滋賀医科大学

平成27年度
医学科一般入試(前期日程)問題

英　　語

(注　意)

1. 問題冊子は試験開始の合図があるまで開かないこと。
2. 問題冊子は表紙のほか8ページである。
3. 試験中に問題冊子及び解答用紙の印刷不鮮明，ページの落丁・乱丁等に気付いた場合は，手を挙げて監督者に知らせること。
4. 解答用紙のすべてに受験番号及び氏名をはっきり記入すること。
5. 解答はすべて解答用紙の所定の解答欄に明瞭に記入すること。
6. 解答に関係のないことを書いた答案は，無効にすることがある。
7. 本学受験票を机の右上に出しておくこと。
8. 試験時間は90分である。
9. 問題冊子は持ち帰ってもよいが，解答用紙は持ち帰らないこと。

英　　語　(3問題)

Ⅰ．次の文章を読んで下の設問に答えよ。設問3に数字で答える以外はすべて日本語で答えること。右肩に*印のある語には下に注がある。(配点　80点)

If you have ever been on a subway or public bus, you know the rules. Do not make eye contact, stay as far away from other people as the space allows, and never talk to anyone. However, what if the rules are wrong?

The behavioral scientists Nicholas Epley and Juliana Schroeder approached commuters* in a Chicago area train station and asked them to break the rules. In return for a $5 gift card, these commuters agreed to participate in a simple experiment during their train ride. One group was asked to talk to the stranger who sat down next to them on the train that morning. Others were told to follow standard commuter behavior and keep to themselves. By the end of the train ride, commuters who talked to a stranger reported having had a more positive experience than those who did not.

If the idea of talking to a chance seat-mate makes you uncomfortable, you are not alone.(1) When Dr. Epley and Ms. Schroeder asked other people in the same train station to predict how they would feel after talking to a stranger, the commuters thought their ride would be more pleasant if they sat on their own. Why are what these commuters predict and their actual experiences so different? Most people imagined it would be difficult to start a conversation. They estimated that fewer than half of their fellow commuters would want to talk to them, but in fact, not a single person reported having been rejected, and the conversations were pleasant. According to a 2004 study published in *Science*, commuting is associated with fewer positive emotions than any other common daily activity. By avoiding contact, we are all following a collective assumption(2) that turns out to be false.

What if the research showed that we would improve our commutes by investing in social capital — interacting* with the strangers sitting all around us? The great thing about strangers is that we tend to put on a happy face when we meet one, reserving our displays of irritation for the people we know and love. When one of us, Liz, was in graduate school, she noticed that her boyfriend, Benjamin, felt free to act unpleasantly around her, but if he were forced to interact with a stranger or acquaintance, he would put on a more cheerful face. Then his own pleasant

behavior would often improve his mood. One of the advantages of being a scientist who studies human behavior is that when your partner does something you do not like, you can bring dozens (3) of couples into the laboratory and get to the bottom of it (4). When Liz tested her idea in a laboratory experiment, she discovered that most people showed the "Benjamin Effect" (5).

Many of us assume, however, that our welfare depends on our closest ties, and not on the minor characters (6) in our daily lives. To investigate how valid this assumption was, our student Gillian M. Sandstrom asked people to keep records of their social interactions. She had them count every interaction during the day according to whether it was a "strong tie" (7) or a "weak tie," (8) a strong tie being someone close to them and a weak tie being someone they did not know so well. She found that reserved and outgoing people alike felt happier on days when they had more social interactions.

More surprisingly, interactions with weak ties created relations at least as happy as interactions with strong ties. In a recent study, we recruited people on their way into a busy coffee shop with a $5 gift card. We asked some customers to start a genuine conversation with the staff at the cash register, smiling and having a brief conversation. Others were told to be as efficient as possible: Get in, get out, and then go on with the day. Those who stayed longer to interact left the coffee shop feeling more cheerful. Efficiency (9), it seems, is valued too highly.

