

前期日程試験

平成 27 年度医学科入学試験問題

英 語

〔注意事項〕

- 1 監督者の指示があるまで、この冊子を開いてはいけない。
- 2 解答用紙に受験番号と氏名を必ず記入すること。
- 3 この問題冊子の本文は、20 ページからなっている。落丁、乱丁及び印刷不鮮明な箇所等があれば、手をあげて監督者に知らせなさい。
- 4 この問題冊子の白紙と余白は、適宜下書きに使用してもよい。
- 5 解答は、すべて別紙「解答用紙」の指定された場所に記入すること。
- 6 この問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

I

Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

Intimacy is key in a world of connection where individuals negotiate complex networks of friendship, minimize differences, try to reach consensus, and avoid the appearance of superiority, which would highlight differences. In a world of status, *independence* is key, because a primary means of establishing status is to tell others what to do, and taking orders is a marker of low status. Though all humans need both intimacy and independence, women tend to focus on the first and men on the second. It is as if their life-blood ran in different directions.¹

These differences can give women and men differing views of the same situation, as they did in the case of a couple I will call Linda and Josh. When Josh's old high-school friend called him at work and announced he'd be in town on business the following month, Josh invited him to stay for the weekend. That evening he informed Linda that they were going to have a houseguest, and that he and his old friend would go out together the first night to have a casual conversation like old times. Linda was upset. She was going to be away on business the week before, and the Friday night when Josh would be out with his former classmate would be her first night home. But what upset her the most was that Josh had made these plans on his own and informed her of them, rather than discussing them with her before extending the invitation.

Linda would never make plans, for a weekend or an evening, without first checking with Josh. She can't understand why he doesn't show her the same courtesy and consideration that she shows him. But when she protests, Josh says, "I can't say to my friend, 'I have to ask my wife for permission!'"

To Josh, checking with his wife means seeking permission, which implies that he is not independent, not free to act on his own. It would make him feel like a child or an inferior person. To Linda, checking with her husband has nothing to do with permission. She assumes that spouses discuss their plans

with each other because their lives are intertwined, so the actions of one have consequences for the other. Not only does Linda not mind telling someone, "I have to check with Josh"; quite the contrary — she likes it. It makes her feel good to know and show that she is involved with someone, that her life is bound up with someone else's.

Linda and Josh both felt more upset by this incident, and others like it, than seemed warranted, because it cut to the core of their primary concerns.² Linda was hurt because she sensed a failure of closeness in their relationship: He didn't care about her as much as she cared about him. And he was hurt because he felt she was trying to control him and limit his freedom.

A similar conflict exists between Louise and Howie, another couple, about spending money. Louise would never buy anything costing more than a hundred dollars without discussing it with Howie, but he goes out and buys whatever he wants and feels they can afford, like a table saw or a new power mower. Louise is disturbed, not because she disapproves of the purchases, but because she feels he is acting as if she were not in the picture.

Many women feel it is natural to consult with their partners at every turn, while many men automatically make more decisions without consulting their partners. This may reflect a broad difference in conceptions of decision making. Women expect decisions to be discussed first and made by consensus. They appreciate the discussion itself as evidence of involvement and communication. But many men feel oppressed by lengthy discussions about what they see as minor decisions, and they feel emotionally restricted if they can't just act without talking first. When women try to initiate a freewheeling discussion by asking, "What do you think?" men often think they are being asked to decide.

Communication is a continual balancing act, juggling the conflicting needs for intimacy and independence. To survive in the world, we have to act in concert with others, but to survive as ourselves, rather than simply as cogs* in

a wheel, we have to act alone. In some ways, all people are the same: We all eat and sleep and drink and laugh and cough, and often we eat, and laugh at, the same things. But in some ways, each person is different, and individuals' differing wants and preferences may conflict with each other. Offered the same menu, people make different choices. And if there is cake for dessert, there is a chance one person may get a larger piece than another — and an³ even greater chance that one will *think* the other's piece is larger, whether it is or not.

If intimacy says, "We're close and the same," and independence says, "We're separate and different," it is easy to see that intimacy and independence fit together well with connection and status. The essential element of connection is symmetry: People are the same, feeling equally close to each other. The essential element of status is asymmetry: People are not the same; they are differently placed in a hierarchy.

