

平成 21 年度入学者選抜学力検査問題

英 語

注 意 事 項

1. この冊子は、監督者から解答を始めるよう合図があるまで開いてはいけません。
2. 解答は解答用紙に書きなさい。解答用紙は 3 枚です。監督者から指示があったら、3 枚とも、解答用紙の上部の所定欄に受験番号と座席番号を、また、下部の所定欄には座席番号をそれぞれ必ず記入しなさい。
3. 英語を選択科目として届け出た者のみが解答しなさい。それ以外の者が解答すると失格となります。
4. この冊子は全部で 9 頁からなります。落丁、乱丁または印刷の不備なものがあつたら申し出てください。
5. 解答用紙は、記入の有無にかかわらず、持ち帰ってはいけません。
6. この冊子は持ち帰ってかまいません。

I 次の文章を読み、問 1 から問 5 の設問に答えなさい。

A close friend of mine (call him Harry) once found himself with two girlfriends, both of whom he loved, desired, and admired. Two, however, were⁽¹⁾ one too many. Confused by contradicting emotions and unable to make up his mind, he recalled what Benjamin Franklin had once advised a nephew in a⁽²⁾ similar situation:

April 8, 1779

If you doubt, set down all the reasons, pro and con, in opposite columns on a sheet of paper, and when you have considered them two or three days, perform an operation similar to that in some questions of algebra; observe what reasons or motives in each column are equal in weight, one to one, one to two, two to three, or the like, and when you have struck out from both sides all the equalities, you will see in which column remains the balance. [...] This kind of *moral algebra* I have often practiced in important and dubious concerns, and though it cannot be mathematically exact, I have found it extremely useful. By the way, if you do not learn it, I apprehend you will never be married.

I am ever your affectionate Uncle,

B. Franklin

Harry was greatly relieved that a logical formula existed to solve his conflict. So he took his time, wrote down all the important reasons he could think of, weighed them carefully, and went through the calculation. When he saw the result, something unexpected happened.⁽³⁾ An inner voice told him that it wasn't right. And for the first time, Harry realized that his heart had already decided — against the calculation and in favor of the other girl. The formula helped to find the solution, but not because of its logic. It brought an

unconscious decision to his awareness, based on reasons obscure to him.

Thankful for the sudden solution but puzzled by the process, Harry asked himself how it was possible to make unconscious choices in contradiction to one's deliberate reasoning. He was not the first to learn that reasoning can conflict with what we call intuition. Social psychologist Timothy Wilson and his colleagues once offered posters to two groups of women as a thank-you present for participating in an experiment. In one group, each woman simply picked her favorite poster out of a selection of five; in a second group, each was asked to describe her reasons for liking or disliking each poster before choosing one. Interestingly, the two groups tended to take different posters home. Four weeks later, they were all asked how much they enjoyed their present. Those who had given reasons were less satisfied and regretted their choice more than those who had not given any. Here and in similar experiments, deliberate thinking about reasons seems to lead to decisions that make us less happy, just as consciously thinking about how to ride a bike or put on a spontaneous smile is not always better than its automatic version. The unconscious parts of our mind can decide without us — the conscious self — knowing its reasons, or, as in Harry's case, without being aware that a decision has been made in the first place.

But isn't the capability for self-reflection uniquely human and therefore uniformly beneficial? After all, doesn't thinking about thinking define human nature? The evidence, however, suggests that weighing pros and cons does not generally make us happy. In one study, people were asked about various everyday activities such as how to decide which TV programs to watch in the evening and what to buy in a department store. Did they survey all channels, using the remote control to flip back and forth through all TV stations, constantly checking for a better program? Or did they quickly stop searching and watch a good-enough program? People who reported exhaustive search in shopping and leisure were called *maximizers*, because they tried hard to get

the best. Those who engaged in a limited search and settled quickly with the first alternative that was satisfactory or “good enough” were called *satisficers*. Satisficers were reported to be more optimistic and have higher self-esteem and life satisfaction, whereas maximizers excelled in depression, perfectionism, regret, and self-blame.

問 1 下線部(1)を和訳しなさい。

問 2 下線部(2)について、フランクリンが甥にどのようなことをするようにすすめたのかを表わす語句(4語)を最終段落から抜き出しなさい。

問 3 下線部(3)が具体的にどのようなことであるかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 4 下線部(4)の人たちについて、プレゼントにたいする満足度をたずねたところどのようなことがわかったかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 5 下線部(5)のようなことをする人たちを表わす英単語(1語)を書きなさい。

Ⅱ 次の文章を読み、問1から問7の設問に答えなさい。*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

In our human society, intentional deception is commonplace. We deal with it every day of our lives. Politicians deceive us. Salespeople trick us into purchases that we might not otherwise make. Deception based on thinking ahead requires a large brain, cognitive skills, awareness, and an ability to think while acting. But are we the only species on the planet capable of intentional deception? Observations show that there are others whose deceiving skills rival our own. Large-brained animals like dolphins are particularly good at deception and, in some cases, seem to do it with some degree of intention.

