



Title	Work and Life of People with Disabilities in Germany and Japan- Sheltered Workshops in the Course of Time -
Author(s)	Fricke, Joshua
Citation	大阪大学, 2025, 博士論文
Version Type	
URL	https://hdl.handle.net/11094/101609
rights	
Note	やむを得ない事由があると学位審査研究科が承認したため、全文に代えてその内容の要約を公開しています。全文のご利用をご希望の場合は、大阪大学の博士論文についてをご参照ください。

The University of Osaka Institutional Knowledge Archive : OUKA

<https://ir.library.osaka-u.ac.jp/>

The University of Osaka

Abstract of Thesis

Name (Joshua Fricke)	
Title	<p>Work and Life of People with Disabilities in Germany and Japan</p> <p>- Sheltered Workshops in the Course of Time -</p> <p>(ドイツと日本における障がい者の就労と生活についての研究 -時代とともに変化する作業所-)</p>
<p>Abstract of Thesis</p> <p>The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities came into force in May 2008. In the 27th article of the Convention, persons with disabilities are guaranteed the right to work in a free and inclusive labor market. Since Germany ratified the Convention in 2009, its implementation has been reviewed in two state review procedures in 2015 and 2023. Japan ratified the Convention in 2014 and was subjected to its first state review process in 2022. In these state reviews, both countries are criticized with similar wording with regard to the fact that the employment of people with disabilities takes place in segregated sheltered workshops that offer too few opportunities for transition to the open labor market and insufficient pay. While the sheltered workshops of both countries are subject to similar criticism, it has become clear in the course of this research project that the systems originated from different social backgrounds.</p> <p>The aim of this paper is therefore to find out through comparative research what challenges countries with well-developed sheltered workshop systems face, and what approaches countries with different sociocultural backgrounds are taking to these challenges. Esping-Andersen's (1990) model of welfare regimes and Kasza's (2002) critical elaboration of this model will serve as the theoretical basis for the comparison of the support systems for people with disabilities in the two countries. On the basis of this analysis, ultimately the question will be discussed: what opportunities sheltered workshops offer and whether they can be a sustainable form of institution.</p> <p>The first part of this paper will analyze the structure of sheltered workshops, which is deeply rooted in the historical development of the respective welfare system. However, statements about these institutions cannot be made without assessing the perceptions of their actual users. Therefore, the second part of this paper is intended to supplement the macro-societal perspective of the state review procedures in the area of sheltered workshops with a more narrowed-down perspective through qualitative research. As a basis for this, field research in both countries in the form of interviews with users, staff members, and managers of workshops, as well as participatory observations in these institutions, will serve.</p> <p>The second chapter is focusing on Germany. It became apparent that the German support system for people with disabilities is firmly rooted in the structures of the dual German welfare system. The dual welfare system refers to the division of labor between the national state and non-statutory welfare associations, which is determined by the principle of subsidiarity. The responsibility for providing welfare services remains with the state. However, the specific implementation is delegated to the welfare associations (Backhaus-Maul & Olk, 1994; Tennstedt, 1995).</p> <p>The third chapter will outline the historical origin of Japanese sheltered workshops. These differ from German workshops in that they have their origin in the disability rights movement of the 1970s and were only fully incorporated into the welfare system with the coming into force of the Supports and Services for Persons with Disabilities Act in 2006 (Kamikake, 1986). The Japanese workshops can thus be regarded as a form of institution that has grown out of the population through a bottom-up process.</p>	

The results of the field research in Germany are presented in the fourth chapter. As also became apparent from the historical analysis, it was reaffirmed that the German sheltered workshops are a highly institutionalized form of facility that are embedded in the structures of the welfare associations. In response to the UN Commission's criticism, all parties agreed that there is a need for reform of the workshop system, particularly with regard to remuneration and the creation of more opportunities for transition to the open labor market. On the other hand, the users of the workshop emphasized that they perceive the workshop as a place of belonging and are against the comprehensive abolition of sheltered workshops.

In the fifth chapter, the analysis of the field research results from the Japanese workshops showed that the bottom-up origin of the workshops can still be found in their daily routine. Even though the workshops represent a segregated form of workplace, they are nevertheless strongly integrated into the local community through their concept and small scale. It also became clear that the Supports and Services for Persons with Disabilities Act (2006) represents a kind of watershed for the identity of the workshops. While workshops that were established before often have the aforementioned activist character, workshops that were established after the law took effect take a more cooperative approach and try to achieve their goal with the help of existing systems and a strong local network.

