

産業医科大学

平成30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。

The calendar, if little else, says spring is here. Although many people gather to see cherry blossoms, that reliable messenger of the change of the season, history shows these blossoms are (ア) than just pretty flowers.

For centuries people in (イ) have celebrated gathering under cherry trees when they're fully flowered. Because the flowers tend to open all at (ウ) and die quickly, they became a symbol of something that's brief and temporary — something that must be enjoyed (エ) it's too late, says Bruce L. Batten, a historian of Japan.

That idea made cherry blossoms appealing as military symbols; personnel were (オ) it was an honor to “die like beautiful falling cherry petals”^{*1} during the era of imperial expansion in Japan, (カ) stretched from the 19th century through World War II. Many cherry trees were planted during that period, and their image on army and navy uniforms helped establish the association (キ) Japan and the cherry blossom. At the same time, cherry trees were planted to comfort the souls of dead soldiers. Eventually they became a symbol of peace, not (ク).

Today, cherry trees can be seen as a sign of (ケ) else. Because there is a record of the celebration of their blossoming, they have become evidence of (コ) change as shorter winters cause the flowers to open at earlier and earlier dates. “That is clear evidence,” Batten says, “that things are getting warmer.”

[Adapted from “The Surprising History of Cherry Blossoms,” by Olivia B. Waxman, *Time*, Vol. 189 No. 12, p. 17, April 3, 2017]

(注) *1 petal : 花弁, 花びら

[2] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

Are there some things that money should not be able to buy? If so, how can we decide which goods and activities should be bought and sold, and which should not? I suggest we approach these questions by asking a slightly different one: are there some things that money cannot buy?

Most people would say yes, there are. Consider friendship. Suppose you want more friends than you have. Would you try to buy some? Not likely. A moment's reflection would lead you to realize that it wouldn't work. A hired friend is not the same as a real one. You could hire people to do some of the things that friends usually do, such as picking up your mail when you're out of town, looking after your children, or listening to your troubles and offering sympathetic advice. Although all of these services can be bought, you can't actually buy a friend. Somehow, the money that buys the friendship spoils it, or turns it into something else.

Or consider the Nobel Prize.*¹ Suppose you desperately want a Nobel Prize but fail to get one in the usual way. It might occur to you to buy one, but you would quickly realize that it wouldn't work. The Nobel Prize is not the kind of thing that money can buy. Nor is the Most Valuable Player (MVP) award of a sports league. You could buy the trophy if some previous winner were willing to sell it, and you could display it in your living room, but you could not buy the award itself.

This is not only because the Nobel committee and sports leagues don't offer these awards for sale. Even if they sold one Nobel Prize each year at an auction,*² the bought award would not be the same as the real thing. The good that gives the prize its value would vanish in such a market exchange. This is because the Nobel Prize is an honor, not a product.

The same is true of a sport's MVP award. It, too, is an honor, whose value would be lost if it were bought rather than earned. There's a difference, of course, between a trophy, which is a symbol of an award, and the award itself. Some winners of the Academy Awards*³ have sold their statuettes,*⁴ or left them to their children who have later sold them at auctions, but it is obvious that buying the Academy Award for best actress is not the same as winning it.

These fairly obvious examples offer a clue to the more difficult question that concerns us: are there some things that money can buy but shouldn't? Consider a good that can be bought but whose buying and selling is against many people's sense of morals — a human kidney,*⁵ for example. Some people defend markets in organs for transplantation;*⁶ others think that such markets are not moral. If it's wrong to buy a kidney, the problem is not, as with the Nobel Prize, that the money ruins the good. The kidney will work regardless of the financial payment, if we can assume that it matches the patient who wants it, so to determine whether kidneys should or shouldn't be for sale, we have to consider a moral problem.

Or consider baby selling. Some years ago, a judge proposed the use of markets for people who wanted to adopt children. He acknowledged that people would be willing to pay a higher price for some babies than for others, but he argued that the market system would do a better job than the current system, which allows agencies to charge certain fees to people who adopt babies, but not to sell babies at an auction or charge a market price for them.

Many people oppose that judge's proposal and maintain that children should not be bought and sold, no matter how efficient the market would be. In thinking through this controversy, it's worth noticing a characteristic feature of it: like a market in kidneys, a market in babies would not ruin the good that the person buying it seeks to acquire. A bought baby is different, in this respect, from a bought friend or Nobel Prize. If there were a market to adopt babies, people who paid the going price would get what they wanted — a child — but whether such a market is moral is a further question.

So it seems, at first glance, that there is a sharp distinction between two kinds of goods: the things (like friends and Nobel Prizes) that money *can't* buy, and the things (like kidneys and children) that money *can* buy but perhaps *shouldn't*. But, if we look more closely, we can notice a connection between the obvious cases, in which the financial exchange spoils the good being bought, and the cases that raise a controversy, in which the exchange does not spoil the good but includes a moral problem.

