

## 平成28年度入学試験問題（一般入試）

# 英 語

### 注 意

1. 問題冊子は、指示があるまで開かないこと。
2. 問題冊子は7ページ、解答紙は2枚である。  
「始め」の合図があったら、それぞれページ数および枚数を確認すること。
3. 解答開始前に、試験監督者の指示に従って、すべての解答紙それぞれ2カ所に受験番号を記入すること。
4. 解答は、黒色鉛筆(シャープペンシルも可)を使用し、すべて所定の欄に記入すること。欄外および裏面には記入しないこと。
5. 試験終了後、監督者の指示に従って、解答紙の順番をそろえること。
6. 下書き等は、問題冊子の余白を利用すること。
7. 解答紙は持ち帰らないこと。

[ 1 ] 次の英文を読んで、文中の( ア )~( コ )に入れるのに最も適当な英語一語をそれぞれ書きなさい。

My father once told me that Doctor Spencer had been looking after the people of our district for nearly forty-five years. He was over seventy and ( ア ) have retired long ago, but he didn't want to retire, and his patients didn't want him ( イ ) either. He was a tiny man with tiny hands and feet and a tiny round face. He was a quick, clever little fellow with a bright smile and a fast ( ウ ) of talking. Nobody feared him. Many people loved him, and he was especially gentle with children.

"Which ankle?" he asked.

"The left one," my father said.

Doctor Spencer ( エ ) the cloth of my father's trouser leg up to the knee with a large scissors. He ( オ ) at the ankle but he didn't touch it.

"That's a bad one," said Doctor Spencer to my father. "We'd better take ( カ ) to the hospital right away. May I use your phone?"

He ( キ ) the hospital and asked for an ambulance. Then he spoke to someone else ( ク ) taking X-rays and doing an operation.

"How's the pain?" Doctor Spencer asked. "( ケ ) you like me to give you something?"

"No," my father said. "I'll wait ( コ ) I get there."

[Adapted from *Danny the Champion of the World*, by Roald Dahl, Puffin Books, New York, 2007, pp. 76-77]

[ 2 ] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

You are on your way to a concert. At a corner, you encounter a group of people, all staring at the sky. Without even thinking about it, you look upward, too. Why? *Social proof*. In the middle of the concert, when a musician displays a brilliant performance, someone begins to clap and suddenly the whole room joins in. You do, too. Why? *Social proof*. After the concert you go to the coat check\*<sup>1</sup> to pick up your coat. You watch how the people in front of you place a coin on a plate, even though, officially, the service is included in the ticket price. What do you do? You probably leave a tip as well.

*Social proof* means that individuals feel they are behaving correctly when they act the same as other people. In other words, the more people who follow a certain idea, the better we consider the idea to be. <sup>(1)</sup> And the more people who display a certain behavior, the more appropriate this behavior is judged to be by others. This is, of course, ridiculous.

*Social proof* is the evil behind bubbles and stock market panic. It exists in fashion, management techniques, hobbies, religion, and diets. It can affect whole cultures, such as when members of a religious group commit suicide together.

A simple experiment, <sup>(2)</sup> carried out in the 1950s, shows how group pressure can interfere with common sense. A subject is shown a line drawn on paper, and next to it three lines — numbered 1, 2, and 3 — one shorter, one longer, and one the same length as the original one. He or she must indicate which of the three lines corresponds to the original one. If the person is alone in the room, he or she gives the correct answer because the task is really quite simple. Now five other people enter the room; they are all actors, which the subject does not know. One after another, they give wrong answers, saying “number 1,” although it’s very clear that number 3 is the correct answer. Then it is the subject’s turn again. In one-third of cases, he or she will give the wrong answer to match the other people’s responses.

Why do we act like this? Well, in the past, following others was a good survival strategy. Suppose that fifty thousand years ago you were traveling around the Serengeti\*<sup>2</sup> with your hunter-gatherer\*<sup>3</sup> friends, and suddenly they all started running. What would you have done? Would you have just stood there, scratching your head, and deciding whether what you were looking at was a lion or something that just looked like a lion but was in fact a harmless animal that could be a good meal? No, you would have run after your friends. Later on, when you were safe, you could have reflected on what had actually happened. Those who acted differently — and I am sure there were some — would not have survived for long. We are the <sup>(3)</sup> direct descendants\*<sup>4</sup> of those who copied the other’s behavior. This pattern is so deeply rooted in us that we still use it today, even when it offers no survival advantage. Only a few

cases come to mind where *social proof* is of value. For example, if you find yourself hungry in a foreign city and don't know a good restaurant, it makes sense to pick the one that's full of local people. In other words, you copy the local people's behavior.