This duality is particularly clear in expressions of sympathy or concern, which are all potentially ambiguous. They can be interpreted either symmetrically, as evidence of mutual feelings among equals, or asymmetrically, offered by someone one-up to someone one-down. Asking if an⁴ unemployed person has found a job, if a couple have succeeded in conceiving the child they crave, or whether an untenured professor expects to get tenure can be meant — and interpreted, regardless of how it is meant — as an expression of human connection by a person who understands and cares, or as a reminder of weakness from someone who is better off and knows it, and hence as condescending.⁵ The latter view of sympathy seems self-evident to many men. For example, a handicapped mountain climber named Tom Whittaker, who leads groups of disabled people on outdoor expeditions, remarked, "You can't feel sympathetic toward someone you admire" — a⁶ statement that struck me as not true at all.

The symmetry of connection is what creates community: If two people are struggling for closeness, they are both struggling for the same thing. And the asymmetry of status is what creates contest: Two people can't both have the upper hand, so negotiation for status is inherently adversarial. In my earlier work, I explored in detail the dynamics of intimacy (which I referred to as involvement) and independence, but I tended to ignore the force of status and its adversarial nature. Once I identified these dynamics, however, I saw them all around me. The puzzling behavior of friends and co-workers finally became comprehensible.

Differences in how my husband and I approached the same situation, which previously would have been mystifying, suddenly made sense. For example, in a jazz club the waitress recommended the crab cakes to me, and they turned out to be terrible. I was uncertain about whether or not to send them back. When the waitress came by and asked how the food was, I said that I didn't really like the crab cakes. She asked, "What's wrong with them?" While staring at the table, my husband answered, "They don't taste fresh." The waitress snapped, "They're frozen! What do you expect?" I looked directly up at her and said, "We just don't like them." She said, "Well, if you don't like them, I could take them back and bring you something else."

After she left with the crab cakes, my husband and I laughed because we realized we had just automatically played out the scripts I had been writing about. He had heard her question "What's wrong with them?" as a challenge that he had to match. He doesn't like to fight, so he looked away, to soften what he felt was an obligatory counterchallenge: He felt instinctively that he had to come up with something wrong with the crab cakes to justify my complaint. (He was fighting for me.) I had taken the question "What's wrong with them?" as a request for information. I instinctively sought a way to be right without making her wrong. Perhaps it was because she was a woman that she responded more favorably to my approach.

When I have spoken to friends and to groups about these differences, they too say that now they can make sense of previously perplexing behavior. For example, a woman said she finally understood why her husband refused to talk to his boss about whether or not he stood a chance of getting promoted. He wanted to know because if the answer was no, he would start looking for another job. But instead of just asking, he was worried, unhappy and not able to relax. Having no others at her disposal, this wife had fallen back on psychological explanations: Her husband must be insecure, afraid of rejection. But then, perhaps everyone is insecure, to an extent. Her husband was actually quite a confident person. And she, who believed herself to be at least as insecure as he, had not hesitated to go to her boss to ask whether he intended to make her temporary job permanent.

Understanding the key role played by status in men's relations made it all come clear. Asking a boss about chances for promotion highlights the hierarchy in the relationship, reminding them both that the employee's future is in the boss's hands. Taking the low-status position made this man intensely uncomfortable. Although his wife didn't especially relish taking the role of supplicant with respect to her boss, it didn't set off alarm bells in her head, as it did in his.⁷

In a similar flash of insight, a woman who works in sales exclaimed that now she understood the puzzling transformation that the leader of her sales team had undergone when he was promoted to district manager. She had been sure he would make a perfect boss because he had a healthy disregard for authority.⁸ As team leader, he had rarely bothered to go to meetings called by management and had encouraged team members to exercise their own judgment, eagerly using his power to waive regulations on their behalf. But after he became district manager, this man was unrecognizable.⁹ He instituted more regulations than anyone had dreamed of, and insisted that exceptions could be made only on the basis of written requests to him.