[Adapted from *What Money Can't Buy*, by Michael J. Sandel, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, New York, 2013, pp. 93-96]

- | | | | |
|---------|------------------------|-----|--------------------------|
| (注) * 1 | Nobel Prize : ノーベル賞 | * 2 | auction : オークション, 競売 |
| * 3 | Academy Award : アカデミー賞 | * 4 | statuette : 小像 |
| * 5 | kidney : 腎臓 | * 6 | transplantation : 移植(手術) |

(設 問)

1. 下線部(1)について、この理由を本文の内容に沿って日本語で書きなさい。
2. 下線部(2)を日本語に訳しなさい。
3. 下線部(3)を日本語に訳しなさい。
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) Most people would agree with the opinion that there are several things that they cannot get by money.
 - (2) For people who cannot get an MVP award in a sports league in the usual way, an auction is an ideal place, because they can acquire the trophy and honor at the same time.
 - (3) Only one Nobel Prize is available at an auction per year.
 - (4) There are people who take a negative stand against buying and selling human organs in a market for moral reasons.
 - (5) Although people have to pay a fee to adopt a baby in the current system, that is not the same as purchasing one.

[3] 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

What makes some men greedy and others generous? Why did Bill Gates, for example, give more than \$28 billion in charity while many other wealthy men kept relatively tight control over their personal fortunes? New evidence reveals a surprising answer. The mere presence of female family members — even infants — can be enough to make men more generous.

In an interesting new study, researchers examined generous behavior and what inspires it in wealthy men. Rather than looking at giving to charity, they looked at why some male chief executives of companies paid their employees more generously than others. The researchers tracked the wages that male chief executives at more than 10,000 Danish*¹ companies paid their employees over the course of a decade.

Interestingly, the chief executives paid their employees less after becoming fathers. On average, after chief executives had a child, they paid about \$100 less in annual compensation per employee. To provide well for his family, the researchers write, it's all too common for a male chief executive to claim "his firm's resources for himself and his growing family, at the expense of his employees."

But there was a twist. When the researchers examined the data more closely, the changes in pay depended on the gender*² of the child of the chief executive. They reduced wages after having a son, but not after having a daughter. Daughters apparently make fathers kind and inspire in them the tendency to take care of others. The speculation is that as we brush our daughters' hair and take them to dance classes, we become gentler and get a deeper understanding of other people's emotions.

Is it even possible that simply being close to infant girls can prompt us to be more generous? Additional studies, in a variety of fields, suggest this is the case — and that it might extend beyond daughters. Consider, for example, one study in which a professor of psychology set up a game in which more than 600 people made choices about sharing resources with someone they didn't know and would never meet again. The participants*³ chose between these basic options:

(a) You get \$25 and your partner gets \$10.

(b) You get \$20 and your partner gets \$30.

The first option is the selfish one; you're claiming most of the resources for yourself. The latter option is more generous as it involves sacrificing a small amount (\$5) to increase your partner's gains by a much larger amount (\$20).

The players expressed consistent preferences in each of the nine rounds they played. The data showed that players who made the more generous choices had more brothers and sisters. Those who were generous had an average of two brothers and sisters; the others averaged one and a half. More brothers and sisters means more sharing, which seems to influence people toward giving.

And once again, gender mattered. The generous participants were 40 percent more likely to have sisters than the people who made more selfish, competitive choices. In relation to

that, there is also another study showing that the more sisters a father has, the more time he spends raising his own children. After growing up with sisters, men who have opportunities to give are more likely to do so.

Social scientists believe that the female behaviors of sisters influence their brothers. It might also be that boys feel the desire to protect their sisters, and studies find that men are significantly more likely to help women than to help men. Indeed, some of the men who give the most to charities acknowledge the inspiration provided by the women in their lives.

In a 2007 presentation in San Francisco, a psychologist*⁴ asked, "Is there anything good about men?" Some people would say, "Not much." But our good point, the psychologist argues, is that across a wide range of characteristics, "men go to extremes more than women." Men are responsible for most of the worst aggressive and selfish acts, but they also engage in some of the most extreme acts of helping and being generous. On this point, there is evidence that whereas many women prefer to share equally, men are more likely to be either perfectly selfish or perfectly generous. It may be that close contact with women is one of the forces that make men more generous.

The effect of women on men has important implications*⁵ for education and work. In schools, we need to think carefully about how we organize children into groups. Students can learn to respect and care about one another if they have to rely upon one another when working together in small groups toward shared goals. If each student is responsible for teaching the group about a different topic that would be covered on a coming test, then the group would need pieces of information from every member in order to put together the general understanding that would be measured on the test. What would happen if every classroom followed this structure, with mixed-gender study groups providing boys with the opportunity to learn from girls? In addition to gaining knowledge, perhaps they would learn something about teaching, helping and caring for others.

At work, we have a great need for more women in leadership positions. We already know from considerable research that companies function better when they have more women in top management roles, especially when it comes to innovation.*⁶ Researchers have recently shown that between 1992 and 2006, when companies introduced women onto their senior executive teams, they generated*⁷ an average of 1 percent more economic value, which usually meant more than \$40 million. ⁽³⁾

We recognize the direct advantages of women as leaders, which often include a variety of perspectives, ways of working together in cooperation, guidance of newer workers, and keen understanding of female employees and customers. But we've largely overlooked the benefit that women have on the men around them. Is it possible that when women join top management teams, they encourage male colleagues to be more generous to employees and to share knowledge more freely? Increases in motivation,*⁸ cooperation, and innovation in companies may be fueled not only by the direct actions of female leaders, but also by their influence on male leaders.

[Adapted from "Why Men Need Women," by Adam Grant, *The New York Times Online*, July 20, 2013]

