

【問題】 下記の英文をすべて日本語に訳せ。ただし、文中にある () 内は訳さなくてよい。

No. 3にある※にも、注意すること。

It is important to begin by debunking the notion that people or organizations are somehow more unethical than they used to be. There is no data to support such a statement, and those of us who study business ethics can cite scandals from just about every decade going back a very long time. Perhaps when we observe ethics scandals, it makes us feel better to think that these are aberrations or that people today are less ethical than they used to be. If we're young, we can blame the aging baby boomers who are running many companies now. After all, they were always undisciplined and rowdy. If we're baby boomers, we can blame Generation X or Y and say that somehow these young people are less ethical than their predecessors. After all, their mothers weren't at home with them, building their characters. But, the truth is that unethical conduct has been around as long as human beings have been around. So, unethical behavior in business (and outside of business) is not an aberration, and managing business ethics isn't a fad. On the other hand, the environment has gotten more complex and dynamic, providing all sorts of ethical challenges and opportunities to express greed. Therefore, people need more guidance from their organizations and leaders than ever before (Treviño and Brown, 2004).

This chapter will take a "management" approach, arguing that, in order to create an ethical organization, ethical conduct must be managed just like any other type of employee behavior. We don't expect quality without managing it. And, we don't expect safety without managing that. Therefore, it is appropriate to think of ethical behavior as just another type of behavior that can and should be managed. Management must take responsibility for such behavior just as it takes responsibility for quality, safety, and productivity.

Some might think that ethical behavior is somehow exempt from management because it believes that ethics is individualistic—"I have my ethics and you have yours"—or that employees are fully formed when it comes to ethics and can't be changed. This is the classic "bad apples" argument, suggesting that unethical behavior is caused by "bad apples" who worm their way into organizations and then behave badly. But, if ethics were completely individualistic and employees were fully formed upon entering organizations, management would still have a responsibility to develop selection systems that would accurately select the most ethical employees and discard those "bad apples" who happen to find their way into the system. So, a management perspective would remain relevant.

But, research actually supports an alternative perspective. Decades of research on cognitive moral development (Kohlberg, 1969; Rest, 1986) supports the idea that moral development can continue into adulthood, meaning that new employees are not fully formed when it comes to ethics. They can be influenced. But, most important, the research finds that the large majority of adults is at the "conventional" level of cognitive moral development. That means that they are not autonomous individuals who think for themselves when it comes to ethical issues. In other words, ethics is not individualistic at all. Rather, these conventional-level people look outside themselves to peers and significant others for guidance when it comes to ethical issues. In work organizations, that guidance comes primarily from coworkers, supervisors, and the organizational culture, making the "management" of ethical conduct essential.

Further, some employees remain at the lowest level of cognitive moral development (the pre-conventional level), where they are highly susceptible to pressures from the reward system. They will do what's rewarded and avoid doing what is punished.

Finally, research on obedience (Milgram, 1974) supports the idea that the majority of people will obey authority figures even if the authority figure asks them to do something that will hurt another human being. Work organizations are powerful authority structures, and many a defendant has said in court, "I did it because my supervisor told me to."

Only a small percentage of employees are at the highest "principled" level of cognitive moral development, meaning that they are more autonomous, capable of reasoning through ethical dilemmas using principles of justice and rights, and more likely to match their behavior with their reasoning. Principled individuals are more likely to do what they think is right despite pressures from peers or authority structures, and they are more likely to report unethical behavior when they see it (see Treviño, 1992a for a review).

Understanding the psychology of moral reasoning makes it clear that most employees need to be managed when it comes to ethics. But, beyond that, it is important to note that even the most developed adults often need help thinking through issues that they haven't faced before. For example, those of us who are not journalists probably haven't thought carefully about the ethical issues surrounding divulging the identity of an information source. Under what circumstances is it ethical or unethical to do so? Further, with the job mobility of today's workers and managers, people frequently move between organizations and industries. Someone moving from the consumer products industry to the defense industry probably hasn't thought much about government contracting and the potential for conflicts of interest. Someone who moves from information technology to the chemical industry hasn't carefully considered issues related to environmental sustainability. Finally, even within industries, new technologies (for example, online financial services, cloning, stem cell research) raise ethical issues that few among us have tackled. For that reason as well, organizations have a responsibility to create a kind of "moral community" in which ethical dialogue can occur and the average employee can receive guidance.

When we think about recent efforts to manage ethics in organizations, many of us think about the United States Sentencing Commission guidelines for organizations that were first adopted in November, 1991. In an attempt to use a carrot as well as a stick, the U.S. Sentencing Commission (see www.ussc.gov) developed guidelines for organizations that wished to avoid serious sanctions that might be brought against the organization in a future legal case. The guidelines were based upon the assumption that an individual in an organization might do something wrong without the organization knowing about it—in other words, a “bad apple” might exist. But, if the organization had made a good faith effort to avoid such misconduct on the part of its members, these efforts would be taken into account, and sanctions meted out to the organization by the court would be less severe. The Sentencing Commission offered seven guidelines organizations should follow in order to be dealt with more leniently in such cases. These guidelines included features such as assigning responsibility for legal compliance at high organizational levels, development and distribution of conduct standards, training on those standards, discipline for misconduct, and an advice and reporting system that would catch problem behavior early and follow up on it. Following the recommendation of their legal counsel, many organizations soon implemented formal ethics or compliance “programs,” and many of these programs were managed from the legal counsel’s office. A professional organization, the Ethics Officer Association (www.eoa.org), was formed and has grown through the 1990s to its current size of nearly one thousand members. Members serve as ethics or compliance officers for their organizations, and they meet regularly to benchmark with each other and discuss the best ways to manage ethics and legal compliance programs. The key word here is “programs.” Following adoption of the 1991 Sentencing Commission guidelines, emphasis was placed on developing formal programs that were designed to manage these issues in large organizations. However, current efforts aimed at creating ethical organizations are beginning to turn their attention to the creation of ethical cultures rather than having this narrow focus on formal legal compliance programs.