In the sixth chapter, the results of the previous chapters are compiled and discussed comparatively. The German and Japanese workshops differ structurally, triggered by their different historical backgrounds. The German workshops emphasize institutionalization and professionalization, which gives them a clear advantage in terms of actual labor market integration. The Japanese workshops focus more on the interpersonal level, which gives them advantages in terms of inclusion in the local communities. Finally, the research questions posed at the beginning will be addressed, namely whether the sheltered workshop is a sustainable form of institution, and which solution strategies both countries pursue in the face of the challenges facing the workshops. The actors interviewed for this paper agree that there is a need for reforms in the area of sheltered workshops and that the institutions need to develop further. On the other hand, however, there were also users who see the workshops as their place of belonging and do not aspire to work in the open labor market. Such voices must also be considered when implementing the transition process of people with disabilities to the open labor market. Regarding solution strategies, it is likely that Germany will continue to address the transformation processes of the workshops within the dual welfare system with the help of the non-statutory welfare associations. In Japan, the low level of institutionalization and trends such as the increasing number of workshops being established as for-profit organizations suggest that new stakeholders with new concepts in the field of workshops will emerge in the future (MHLW, n.d.-e). Further research is needed to analyze the opportunities and risks associated with this process.

This paper concludes with the prospect that in both countries, more and more people, regardless of disability, cannot cope with the traditional models of work, and thus there is a societal necessity for the creation of places of belonging. In the future, it must be analyzed whether the social re-evaluation of the workshops, as part of an inclusive labor market, is a possible further development for this form of institution.

論文審査の結果の要旨及び担当者

氏 名 (FRICKE JOSHUA)			
	(職)	氏 名	
論文審査担当者	主 査	教授	斉藤 弥生
	副 査	教授	河森 正人
	副 査	准教授	中井 好男
	副 査	准教授	宮本 匠

論文審査の結果の要旨

障害者権利条約では、障がいがあっても普通に地域で暮らせるために、締約国は障がいのある人たちの就労の機会を保障しなければならず、国連は定期的な調査に基づき、課題解決に向けた勧告を行う。ドイツも日本も、障がいのある人たちの就労の一般労働市場への移行が不十分であると国連からは正勧告を受けているが、本研究は逆に一般就労と福祉的就労に二分されている働き方自体に対する問題提起を行っている。つまり障がい者就労は一般就労に向かうべきと安易に結論づける潮流のなか、本研究は「作業所」と呼ばれる福祉的就労に着目し、作業所が障がい当事者にとって何を意味するのか、どのような役割を果たしているかについて、当事者目線で追究し、障がい当事者が望む就労と向き合おうとする点が挑戦的でオリジナリティが高く、本論文が評価される点でもある。

本論文の第1章では、日本とドイツの福祉制度を比較する意味を検討している。Esping-Andersenはドイツと日本を同一の保守主義モデルに分類するが、申請者はKaszaの主張を引用しながら、同じレジームに分類される国々でもそれぞれの歴史的、社会的背景の違いを注視する必要があるとし、障がい当事者の就労に焦点を当てた自身の研究は福祉レジーム分類をさらに進展させることができるとしている。確かに全人口に占める障がい者の割合、法定雇用率や作業所制度の存在だけをみれば、ドイツと日本は類似している。しかし障がい当事者の就労には両国の政策理念とガバナンスに大きな違いが存在するのは本論文が示すとおりである。

第2章ではドイツの作業所の始まりと発展の歴史を整理し、フィールド調査とインタビューにより、障がい者就労の現状を明らかにした。ドイツでは補完性の原理により、社会福祉サービスは6つの福祉団体により提供され、作業所も福祉団体が運営している。障がい者参加促進法も成立し、作業所にも利用者の企業派遣等、福祉的就労と一般就労の距離を縮めようとする動きもみられる。インタビュー調査では障がい当事者の方にとって、作業所は単に生活費を稼ぐだけの場ではなく、安心できる居場所と捉えていることを明らかにしている。

第3章では、日本の作業所を考えるうえで障害者自立支援法（2006年施行、2010年廃止）は分岐点となり、これまで当事者運動や親たちの会が立ち上げてきた無認可作業所の多くは就労支援事業所となり、そこで働く障がいのある人たちは利用料を支払う利用者、つまり福祉対象者にしてしまったことを指摘する。日本の作業所は草の根運動で生まれ、アットホームだが、一つ一つの事業所の規模が小さく、安定して仕事が生産されないため、利用者に払われる工賃も安い。この点が弱小組織の多い日本と高度に組織化されたドイツの作業所との大きな違いでもある。それでも企業訪問を繰り返し、作業所の利用者が一般就労を目指し、努力を続ける団体の存在も示している。

本論文の学術的貢献は障がい当事者にとって作業所の存在意義を示すことで、その就労を福祉的就労か一般就労かの二者択一で考えるべきではなく、両者の融合が必要で、現場ではそれが始まりつつあることを明らかにした点である。申請者はドイツの医療機関での勤務経験や作業所でのフィールドワーク、3年を超える日本の障がい者作業所でのフィールドワークを含め、丁寧に障がい当事者の声に耳を傾けてきたことにある。障がいの種類によっては障がい当事者へのインタビューは困難な場合も多く、フィールドワークが有効となる。作業を共にすることで、言語以外でのコミュニケーションも可能となる。また本研究では、ドイツ語を母国語とする申請者の学術領域での日本語運用力、コミュニケーション力が十分に発揮されており、論文にはドイツの最新の情報や希少価値のある情報も多く含まれており、社会福祉学、福祉社会学、社会政策研究をはじめ、関連研究領域に寄与する研究といえる。以上のことから、本論文は博士（人間科学）の学位授与に値するものと判定された。