This man behaved differently because he was now differently placed in the hierarchy. When he had been subject to the authority of management, he'd done all he could to limit it. But when the authority of management was vested in him, he did all he could to enlarge it. By avoiding meetings and flouting regulations, he had evidenced not disregard for hierarchy but rather discomfort at being in the subordinate position within it.

Yet another woman said she finally understood why her fiancé, who very much believes in equality, once whispered to her that she should keep her voice down. "My friends are downstairs," he said. "I don't want them to get the impression that you order me around."

That women have been labeled "nags" may result from the interplay of men's and women's styles, whereby many women are inclined to do what is asked of them and many men are inclined to resist even the slightest hint that anyone, especially a woman, is telling them what to do. A woman will be inclined to repeat a request that doesn't get a response because she is convinced that her husband would do what she asks, if he only understood that she *really* wants him to do it. But a man who wants to avoid feeling that he is following orders may instinctively wait before doing what she asked, in order to imagine that he is doing it of his own free will. Nagging is the result,¹⁰ because each time she repeats the request, he again puts off fulfilling it.

Note

*cog = one of a series of teeth on the edge of a wheel that fit between the teeth on the next wheel and cause it to move.

(Adapted from: *YOU JUST DON'T UNDERSTAND Women and Men in Conversation*, by Deborah Tannen, 1990, Ballantine Books.)

QUESTIONS

1. Underlined 1: Explain the underlined part in Japanese especially by making it clear what “it” refers to.
2. Underlined 2: Choose the item which has the closest meaning to the underlined sentence. Write the LETTER of your answer.
 - (A) This incident endangers the relationship with bosses.
 - (B) This incident threatens physical health.
 - (C) This incident shows Linda’s lack of care for Josh.
 - (D) This incident reveals disagreements previously hidden.
3. Underlined 3: Explain the underlined part in Japanese especially by making it clear what “it” refers to.
4. Underlined 4: Explain the underlined part in Japanese.
5. Underlined 5: Choose the item which has the closest meaning to the underlined word. Write the LETTER of your answer.
 - (A) being stable and having high status.
 - (B) having more money and privilege.
 - (C) behaving as if one is more important and intelligent.
 - (D) feeling more self-confident.
 - (E) behaving as if one is weaker and less wealthy.
6. Underlined 6: Why did the author feel like this? Explain the reason(s) in Japanese.

7. Underlined 7: Explain the underlined part in Japanese especially by making it clear what the two “it”s refer to.

8. Underlined 8: Explain in Japanese what the author means by “a healthy disregard for authority”.

9. Underlined 9: Choose the item which has the closest meaning to the underlined word. Write the LETTER of your answer.
 - (A) This man greatly changed his attitude.
 - (B) This man completely disguised himself.
 - (C) This man was to leave his current working place.
 - (D) This man obtained more power than anyone else.
 - (E) This man was to be transferred to another office.

10. Underlined 10: According to the author’s logic, explain in detail the meaning of the part in Japanese especially by making clear the reason why “Nagging is the result”.

II Read the passage below and answer the questions which follow.

We sped across the tundra in the dark. The old train rattled, occasionally complained. As the sun came up around 10 a.m., the world faded from black to cobalt to white and every shade ¹ between. All was snow; it was just a matter of how much, where, what shape. Black spruce* trees draped in white rose up from the ground like crystals of frost.

“If you walked in that direction,” I heard my father say, “you would die.” I could not see in what direction he was pointing, but ² it didn’t matter. He was right. In temperatures that hovered around zero, it would take several days to hike to the nearest town.

We were traveling north from Anchorage, where in early January there are more than six hours of daylight, to Fairbanks, where there are fewer than five. *The Aurora Express*, run by the Alaskan Railroad once a week in the winter, takes 12 hours to cross the more than 300 miles, or 480 kilometers, of forest, mountains and tundra between the two cities. One can fly from Anchorage to Fairbanks. One can drive. But there is no better way to wrap your head around Alaska in winter, ³ the terrible beauty of its negative space, than by train — especially a three-car train led by a diesel locomotive that averages about 30 miles an hour.