Stan Kuczaj has worked with dolphins for many years. He and his colleagues have recorded several occurrences of what could be considered deceptive behavior in dolphins. At one of their facilities, they were researching a female adult dolphin named Kelly, who along with other dolphins had been trained quite successfully to retrieve objects from the pool in exchange for fish. After all the other dolphins had finished with their retrieval tasks and gone their own way, Kelly appeared at the surface with some objects of unknown origin in the hope of gaining more fish. Where did Kelly's objects come from? After searching the pool, Kelly's trainer discovered a secret collection of toys that the dolphin had cleverly concealed under a drain cover. Day after day, she had collected objects accidentally dropped into the pool by tourists, to be used for exchange with her trainers for fish. On closer observation, it became clear that Kelly was extremely careful not to add or remove objects from her hidden collection when other dolphins were present. Was she intentionally deceiving other dolphins by secretly hiding these objects for her own use or was this just a coincidence?

Another interesting case was that of what we might call the "paper dolphin." This female, like Kelly, was trained to bring objects to her trainer in

exchange for a reward. In one session, at the trainer's request, she arrived at the surface with a small piece of paper picked up from the bottom of the pool ready to claim her reward. Shortly thereafter, she brought another piece of paper to exchange for a second fish. Then a third, a fourth, and so on; always small pieces and always one at a time. After a large pile of paper bits had been collected near the poolside, her trainer decided to make a closer inspection of the pool. Looking carefully, he discovered what remained of a large paper bag stuck in one of the underwater drain covers and subsequently gave the dolphin the command to retrieve it, which she did in its entirety.⁽⁵⁾ It was unclear how the bag became trapped in the drain cover and whether the dolphin had anything to do with its being there, but she had succeeded in fooling her trainer and increasing the rewards received by retrieving bits of the paper bag instead of the whole object.

Dolphins are not the only large-brained mammals other than humans that deceive others. Both monkeys and *apes have shown skill with these tactics. Dorothy Cheney and Robert Seyfarth, who studied *vervet monkey social behavior in Kenya, wanted to know the extent to which the monkeys understand the nature of social relationships within their group, and how that knowledge might be used by group members to manipulate and deceive one another. Vervet monkeys are clearly good anthropologists; they understand kinship patterns in the group. Using tape-recorded playbacks of baby vervet distress calls, Cheney and Seyfarth showed that vervets are keenly aware of which baby belongs to which mother.⁽⁶⁾ When the call of a given baby was played by the researchers, the other animals in the group looked at the mother of the missing infant. Female vervets, in other words, understand patterns of maternity in their groups.

The researchers also found that vervet monkeys lie. Many *primatologists have seen examples of lying in *primates. In the vervet study, one monkey would give a *predator alarm call as the group fed in a desired fruit tree. As

other group members fled from the “predator,” the call-giver would take advantage of its lie by feeding aggressively in their absence.

In the worlds of dolphins and primates we find examples supporting the idea that these animals may intentionally deceive others to gain a variety of benefits. Deception based on thinking ahead requires a complex brain, cognitive skills, awareness, and an ability to learn new solutions to problems. Dolphins and apes seem to possess all of these characteristics, at least in some measure. Intentional deception is not solely a human talent, but one that also belongs to these animals of the forest and the ocean.

(注)

ape	類人猿(オランウータン, チンパンジー, ゴリラなど)
vervet monkey	ベルベットモンキー(オナガザル科のサバンナモンキーの亜種, 南アフリカ産)
primatologist	霊長類学者
primate	霊長類
predator	天敵

問 1 下線部(1)が具体的にどのようなことであるかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 2 下線部(2)の問いの答えが何かを日本語で答えなさい。

問 3 下線部(3)について, どのようなことが明らかになったかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 4 問題のイルカがなぜ下線部(4)のように呼ばれたのかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 5 下線部(5)が具体的にどのようなことであるかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 6 下線部(6)がどのような事実からわかるかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 7 著者が、イルカやベルベットモンキーなどの例を用いて、この文章全体で示したかったことが何であるかを日本語で説明しなさい。

Ⅲ AとBの設問に答えなさい。

A. Complete the conversation using the word in brackets.

Example:

(yet)

A: Are you ready to leave?

B: No, sorry. _____.

Answer: I am not ready yet.

1. (films)

A: _____?

B: I like horror and science fiction mostly.

2. (bank)

A: Excuse me. _____ here?

B: Yes, there's one just down the road, next to the convenience store.

3. (rather)

A: Do you want to go to the theater tonight?

B: I _____ stay in. I've got a headache.

4. (not)

A: Would _____ making so much noise? I'm trying to sleep.

B: I'm sorry. I'll turn the music down.