※

- Generation X or Y の訳は、「X 世代、Y 世代」。
- The United States (U. S.) Sentencing Commission の訳は、「合衆国量刑委員会」。
- guidelines の訳は、「ガイドライン」でよい。
- compliance の訳は、「コンプライアンス」でよい。

2013年度北海学園大学大学院経営学研究科博士(後期)課程入学試験

英語(組織経営 流通・マーケット)

問題1 以下の英文を全訳しなさい。

Marketing theory and practice developed initially in connection with physical products such as toothpaste, cars, and steel. Yet one of the major megatrends of recent years has been the phenomenal growth of services. We define a service as follows:

A service is any act or performance that one party can offer to another that is essentially intangible and does not result in the ownership of anything. Its production may or may not be tied to a physical product.

A company's offering to the marketplace often includes some services. The service component can be a minor or a major part of the total offering. Five categories of offerings can be distinguished:

1. Pure tangible good: The offering consists primarily of a tangible good such as soap, toothpaste, or salt. No services accompany the product.
2. Tangible good with accompanying services: The offering consists of a tangible good accompanied by one or more services. Levitt observes that "the more technologically sophisticated the generic product (e.g., cars and computers), the more dependent are its sales on the quality and availability of its accompanying customer services (e.g., display rooms, delivery, repairs and maintenance, application aids, operator training, installation advice, warranty fulfillment). In this sense, General Motors is probably more service intensive than manufacturing intensive. Without its services, its sales would shrivel".
3. Hybrid: The offering consists of equal parts of goods and services. For example, people patronize restaurants for both food and service.
4. Major service with accompanying goods and services: The offering consists of a major service along with additional services or supporting goods. For example, airline passengers buy transportation service. The trip includes some tangibles, such as food and drinks, a ticket stub, and an airline magazine. The service requires a capital-intensive good—an airplane—for its realization, but the primary item is a service.
5. Pure service: The offering consists primarily of a service. Examples include baby-sitting, psychotherapy, and massage.

Because of this varying goods-to-service mix, it is difficult to generalize about services without further distinctions. However, some generalizations seem safe: First, services vary as to whether they are equipment based(automated car washes, vending machines) or people based (window washing, accounting services). People based services vary by whether they are provided by unskilled, skilled, or professional workers. Second, some services require the client's presence and some do not. Brain surgery involves the client's presence, but a car repair does not. If the client must be present, the service provider has to be considerate of his or her needs. Thus beauty shop operators will invest in their shop's decor, play background music, and engage in light conversation with the client. Third, services differ as to whether they meet a personal need(personal services)or a business need(business services). Physicians will price physical examinations differently for private patients versus employees on a prepaid company health plan. Service providers typically develop different marketing programs for personal and business markets. Fourth, service providers differ in their objectives(profit or nonprofit)and ownership(private or public).These two characteristics, when crossed, produce four quite different types of organizations. The marketing programs of a private investor hospital will differ from those of a private charity hospital or a Veterans Administration hospital.

問題2 以下の英文を全訳しなさい。

In an effort to lay down foundations for a general theory of marketing, Vargo and Lusch presented a framework that depicted the evolution of marketing logic from its traditional goods-centered perspective to an emerging service-centered view. This paradigm shift includes the role of goods as transmitters for service provision as opposed to being end products; the role of customers as co-creators of value as opposed to recipients of goods; the utilization of operant resources like knowledge and skills as primary units of exchange; determining value through customers' service experiences rather than producers' assessments; and structuring buyer-supplier interactions on relational foundations rather than transactional exchanges. The present paper focuses on how this paradigm shift alters contemporary views of supply chain networks, i.e. value co-creation networks as described within the service-dominant (S-D) logic. Lusch et al. suggest that supply chain management (SCM) research and S-D logic "fit naturally because it implies that SCM is concerned with developing and integrating resources to create competitively compelling value propositions".

As suggested by Lusch et al., the inherent manufacturing orientation of the goods-dominant (G-D) logic has fed into a common view of supply chain as a vertically linear set of organizations tied to one another through inorganic transactional exchanges. S-D logic argues that "goods are distribution mechanisms for service provision". Goods and other operand resources enable the transfer of operant resources (e.g. knowledge and skills) between firms. Therefore, within the S-D logic, supply chains are viewed as value co-creation networks. These networks promote knowledge growth (the fundamental source of competitive advantage) and exchange amongst network members via resource deployment and coordination. The exchange of knowledge and utilization of operant resources among the network members leads to co-created service offerings and value proposals for the end-users, with the ultimate goal of transforming end-user experiences to perceptions of superior value-in-use.