At one point, midday, we made ⁴ an unscheduled stop to pick up a man with two large dogs by the side of the tracks. The train will stop for anyone who flags it down, the conductor told us. For those who live in the wilderness between Fairbanks and Anchorage, the train is a lifeline. The man rode with us for a few hours, then got off in his snowshoes. His dogs played in the deep powder as he put on his backpack for the hike to his cabin somewhere in the woods.

If you ask friends to tell you why they are planning to visit Alaska in the winter, they’ll probably tell you they’re going for the Iditarod Dog Sled Races.

To ski. To catch a glimpse of the northern lights. Of the mere tens of thousands of vacationers to the 49th state in the winter (compared with more than a million in the summer), these are the most common reasons for visiting.

But some people will shrug their shoulders, get a faraway look in their eyes, and say, "I'd just like to see it." This is, perhaps, the truest reason of all. They come to reach out and touch, for a brief moment, the limits of human existence.⁵ To feel its chill and gaze into its twilight.

This was something I first began to understand as I sat in the cafe car of *the Aurora Express* at sunset, looking out on the snowscape. Across from me was Sam, a tourist from Taiwan who spoke almost no English. He played his ukulele softly. We began to sing "Let It Be," but could not remember all the words, so we sang the first verse and the chorus, over and over, louder each time. Other passengers joined in, filling the car. The sound was a comfort as we again slipped into darkness.

My family's reason for visiting Alaska last winter was typical: We came to the dark in search of the northern lights, the aurora borealis**, those magnetic storms of ionized oxygen and nitrogen atoms that play across the sky like gods at war.

Our back story, though, is not exactly typical: My father, a retired programmer, earned his Ph.D. in astronomy in the early 1970s but never worked in the field. When I was a child, on clear nights when the magnetic activity was projected to be strong, my father would get us into the car and drive north of New York City on the off-chance that the aurora would perhaps be visible. These trips were our pilgrimages, our tests of faith in the idea that if we stood in a dark-enough spot at the right time, the heavens would open up and show what they held. Each time, my father kept us out in the cold until he could bear the complaints no longer.⁶ But we never saw the aurora. The heavens remained closed.

That was two solar cycles ago — two nine- to fourteen-year periods in which the solar flares responsible for auroras alternately grew larger and smaller. The last solar maximum was in 2000. The next was happening in 2014, when we traveled to Alaska. This time, my father and I had iPads with bookmarks for five websites that projected the aurora in real time. My sister had two cameras and many, many pairs of hand warmers. My mother had hope.

In Fairbanks, we rented a car, stocked up on water and snacks, and drove out to Chena Hot Springs, sixty miles east. Midway to Chena, my father pointed to a gap in the clouds. “I think I see something!” he cried. “Pull over!” A man came out of nowhere with a flashlight, asking if we needed assistance. The dirt road where we had stopped turned out to be his driveway. The stars were out, but the aurora was not. We drove on. When we finally reached the hot springs, the steam of the hot springs and the clouds above shielded the sky from view. It was a disappointing night for us all.

The next day, we made a friend, Elaine. She joined us in the snow-cat ride that night to a hilltop above Chena. It was her last chance to see the lights, and though in good spirits, she was prepared for the worst. “I’ll tell my friends I saw the rare ‘black aurora!’”

I spent most of the evening outside, alone among the spruce trees, wrapped in many layers of down, staring north. Near two o’clock I convinced myself that a faint light was shining behind the clouds. I held my post and squinted as a light grew. A small piece of sky opened up. I had a hard time persuading the others to come out of the hut so late, but finally my sister appeared with her heavy, awkward camera and tripod. The rest followed. We stood motionless in a semicircle, holding our breath as the camera absorbed the light. When the shutter clicked, we gathered around to see the result: a faint arc of green light coming from the direction I was pointing. We looked again to the north, as if proof of the thing could make it more visible. The patch of sky sealed up. The glow dimmed.

“Great,” Elaine said. “Even the camera saw an aurora before me.”

Notes.

*spruce = a widespread coniferous tree which has a distinctive conical shape and hanging cones, widely grown for timber, pulp, and Christmas trees.

**aurora borealis = the northern lights.

(Adapted from: "Shedding light on Alaska in the winter". *The International New York Times* in *The Japan Times*. Saturday-Sunday, January 4-5, 2014.)

