being seen by the naked eye). At noon on a sunny day, (11a) would (normally) be false on the first reading and true on the second. (11b), in contrast, is unambiguous: it has only the 'currently visible' reading, and would be false in the sunny day context. (B)This suggests that the ambiguity in (11a) does not reflect an ambiguity in *visible*, but rather has something to do with composition.

Taken together, examples like these show that subtle differences in structure can affect the truth conditions of sentences with attributive adjectives, a fact that must be kept in mind when constructing arguments — either linguistic or philosophical— based on the interpretations of such constructions. Superficially simple structures sometimes hide an underlying complexity, which must be taken into account by reasoning based on the meanings of those constructions and the elements they contain.

(出典：Kennedy, Chris. 2012. "Adjectives,' in Russell, G. and D. Graff Fara (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Philosophy of Language*. Routledge.　一部改変)

問１　下線部(A)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問２　本文では、形容詞という範疇の認定基準として考えられるものを３つ紹介している。そのそれぞれについて、どのような認定基準であるか、およびどのような例外や付帯条件があるかを本文に即して説明しなさい。

問３　どうして下線部(B)のように結論付けられるのか。その理由について、(11a)の多義性について触れながら、本文に即して説明しなさい。

問４　下線部(X)において筆者は「このような分布の根底にある理由はよくわかっていない」と述べている。あなた自身は(10)に示された分布はどのような理由によると推測するか。あなた自身のアイデアを述べなさい。

平成 26 年度実施
東北大学大学院情報科学研究科
博士課程前期・後期入学試験問題

(2014 年 8 月 28 日)

共通外国語科目　第５群
(英語)

○ 試験終了後、答案用紙に加えて、この問題冊子も回収する。

問題　“I'm Sorry, I'm Not Apologizing.”と題する次のエッセイを読み、後の問いに答えなさい。

Conversation is a ritual. We say things that seem the thing to say, without thinking of the literal meaning of our words any more than we expect the question “How are you?” to call forth a detailed account of aches and pains. But people have different habits for using these rituals, and when a ritual is not recognized, the words spoken are taken literally. I have heard visitors to the United States complain that Americans are hypocritical because they ask how you are but aren't interested in the answer. And Americans in Burma are puzzled when Burmese ask, “Have you eaten yet?” — and show no sign of inviting them to lunch.

We expect rituals at points of transition like greetings, and we expect them to be different — and those differences to cause confusion — when we go to foreign countries. (A)<u>But we don't expect differences, and are far less likely to recognize the ritual nature of our conversations, among other Americans at work.</u> Our differing rituals are even more problematic when we think we're all speaking the same language.

One conversational ritual that can differ from one person to the next and cause trouble at work is apologizing.

I had been interviewed by (B)<u>a well-known columnist</u> who ended our friendly conversation by giving me the number of her direct telephone line in case I ever wanted to call her. Some time later, I did want to call her but had misplaced her direct number and had to go through the newspaper receptionist to get through to her. When our conversation was ending, and we had both uttered ending-type remarks, I remembered that I wanted to get her direct number for the future and said, “Oh, I almost forgot — last time you gave me your direct number, but I lost it; I wondered if I could get it again.” “Oh, I'm sorry,” she came back instantly. “It's…” And she gave me the number. I laughed because she had just done something I had mentioned in our interview: said “I'm sorry” when an apology was not called for. She had done nothing wrong; I was the one who lost the number. But in fact she was not apologizing; she was just uttering an automatic conversational smoother to assure me she had no intention of rushing me off the phone or denying me her number.

Many women are frequently told, “Don't apologize” or “You're always apologizing.” The reason “apologizing” is seen as something they should stop doing is that it seems synonymous with putting oneself down. But for many women, and a fair number of men, saying “I'm sorry” isn't literally an apology; it is a ritual way of restoring balance to a conversation. “I'm sorry,” spoken in this spirit, if it has any literal meaning at all, does not mean “I apologize,” which would be tantamount to accepting blame, but rather “I'm sorry that happened.” To understand the ritual nature of apologies, think of a funeral at which you might say, “I'm so sorry about Reginald's death.” When you say that, you are not pleading guilty to a murder charge. You're expressing regret that something happened without taking or assigning blame. In other words, "I'm sorry" can be an expression of understanding — and caring — about the other person's feelings rather than an apology.

That an apology can be a routinized way of taking the other person's feelings into account becomes clear in the following example. When professional pool player Ewa Mataya, who is regarded as one of the top female pool players in the world, was being bested in a tournament by amateur (C) <u>Julie Nogiac</u>, Mataya said of Nogiac, "She's very sweet. She kept apologizing." I doubt Nogiac actually regretted that she was beating the champion; she was simply expressing her awareness that her doing so must have been making Mataya feel bad.

This is not to say that "I'm sorry" is never an apology. But when it is, in the sense of accepting responsibility for something that went wrong, it is often assumed to be the first step in a two-step ritual: I say "I'm sorry" and take half the blame; then you take the other half. (D)<u>A secretary</u> told me she liked working for her boss because, if he said, "When you typed this letter, you missed this phrase that I inserted," and she said, "Oh, I'm sorry. I'll fix it," he would usually follow up, "Well, I wrote it so small it was easy to miss."

Admitting fault can be experienced as taking a one-down position. When both parties share the blame, they end up on an equal footing. That is the logic behind the ritual sharing of blame in response to an apology. It's a mutual face-saving device. Someone who feels that an apology requires a ritualized sharing of blame might even make up a fault to admit, in order to seal off the interchange in an appropriate way. And those who share an understanding of the ritual will not take that admission of fault literally, but will simply appreciate it as an attempt to save face for them. Put another way, it is a courteous way of not leaving the apologizer in the one-down position.

Someone, on the other hand, who does not use apologies ritually may well take them all literally. And this can lead to resentment on the part of the ritual apologizer. If I say "I'm sorry" and you say "I accept your apology," then my attempt to achieve balance has misfired, and I think you have put me in a one-down position, though you probably think I put myself there.

Ritual apologies — like other conversational rituals — work fine when both parties share assumptions about their use. (E)<u>But people who utter frequent ritual apologies when others don't may end up seeming to be taking blame for mishaps that are not their fault.</u> When they are partly at fault, they come out looking entirely so. There are cultural as well as gender influences on how likely people are to use apologies in this way, but research on Americans by Nessa Wolfson and on New Zealanders by Janet Holmes shows that women are more likely to do it than men. Holmes found that women uttered the most apologies to other women and far fewer to men, while men uttered very few to other men and slightly more to women.

出典 Deborah Tannen. 1994. *Talking from 9 to 5*. New York: William Morrow. [一部改変]

問１　下線部(A)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問２　下線部(B)と下線部(C)の２名の発言からわかる the ritual nature of apologies の特徴はどのようなものか、本文に沿って２行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。

問３　下線部(D)の人物の発言からわかる the ritual nature of apologies の特徴はどのようなものか、本文に沿って２行程度の日本語で説明しなさい。

問４　下線部(E)を日本語に訳しなさい。

問５　以下(1)(2)のいずれかを選択して解答しなさい。

(1) “Conversation is a ritual.”という本エッセイと同じトピックセンテンスをもとに、10 行程度の英文で、あなたの意見を自由に論じなさい。

(2) 本エッセイの主張が正しいとして、職場や学校でどのような問題につながると考えられるか。10 行程度の英文で具体的に論じなさい。