大阪医科大学

平成26年度入学試験問題（後期）

英　　語

注　　意

1. 合図があるまで表紙をあけないこと。
2. 受験票は机上に出しておくこと。

英　語（後　期）　（その１）

Ⅰ　下線部を和訳せよ。

You are on your way to a concert. At an intersection, you encounter a group of people, all staring at the sky. Without even thinking about it, you peer upwards too. Why? *Social proof*. In the middle of the concert, when the soloist is displaying absolute mastery, 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 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, sometimes roughly termed the *herd instinct*, dictates 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 (truer) we deem the idea to be. (1) And the more people who display a certain behaviour, the more appropriate this behaviour is judged to be by others. This is, of course, absurd.

Social proof is the evil behind bubbles and stock market panic. It exists in fashion, management techniques, hobbies, religion and diets. It can paralyse whole cultures, such as when sects commit collective suicide.

A simple experiment carried out in the 1950s by psychologist Solomon Asch shows how peer* pressure can warp 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 of 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 gives correct answers—unsurprising, 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 will answer incorrectly 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 50,000 years ago, you were travelling around the Serengeti Plain in Tanzania with your hunter-gatherer friends, and suddenly they all bolted. What would you have done? (2) Would you have stayed still, weighing up 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 serve as a great protein source? No, you would have sprinted after your friends. Later on, when you were safe, you could have reflected on what the "lion" had actually been. Those who acted differently from the group—and I am sure there were some—exited the gene pool**. We are the direct descendants of those who copied the others' behaviour. (3) This pattern is so deeply rooted in us that we still use it today, even when it offers no survival advantage, which is often the case. 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 locals. In other words, you copy the locals' behaviour.

Comedy and talk shows make use of social proof by inserting canned laughter*** at strategic spots, inciting the audience to laugh along. The advertising industry also benefits greatly from our weakness for social proof. This works well when a situation is unclear (such as deciding among various car models, cleaning products, beauty products, etc. with no obvious advantages or disadvantages), and where people "like you and me" appear.

(4) So, be cautious 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 novelist W. Somerset Maugham's wise words: "If 50 million people say something foolish, it is still foolish."

(出典：Rolf Dobelli, *The Art of Thinking Clearly*. Harper, 2013. 一部変更あり)

*peer: Your *peers* are the people who are the same age as you or who have the same status as you.

**gene pool: all of the genes available to a particular species

***canned laughter: pre-recorded laughter

Ⅱ　下線部を和訳せよ。ただし，(1)の “It does so rapidly” についてはその指示内容を明らかにして訳すこと。

Our minds seem to possess the “philosopher’s stone,” which enables us to turn adversity into opportunity. In the ancient practice of alchemy*, the philosopher’s stone was believed to be the key element with which one could turn common metals into gold and silver and create a “panacea,” a remedy that would cure all disease. For about 2,500 years, up until the twentieth century, philosophers and scientists from ancient Egypt to Rome to China devoted their lives to the search for the philosopher’s stone. Despite an admirable recent attempt by Harry Potter and company, the stone that gives its owner eternal life was never found. As hard as they tried, the alchemists could never turn metal into much else.

The human brain, however, is extremely efficient in turning lead into gold. (1) It does so rapidly, with what appears to be minimum effort. Our minds seek and adopt the most rewarding view of whatever situation befalls us. Although we dread hardships, such as divorce, unemployment, or sickness, believing that we will never get over them, we are usually wrong. People tend to bounce back to normal levels of well-being surprisingly fast following almost any misfortune. Merely a year after becoming paraplegic**, accident victims report levels of enjoyment from everyday events similar to those of healthy individuals. They also do not differ in the degree of future happiness they predict for themselves.

The irony, however, is that people are extremely bad at predicting how they would feel if they had to face such misfortunes. If you ask people to estimate how they would cope after becoming paraplegic, they tend to overestimate the length and intensity of their emotional reaction. The usual response is “My life would be over; I could not go on.” You never hear someone say, “If I lose the ability to use my legs, I will probably be as optimistic about the future as the next guy.” In most cases, however, this becomes reality. (2) With regard to a large range of medical conditions, patients report a significantly higher quality of life than healthy individuals predict they would have if they suffered these conditions.

Take Matt Hampson, for example. Matt is twenty-three years old. One day, during a rugby training session, he dislocated his spine and was paralyzed from the neck down, probably for the rest of his life. He now sits in a wheelchair, which he steers by using his chin, and breathes through a ventilator. Most of us automatically feel pity for Matt. But he says, “Life is different now. It’s not over, it’s different. And it’s not any worse. Some ways it’s better.” In some ways it’s better because he compensated by gaining new skills and exploring different capabilities. In his new life, Matt is writing a rugby commentary and an autobiography. He runs a rugby website as well as a charity for children with similar injuries.

(3) The trick the brain plays once it encounters the unbearable is to quickly find its comforting and hopeful aspect. Before we become severely ill, we view sickness and disability as something to be avoided at all costs. This is an adaptive way of viewing adversities, as it drives us to shun hardships, to keep away from danger, and to take care of ourselves. However, once these adversities become our reality, viewing them as such is no longer helpful. In order to continue functioning, we quickly need to reevaluate our circumstances and reverse our evaluation of the situation that has befallen us so that we can carry on with our lives.

（出典：Tali Sharot, *The Optimism Bias: A Tour of the Irrationally Positive Brain*. Pantheon, 2011. 一部変更あり）

*alchemy: pseudoscience focused on the attempt to change all metals into gold

**paraplegic: being unable to move the lower half of one’s body

Ⅲ　下線部を英訳せよ。

(1) 人間は，どのようなメカニズムによって正しくつづられた語とそうでない語を区別できるのだろうか。(2) 長い間，この能力は，子どもがすでに身につけている話し言葉に基づいていると考えられてきた。しかし，ある研究によると，こうした能力は音声言語だけによるのではないことがわかった。(3) 字が読めるようになることは，語を構成している文字の間の規則的なパターンを認識し，記憶する能力とも関係しているのだ。