QUESTIONS

1. Underlined 1: “the world faded from black to cobalt to white and every shade between.” Make the meaning of “between” clearer by adding one English word in each blank below:
... and every shade between () and ().

2. Underlined 2: The author says that “it didn’t matter” in which direction his father was pointing. Why not? Choose the best answer below and write the LETTER of your answer.
(A) His father had no sense of direction.
(B) It was equally cold everywhere in Alaska.
(C) It was unimportant whether the writer lived or died.
(D) It would be equally dangerous to walk in any direction.

3. Underlined 3: The passage speaks of “the terrible beauty of its negative space”. What does this phrase mean here? Choose the best answer below and write the LETTER of your answer.
(A) the beauty of the sky at night.
(B) the brilliant colors of the northern lights.
(C) the strange beauty of emptiness in Alaska.
(D) the beauty of glittering snow in the starlight.

4. Underlined 4: "A man rode on the train with his two dogs." Since it was "an unscheduled stop", how did the train know that the man wanted to get on the train? Choose the best answer below and write the LETTER of your answer.

- (A) The dogs had wanted to play in the deep snow.
- (B) The man had not been wearing normal shoes.
- (C) The man had waved his hands to signal the engineer.
- (D) The train had stopped at that place every day.

5. Underlined 5: Sitting in the cafe car on the train, the author and the other passengers "felt the limits of human existence". In other English words, what does he mean here? Choose the best answer below and write the LETTER of your answer.

- (A) believed that they had no friends.
- (B) could see no other people.
- (C) sensed that they were becoming isolated in the endless cold and dark.
- (D) spoke almost no English.

6. Underlined 6: The father kept his family "out in the cold until he could bear the complaints no longer". In the blanks provided below, write in English two complaints which his family may have made.

1. _____.
2. _____.

7. Underlined 7: After listing the possessions which he, his father, and his sister had with them, the author writes that "my mother had hope". Complete the following sentence with English words in accordance with the passage.

My mother had hope of _____.

8. Underlined 8: The “father pointed to a gap in the clouds. ‘I think I see something!’ he cried”. By completing the following English sentences, answer these two questions.

1. What did the father think that he saw?

He thought _____.

2. In reality, what did he see?

He saw _____.

9. Underlined 9: Elaine “was prepared for the worst”. In Elaine’s way of thinking, what was “the worst”? Choose the best answer below and write the LETTER of your answer.

(A) being stranded overnight in the snow.

(B) having to walk to the top of the hill.

(C) losing her camera in the darkness.

(D) not being able to see the northern lights at all.

10. Underlined 10: Choose the best phrase below which makes the sentence complete in accordance with the passage.

When Elaine said “Great”, she was

(A) very excited to have seen the aurora at last.

(B) somewhat upset that she had brought such a good camera and tripod.

(C) greatly impressed with the wild natural beauty of Alaska.

(D) really disappointed, but ironically pretended that she was thrilled.

III

Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

When foreign visitors formerly described American culture, they generally settled upon one trait: energy. Whether driven by material motivations or spiritual ones, most visitors to the country felt that characteristically Americans worked more intensely, had a more expansive vision of the future, moved more often to seek out opportunity, and switched jobs more than anyone else on earth. In fact, successful people in America were often called “movers.” No wonder then that these characteristics are often lumped together as components of *social mobility*, not to be confused with, but clearly related to, *economic mobility*.

But this energetic “movement” may be changing because in the past sixty years Americans have become steadily less mobile. In the 1950s, twenty percent of Americans moved in a particular year; currently, it is around twelve percent. In the 1950s and 1960s, people lived in the same house for an average of five years; presently, people live in the same house for an average of 8.6 years. Americans are now no more mobile than citizens of traditional European countries, such as Denmark or Finland.

A few theories might offer partial explanations for this reduced mobility. America is an aging nation and old people tend to move less than young people. With its western frontier now largely “settled” as a result of earlier human migration for new opportunities, there are fewer “empty” spaces to attract a highly mobile, younger pioneer spirit. Between the 1980s and 2000s, mobility among young people dropped by forty-one percent.

