

平成 26 年度一般入試前期日程

英 語 問 題 紙

注 意 事 項

1. 試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題紙を開いてはいけません。
2. 英語の問題紙は、10 ページあります。
3. 解答用紙は 4 枚あります。
4. 受験番号は、監督者の指示に従って、全ての解答用紙の指定された箇所に必ず記入しなさい。
5. 受験番号および解答以外のことを解答用紙に書いてはいけません。
6. 解答はすべて解答用紙の指定された欄に書くこと。裏面に書かないこと。
7. 解答用紙のみを提出しなさい。問題紙は持ち帰りなさい。

問題 1 以下の英文を読み、問いに日本語で答えなさい。

Seeing ourselves as a member of a group automatically marks everyone as either an “us” or a “them.” Some of our in-groups, like our family, our work colleagues, or our bicycling buddies, include only people we know. Others, like females, Hispanics, or senior citizens, are broader groups that society defines and assigns traits to. But whatever (1)in-groups we belong to, they consist by definition of people we perceive as having some kind of commonality with us. This shared experience or identity causes us to see our fate as being intertwined with the fate of the group, and thus the group’s successes and failures as our own. It is natural, then, that we have a special place in our hearts for our in-group members.

We may not like people in general, but however little or much we like our fellow human beings, our subliminal selves tend to like our fellow in-group members more. Consider the in-group that is your profession. In one study, researchers asked subjects to rate the likability of doctors, lawyers, waiters, and hairdressers, on a scale from 1 to 100. The twist was, every subject in this experiment, was him- or herself either a doctor, a lawyer, a waiter, or a hairdresser. The results were very consistent: those in three of the four professions rated the members of the *other* professions as average, with a likability around 50. But they rated those in their own profession significantly higher, around 70. There was (2)only one exception: the lawyers, who rated both those in the other professions *and* other lawyers at around 50. That probably brings to mind several lawyer jokes, so there is no need for me to make any. Of the four groups assessed by the researchers, lawyers, you see, form the only one whose members regularly *oppose* others in their own group. So while other lawyers may be in a given lawyer’s in-group, they are also

potentially in his or her out-group. Despite that anomaly, research suggests that, whether with regard to religion, race, nationality, computer use, or our operating unit at work, we generally have a built-in tendency to prefer those in our in-group. Studies show that common group membership can even *trump negative personal attributes. As one researcher put it, “(3)One may like people as group members even as one dislikes them as individual persons.”

This finding — that we find people more likable merely because we are associated with them in some way — has a *natural corollary: we also tend to favor in-group members in our social and business dealings, and we evaluate their work and products more favorably than (4)we might otherwise, even if we think we are treating everyone equally. For example, in one study researchers divided people into groups of three. Each group was paired with another, and then each of the paired groups was asked to perform three varied tasks: to use a children's toy set to make a work of art, to sketch a plan for a senior housing project, and to write a symbolic fable that imparts a moral to the reader. For each task, one member of each group in the pair (the “nonparticipant”) was separated from his or her *cohorts, and did not take part in the tasks. After each pair of groups had completed a task, the two nonparticipants were asked to rate the results of the efforts of both groups.

The nonparticipants had no *vested interest in the products their in-group had turned out; nor had the groups been formed with regard to any distinctive shared qualities. If the nonparticipants had been objective, therefore, you'd think that on average they would have preferred the products of their out-group just as often as they preferred those of their in-group. But (5)they didn't.

*trump 克服する, 乗り越える

*natural corollary 当然の帰結

*cohort グループ, 集団

*vested interest 利害関係

In two cases out of three, when they had a preference, it was for what their in-group had produced.

Another way the in- and out-group distinction affects us is that we tend to think of our in-group members as more variegated and complex than those in the out-group. For example, the researcher conducting the study involving doctors, lawyers, waiters, and hairdressers asked all of his subjects to estimate how much those in each profession vary with regard to creativity, flexibility, and several other qualities. They all rated those in the other professions as significantly more homogeneous than those in their own group. Other studies have come to the same conclusion with regard to groups that differ by age, nationality, gender, race, and even the college people attended and the *sorority women belonged to. That's why, as one set of researchers pointed out, newspapers run by the predominantly white establishment print headlines such as "Blacks Seriously Split on Middle East," as if it is news when all African Americans don't think alike, but they don't run headlines like "White People Seriously Split on Stock Market Reform."

It might seem natural to perceive more variability in our in-groups because we often know their members better, as individuals. For instance, I know a great many theoretical physicists personally, and to me they seem to be quite a varied bunch. Some like piano music; others prefer the violin. Some read Nabokov; others, Nietzsche. Okay, maybe they're not *that* varied. But now suppose I think of investment bankers. I know very few of those, but in my mind I see them as even less varied than theoretical physicists: I imagine they *all* read only the *Wall Street Journal*, drive fancy cars, and don't listen to music at all, preferring to watch the financial news on television (unless the news is bad, in which case they just skip it and pop open a \$500 bottle of

*sorority 女子学生社交クラブ

wine). The surprise is that the feeling that our in-group is more varied than our out-group *does not depend* on having more knowledge of our in-group. Instead, the categorization of people into in-groups and out-groups alone is enough to trigger that judgment. In fact, as we'll see in just a bit, our special feelings toward our in-group persist even when researchers artificially sort strangers into random in-groups and out-groups. When Mark Antony addressed the throngs after Caesar's assassination, saying, in Shakespeare's version of the events, "Friends, Romans, countrymen, lend me your ears," he was really saying, "In-group members, in-group members, in-group members..." (7) A wise appeal.