Comedy and talk shows make use of *social proof* by playing recorded laughter at certain spots, which stimulates the audience to laugh along. One of the most impressive, though troubling, cases of this phenomenon is the famous speech by Nazi<sup>\*5</sup> propaganda<sup>\*6</sup> minister Joseph Goebbels,<sup>\*7</sup> delivered to a large audience in 1943. As the war went from bad to worse for Germany, he demanded to know: "Do you want total war? If necessary, do you want a war more total and radical than anything that we can even imagine today?" The crowd roared. If the people in the crowd had been asked as individuals and without having to give their name, it is likely that nobody would have consented to this crazy proposal.

The advertising industry benefits greatly from our weakness for *social proof*. This works well when a situation is not clear (such as deciding among various models of cars, cleaning products, beauty products, and so on, where neither one has an obvious advantage), and where people "like you and me" appear.

So be suspicious whenever a company claims its product is better because it is "the most popular." How is a product better simply because it sells the most units? And remember English novelist W. Somerset Maugham's<sup>\*8</sup> wise words: "If fifty million people say something foolish, it is still foolish."

[Adapted from *The Art of Thinking Clearly*, by Rolf Dobelli, HarperCollins Publishers, New York, 2013, pp. 10-12].

[注] \* 1 coat check : コート(手荷物)預り所

\* 2 Serengeti : セレンゲティ(タンザニア連合共和国北部からケニア共和国南西部にかけての地域; タンザニア領域内には自然保護を目的とした国立公園があることでの名)

\* 3 hunter-gatherer : 狩猟採集民

\* 4 descendant : 子孫, 末裔

\* 5 Nazi : ナチ党の, ナチズムの

\* 6 propaganda : 偏った情報, 戦略的宣伝活動

\* 7 Joseph Goebbels : ヨーゼフ・ゲッベルス(1897-1945; ドイツナチス党の政治家)

\* 8 W. Somerset Maugham : ウィリアム・サマセット・モーム(1874-1965; イギリスの小説家・劇作家)

(設問)

1. 下線部(1)を日本語に訳しなさい。
2. 下線部(2)の実験内容とその結果を、本文の内容に沿って200字程度の日本語で書きなさい。
3. 下線部(3)のように筆者が考える理由を、本文の内容に沿って日本語で説明しなさい。
4. 本文の内容に関する次の文(1)~(5)を読み、正しいものには○、間違っているものには×を、それぞれ記入しなさい。
  - (1) At a concert, if one person cheers, soon most other people will cheer, too.
  - (2) *Social proof* occasionally has a harmful effect on people to the extent that they can even kill themselves in line with others.
  - (3) If you do not know of a good place to eat in an unfamiliar location, it is best to eat where tourists eat.
  - (4) Politicians can use *social proof* to convince people to act in ways that they do not truly believe in.
  - (5) Good sales are proof that a product has superior quality.

[ 3 ] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

While I was visiting a village in the Fiji\*<sup>1</sup> islands, I had a conversation with a man who had visited the United States, and he told me his impressions. There were some features of American life that he admired, but others that disgusted him. Worst of all was our treatment of the elderly. In rural Fiji, old people continue to live in the village where they have spent their lives, surrounded by their relatives and friends. They often live in a house of their children, who take care of them. In the United States, though, my Fijian acquaintance was shocked that many old people are sent to retirement homes\*<sup>2</sup> where they are visited only occasionally by their children. He said with anger, "You throw away your old people and your own parents!"

Among traditional societies, some give their elderly very high status, but others give them even lower status than Americans do. Of course, there is much individual variation within any society: I have several American friends who put their parents into a retirement home and visit them once a year or never, and another friend who published his 22nd book on his 100th birthday and celebrated the occasion in the company of all of his children, grandchildren,\*<sup>3</sup> and great-grandchildren, whom he also saw regularly throughout the year. Even though there is a wide range of differences in how we treat the elderly, however, it is widely acknowledged that their lives are often miserable.