It is also true that many young people are locked into homes whose values have dropped or are burdened by loans taken out to finance an increasingly expensive university education and cannot move because they are in debt. Yet, the lack of mobility has also affected people who rent apartments and are not in debt to the same level. This loss of social mobility affects both those tied

down and those who could move.

Another theory would suggest that labor markets are more homogeneous than they previously were. It used to be that the jobs found in Pittsburgh were different from the ones found in Atlanta. Large numbers of isolated African-Americans moved from the racially segregated south to play their music in Chicago, Harlem, and Detroit, exporting a unique culture to regions where it was unknown. Their mobility enriched themselves and helped create a flowering entertainment industry in their newly adopted northern home.

Critics, like Peter Beinart writing in the *National Journal*, have joined a chorus of sociologists who claim that the real reason for the loss of mobility is a lack of self-confidence. It takes faith and belief to move. You are putting yourself through temporary expense and inconvenience in favor of a long-term faith that the future will be better than the present. Many highly educated people, who are still moving in high numbers, have that long-term faith. Less educated people often do not.

One of the oddities of the mobility that does exist is that people are not moving into low-unemployment/high-income areas of the country, but are instead moving into lower-income areas with cheap housing. That would suggest that they are more likely to move to places that offer immediate comfort even if their long-term income prospects are lower. The absence of self-confidence is reflected in this need for short-term security.

This loss of faith is reflected in other areas of life. Fertility rates, a good indicator of confidence in the future, are down. Even accounting for cyclical changes, people are less likely to voluntarily leave one job in search of a better one. Only forty-six percent of white Americans believe that they have a good chance of improving their standard of living in the future, the lowest levels in the history of the General Social Survey.

Thirty years ago, the vast majority of Americans identified themselves as members of the middle class, but since 1988 the percentage of Americans who

describe themselves as “economically disadvantaged people” has doubled. Many young people today, unlike their grandparents, believe that success is a matter of luck, not effort. A larger percentage of the nation’s income is now possessed by a smaller proportion of the population than ever before.

These pessimistic views bring to mind a concept now floating around academic circles in Europe: the “Precariat.” According to Guy Standing, a British academic, the “Precariat” refers to a growing class of people in many countries, not merely Americans, with short-term or part-time work and with precarious living conditions. Managing their budgets week-by-week in part-time employment, they are unable to envisage any future changes in their lives. They live with multiple forms of social and economic insecurity that make no room for any “imaginative story of possible occupational development.” This so-called “Precariat” is more likely to join protest groups across the political spectrum.

Michael Strain of the American Enterprise Institute believes that the government should give moving vouchers (payments) to young people who have no permanent jobs or hope, thereby artificially stimulating *social mobility* and with it, optimism. This would enable them to “chase opportunities” as did the generations of immigrants and pioneers who built America and created the energies embodied in the prospect of the “American Dream.”

(Adapted from: “The American Precariat.” *The International New York Times* on 26th January 2014.)

QUESTIONS

According to the content of the passage, write T for True, F for False or N for Not mentioned in the text for each statement. Answer a question with “N” only if the statement is either not present in the text or cannot be inferred from the information in the text.

1. Historically, social mobility has been the cause of economic mobility rather than the result.
2. What visitors have perceived as the energy of America can partly be attributed to a social mobility that formerly enabled people to easily change jobs and homes.
3. American social mobility is no longer greater than that of traditional European cultures such as those of Finland or Denmark.
4. Young people with relatively high levels of personal indebtedness have much higher levels of social mobility, which is reflected in their search for cheaper housing and different jobs.
5. The passage provides a theory that the loss of self-confidence may be responsible for the loss of social mobility now occurring in America.
6. At present, higher levels of social mobility always result in precarious protest movements across the political spectrum.
7. Recently, one scholar has advocated a government program that would use vouchers to pay young people to move, which could provide them with a chance to escape membership of the “Precariat.”

IV Read the following lines and answer the following question in about 150 English words.

By the time students have graduated from high school, many of them have had some significant experience in their lives or run into some personal difficulty. As a result of this experience or event, the students' attitude toward their future life or career has been greatly affected.

Write about any experience that has changed your own attitude about your life and describe how this experience has affected your present life as well as your hopes and ambitions for the future.