(Adapted from *Subliminal: How Your Unconscious Mind Rules Your Behavior*,
by Leonard Mlodinow)

問 1 下線部(1)の定義を本文に即して述べなさい。

問 2 下線部(2)の内容を本文に即して述べなさい。

問 3 下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。

問 4 下線部(4)の内容を本文に即して述べなさい。

問 5 下線部(5)の内容を本文に即して述べなさい。

問 6 下線部(6)の結論はどのような結論か、本文に即して述べなさい。

問 7 下線部(7)のように評価できる理由を本文に即して述べなさい。

問題 2 Read the passage and answer the questions in English.

Can I Tattoo Your Face?

Some time ago I ran smack into a rather strange conflict of interest. In this case I was the patient. As a young man in my midtwenties — about six or seven years after I was originally injured — I went back to the hospital for a routine checkup. On that particular visit, I met with a few physicians, and they reviewed my case. Later, I met the head of the burn department, who seemed especially happy to see me.

“Dan, I have a fantastic new treatment for you!” he exclaimed. “You see, because you have thick, dark hair, when you shave, no matter how closely you try to shave, there will always be little black dots where your hair grows. But since the right side of your face is scarred, you don’t have any facial hair or small black dots on that side, making your face look asymmetrical.”

At that point, he launched into a short lecture on the importance of symmetry for aesthetic and social reasons. I knew how important symmetry was to him, because I was given a similar minilecture a few years earlier, when he convinced me to undergo a complex and lengthy operation in which he would take part of my scalp together with its blood supply and re-create the right half of my right eyebrow. (I’d undergone that complex twelve-hour operation and liked the results.)

Then came his proposal: “We have started tattooing little dots resembling *stubble onto scarred faces much like yours, and our patients have been incredibly happy with the results.”

“That sounds interesting,” I said. “Can I talk to one of the patients that

*stubble 無精ひげ

had this procedure?"

"Unfortunately you can't — that would violate medical confidentiality," he said. Instead, he showed me pictures of the patients — not of their whole faces, just the parts that were tattooed. And sure enough, it did look as though the scarred faces were covered with black stubblelike specks.

But then I thought of something. "What happens when I grow old and my hair turns gray?" I asked.

"Oh, that's no problem," he replied. "When that happens, we'll just lighten up the tattoo with a laser." Satisfied, he got up, adding "Come back tomorrow at nine. Just shave the left side of your face as you usually do, with the same closeness of shave that you like to keep, and I'll tattoo the right side of your face to look the same. I guarantee that by noon, you'll be happier and more attractive."

I mulled over the possible treatment on my drive home and for the rest of the day. I also realized that in order to get the full benefit from this treatment, I would have to shave in exactly the same way for the rest of my life. I walked into the department head's office the next morning and told him that I was not interested in the procedure.

I did not expect what came next. "What is wrong with you?" he growled. "Do you like looking unattractive? Do you derive some kind of strange pleasure from looking asymmetrical? Do women feel sorry for you? I'm offering you a chance to fix yourself in a very simple and elegant way. Why not just take it and be grateful?"

"I don't know," I said. "I'm just uncomfortable with the idea. Let me think about it some more."

You may find it hard to believe that the department head could be so aggressive and harsh, but I assure you this is exactly what he told me. At the

same time, it was not his usual manner with me, so I was puzzled by his unrelenting approach. In fact, he was a fantastic, dedicated doctor who treated me well and worked very hard to make me better. It was also not the first time I refused a treatment. Over many years of interacting with medical professionals, I had decided to have some treatments and not others. But none of my doctors, including the head of the burn department, had ever tried to guilt me into having a treatment.

In an attempt to solve this mystery, I went to his deputy, a younger doctor with whom I had a friendly rapport. I asked him to explain why the department head had put me under such pressure.

“Ah, yes, yes,” the deputy said. “He’s already performed this procedure on two patients, and he needs just one more in order to publish a scientific paper in one of the leading medical journals.”

This additional information certainly helped me better understand the conflict of interest I was up against. Here was a really good physician, someone I had known for many years and who had consistently treated me with compassion and great care. Yet, despite the fact that he cared a great deal about me in general, in this instance he was unable to see past his conflict of interest. It goes to show just how hard it is to overcome conflicts of interest once they fundamentally color our view of the world.

After years of experience publishing in academic journals myself, I now have a greater understanding of this physician’s conflict of interest (more about this later). Of course, I’ve never tried to coerce anyone into tattooing his face — but there’s still time for that.

(Adapted from *The (Honest) Truth About Dishonesty: How We Lie to Everyone — Especially Ourselves*, by Dan Ariely)

Question 1. Why did Dan visit the hospital at the beginning of the story?

Question 2. Suppose Dan has his face tattooed. What would the doctor do if Dan's hairs turned gray?

Question 3. What is the real reason the doctor wanted to tattoo Dan?

Question 4. According to the text, are the following statements true or false?
Mark T for true or F for false.

- A. It was not the first time that the doctor taught Dan how important symmetry was.
- B. Dan talked with others who had had the tattoo operation.
- C. Dan was happy with the outcome of the operation that restored part of his right eyebrow.
- D. Dan considered whether or not to have the treatment to have his face tattooed for about a day.
- E. This is the first time Dan refused treatment by a physician.
- F. Dan's doctor was usually aggressive and harsh.
- G. Dan gets on well with his doctor's deputy.
- H. Dan published a paper for the first time last year.
- I. Dan regrets not having his face tattooed.

問題 3 In order to encourage many high school students to do volunteer work, the government should give scholarships to students who regularly participate in volunteer activities. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this opinion? Write an essay in English using examples.