We can begin to understand Americans' treatment of the elderly by considering some of our cultural values, such as independence, respect for privacy, and individualism.\*<sup>4</sup> American people's sense of self-respect\*<sup>5</sup> is measured by their own achievements, not by the achievements of the family to which they belong. We are taught to be independent and to rely on ourselves, and we condemn the opposite characteristics of dependence and lack of ability to take care of ourselves. In fact, for Americans a dependent personality is considered to be a condition that requires psychiatric\*<sup>6</sup> or psychological treatment.

Americans also value individual privacy, an unusual concept in many of the cultures of the world, most of which provide little privacy and do not feel a desire for it. In many parts of the world, and throughout much of history, it is normal for three or more generations to live in the same house. In America, by contrast, when children reach the age of marriage they are expected to set up their own private home, and many do not even live in the same town or even state as their parents.

Care for the elderly goes against all those values of independence, privacy and individualism. We accept a baby's dependence, because the baby has never been independent, but we struggle against the dependence of the elderly who have been independent for decades.

But the cruel reality is that old people eventually reach a condition in which they can no longer live independently, cannot rely on their own abilities, and have no choice but to become dependent on others and give up their precious privacy. Becoming dependent is at least as painful for the elderly people involved as it is for the middle-aged children who watch what is happening to parents who could previously take care of themselves. <sup>(2)</sup> How many readers of this essay have known an elderly person who insisted, because of self-respect, on trying to continue living independently, until an accident (such as falling and breaking a bone or being unable to get out of bed) made the continued independence impossible? American ideals push old Americans to lose self-respect, and push their younger care-givers\*<sup>7</sup> to lose respect for them.

Another distinctive American value that creates prejudice against the elderly is our admiration of youth. <sup>(3)</sup> Of course, we don't have this value as a cultural preference for no good reason. It is true that, in this modern world of rapid changes in technology, young adults' education makes their knowledge more up-to-date and useful for important things like jobs, and even for the common challenges of everyday life. Another factor in our admiration of youth is the competitive nature of modern American society, which gives an advantage to younger people, who have speed and strength. Still another factor is that so many Americans are children of people who were born and grew up abroad. Those children saw that their older parents could not speak English well and actually did lack important knowledge about how American society functions.

The status of old people in Western societies has changed dramatically in recent decades, but at the same time there have been other changes in society. People are living longer and staying healthier, while senior citizens are becoming a larger proportion of the population. We must find a way to use old people for what they are good at and what they like to do. Devising new living conditions for the elderly, appropriate to the changing modern world, remains a major challenge for our society. Many past societies made better use of their elderly and gave them better lives than we do today. We can surely find better solutions now.

[Adapted from *The World Until Yesterday*, by Jared Diamond, Penguin Books, London, 2012, pp. 210-240]

- [注] \* 1 Fiji : フィジー (南太平洋上の島国)      \* 2 retirement home : 老人ホーム  
\* 3 grandchild : 孫      \* 4 individualism : 個人主義  
\* 5 self-respect : 自尊心      \* 6 psychiatric : 精神医学の  
\* 7 care-giver : 介護者

〔設問〕

1. 下線部(1)について、アメリカとそれ以外の国との違いを、本文の内容に沿って日本語で説明しなさい。
2. 下線部(2)を日本語に訳しなさい。
3. 下線部(3)について、このように考えられる理由を本文中から3点挙げ、それぞれ日本語で書きなさい。
4. 本文の内容に関する次の文(1)~(5)を読み、正しいものには○、間違っているものには×を、それぞれ記入しなさい。
  - (1) The man from Fiji admired American retirement homes.
  - (2) The elderly in all traditional societies have higher status than the elderly in America do.
  - (3) Independence is highly valued in the United States, and adults who rely heavily on others are regarded as not being in sound mind.
  - (4) The difference between a baby's dependence and an old person's dependence is that the old person used to be independent.
  - (5) Most old people suffer from poor health, so there is no use for them in society.

〔4〕 (英作文)

近年日本では少子化(declining birthrate)が問題になっていますが、その理由はどのようなものであると考えますか。100語程度の英語で書きなさい。