2017年度大学院入学試験＜2017年2月11日実施＞

政策科学研究科後期課程　入学試験問題

外国語(英語)試験

＜一般入試＞

試験時間　10時00分　～　11時30分
(途中退室はできません)

- 持ち込み許可物件は、一般的な外国語辞書(当該外国語の和訳辞書)です。但し、専門語辞典、辞書機能付き電子手帳等は認めません。
- 問題は試験終了後に回収します。

次の〔A〕、〔B〕の設問に答えなさい（すべての設問に解答すること）。

〔A〕以下の英文を読み、設問に日本語で答えなさい。解答用紙に問題番号を標記してから解答しなさい。

PLAUSIBLE RIVAL HYPOTHESES

A fundamental strategy of social research involves evaluating 'plausible rival hypotheses'. We need to examine and evaluate alternative ways of explaining a particular phenomenon. This applies regardless of whether the data are quantitative or qualitative; regardless of the particular research design (experimental, cross-sectional, longitudinal or case study); and regardless of the method of data collection (e.g. observation, questionnaire). Our mindset needs to anticipate alternative ways of interpreting findings and to regard any interpretation of these findings as provisional — subject to further testing.

The idea of evaluating plausible rival hypotheses can be illustrated using the example of the correlation between type of school attended and academic achievement. Many parents accept the causal proposition that attendance at fee paying private schools improves a child's academic performance (Figure 1.6)*. Schools themselves promote the same notion by prominently advertising their pass rates and comparing them with those of other schools or with national averages. By implication they propose a causal connection: 'Send your child to our school and they will pass (or get grades to gain entry into prestigious institutions, courses).' The data they provide are consistent with their proposition that these schools produce better results.

But these data are not compelling. There are at least three other ways of accounting for this correlation without accepting the causal link between school type and achievement (Figure 1.6)*. There is the *selectivity* explanation: the more able students may be sent to fee paying private schools in the first place. There is the *family resources* explanation: parents who can afford to send their children to fee paying private schools can also afford other help (e.g. books, private tutoring, quiet study space, computers). It is this help rather than the type of school that produces the better performance of private school students. Finally, there is the family *values* explanation: parents who value education most are prepared to send their children to fee paying private schools and it is this family emphasis on education, not the schools themselves, that produces the better academic performance. All these explanations are equally consistent with the observation that private school students do better than

government school students. Without collecting further evidence we cannot choose between these explanations and therefore must remain open minded about which one makes most empirical sense.

There might also be methodological explanations for the finding that private school students perform better academically. These methodological issues might undermine any argument that a causal connection exists. Are the results due to questionable ways of measuring achievement? From what range and number of schools were the data obtained? On how many cases are the conclusions based? Could the pattern simply be a function of chance? These are all possible alternative explanations for the finding that private school students perform better.

Good research design will anticipate competing explanations *before* collecting data so that relevant information for evaluating the relative merits of these competing explanations is obtained. In this example of schools and academic achievement, thinking about alternative plausible hypotheses beforehand would lead us to find out about the parents' financial resources, the study resources available in the home, the parents' and child's attitudes about education and child's academic abilities before entering the school.

＊Figure 1.6 は省略。

【出典】David de Vaus, Research Design in Social Research, Sage Publications, 2001. pp. 11-13.

問１. evaluating plausible rival hypotheses とはどのようなものか、問題文中の例を用いて説明しなさい。

問２. 問題文中の下線部で before collecting data とされているのはなぜか、説明しなさい。

〔B〕以下の英文を読み、設問に日本語で答えなさい。解答用紙に問題番号を標記してから解答しなさい。

Depth interviews and focus groups

There are two main types of qualitative research: the depth interview and the group interview.

The *depth interview* is unstructured (there is an interview guide but no questionnaire), of very variable length (but may take up to five hours), and may be extended into repeat interviews at later dates (for example, to find out how individuals' perspectives change in response to some experience or event in their lives). Although the interviewer guides the

discussion enough to focus on the topic of interest, the depth interview provides enough freedom for respondents also to steer the conversation, for example to bring in all sorts of tangential matters that, for them, have a bearing on the main subject. This sort of interviewing is very different from the structured interview based on a questionnaire used in large-scale surveys, and requires skills. A variety of specialised techniques are sometimes used to elicit aspects of respondents' views that are not directly articulated, such as the repertory grid and projective techniques (involving sentence completion, pictures, and so forth); these may be used for interviewing special groups, such as children, or for sensitive topics.

The second method is the *focus group*, which consists of a group discussion or group interview: between four and 12 people (eight being optimal) discuss the topic of concern for one to two hours with the guidance of a moderator. Focus groups produce less information on individual motivations and views than depth interviews can achieve, but they yield additional information as people react to views they disagree with, or the group as a whole develops a perspective on the subject.

Focus groups are used extensively in market research, in evaluation research where there is an identifiable client group (as in healthcare), and in social development work by the World Bank, International Labour Office and other international bodies. Depth interviews are used more extensively in academic research. Qualitative studies normally involve small numbers of respondents. In market research, where the focus is usually fairly specific (reactions to a particular product or service, or to a new policy), depth interviews with 15-25 people and/or three to four focus groups would be typical. The more diverse and diffuse topics covered by social research usually require at least 30-50 depth interviews; but some will warrant over 100 depth interviews, at which point it becomes much easier to distinguish sub-groups and specific clusters or patterns of attitudes and related behaviour. When depth interviews are used in oral history surveys, hundreds of interviews may be collected.

Depth interviews and focus groups are usually tape recorded, so that direct quotations from respondents figure largely in the eventual report, in place of the tables and statistics offered in a survey report. But, as noted later, reports on qualitative research take many forms. In market research, a short verbal report is often sufficient if the results are clear cut — for example, if the product or advertisement is disliked.

The great strength of qualitative research is the *validity* of the data obtained: individuals are interviewed in sufficient detail for the results to be taken as true, correct, complete and believable reports of their

views and experiences. Its main weakness is that small numbers of respondents cannot be taken as representative, even if great care is taken to choose a fair cross-section of the type of people who are the subjects of study. If qualitative research is dismissed as a weak alternative to a survey, this is because the validity problems in survey data are largely invisible and regularly overlooked, particularly by economists and statisticians, who routinely work with large datasets and official statistics and often make unproven assumptions about behaviour.

The other great strength of qualitative research is in the study of motivations and other connections between factors. The question 'why?' often cannot be asked, or answered, directly and may involve a variety of circumstantial and contextual factors creating links between, or choices between, apparently unrelated matters. Whether one is seeking explanations at social-structural level, or at the level of individual choices and life styles, qualitative research is valuable for identifying patterns of associations between factors on the ground, as compared with abstract correlations between variables in the analysis of large-scale surveys and aggregate data. Depth interviews can also clarify the reasons for discrepancy between stated attitudes and behavior.

repertory grid　レパートリー・グリッド（法）
projective techniques 投影法
sentence completion 文章完成（法）

【出典】

Catherine Hakim, Research Design: Succesful Designs for Social Economics Research 2nd ed., Routledge, 2000. pp. 35-36

問１. depth interview とはどのような方法か、簡潔に説明しなさい。
問２. focus group とはどのような方法か、簡潔に説明しなさい。
問３. qualitative research の長所とはどのようなものか、問題文の内容を参考にして論じなさい