Imagine you are on a large college campus. Even making eye contact to interact with people we walk by can make a difference. Such simple interactions with strangers may ease their sense of separateness; and being acknowledged by others might do the same for us. There should be one consideration, however; another set of studies has shown that people tend to run away from strangers who stare at them too strongly on the street.

Rather than fall back on our mistaken belief in the pleasures of being alone, we could reach out to other people. At least, when we walk down the street, we can refuse to accept a world where people look at one another as though through air. When we talk to strangers, we are likely to gain much more than the "me time" (10) we might lose.

(出典　http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/26/opinion/sunday/hello-stranger.html より改変引用。)

注　commuter ＝ 通勤・通学者

interact(-ing) ＝ 相互に作用・影響し合う

設問 1　What percentage of the commuters attempting to start a conversation with other commuters experienced rejection?

設問 2　What common daily activity is associated with the fewest positive emotions?

設問 3　Choose the most suitable answer for A-C below:

A. The underlined phrase, "you are not alone,"(1) means that

1. you have friends to talk to.
2. you are not isolated from others.
3. you are not the only one who feels that way.
4. you can contact people by phone.

B. The "Benjamin Effect"(5) concerns people who tend to

1. behave more pleasantly toward family members than toward acquaintances.
2. cooperate with experiments in a laboratory.
3. investigate social capital through experimentation.
4. act more cheerfully towards strangers than towards people very close to them.

C. Minor characters(6) are people that _____ our lives.

1. we have stronger connections with in
2. we have slight connections with in
3. are main actors in the drama of
4. we never interact with in

設問 4　What collective assumption(2) is the author referring to?

設問 5　下線部 (3) の語句 "bring dozens of couples into the laboratory" は，どのような意味なのか本文に沿って説明せよ。

設問 6　下線部 (4) の語句 "get to the bottom of it" は，どのような意味なのか本文に沿って説明せよ。

設問 7　From the text, give one example of a strong tie(7), and one of a weak tie(8).

設問 8　下線部 (9) の語 "Efficiency" は，どのような意味なのか本文に沿って説明せよ。

設問 9　下線部 (10) の語句 "me time" は，どのような意味なのか本文に沿って説明せよ。

設問10　Describe a situation from the text in which the author admits that trying to interact with a stranger may be unsuccessful.

Ⅱ．次の文章を読んで下の設問に答えよ。解答はすべて日本語で答えること。右肩に*印のある語(句)には下に注がある。(配点　80 点)

The North American sky, according to pre-1850s historical accounts, was once black with passenger pigeons*. "Their flocks, a mile wide and sometimes 300 miles long, were so closely packed that they darkened the sky for hours and days as they passed overhead" (Schorger). By the second half of the nineteenth century, however, they were mostly gone. "Martha," the last individual of the species, expired in the Cincinnati Zoo in 1914.

The great conservationist-philosopher Aldo Leopold expressed his sorrow over the disappearance of the birds in 1949 in his writings and wondered if they would be seen again in the skies of Wisconsin. (1) He could not have known that only a handful of decades later we would be close to a scientific revolution in efforts to reverse the death of species. The "de-extinction" movement, promoted by a prominent group of scientists, argues that we no longer have to accept the fact of extinction as final. By applying techniques such as cloning and genetic engineering, they believe, we can and should return lost species such as the passenger pigeon to the landscape. This is the goal of the San Francisco-based Long Now Foundation, which is actively supporting scientific efforts to recreate the lost bird. However, it does not stop there. Scientists in Spain say they are close to cloning the Pyrenean ibex, a mountain goat that took its last breath in 2000. Other species have also been targeted, including the Tasmanian tiger and even the mammoth.

The de-extinction supporters make persuasive arguments. The most powerful among them appeals to our sense of justice: de-extinction is our opportunity to right past wrongs and to make up for our moral failings. These people argue further that the revived species will restore lost ecological functions and increase the diversity of ecosystems.

At the same time, the de-extinction proposal raises (2) considerable concerns. Revived species could create problems in contemporary environments and for native species that have evolved in the absence of the vanished animal. As with the introduction of any species into a new environment, there are risks of the spread of disease and biological invasion. Some conservationists also express the fear that, given decades of ecological change and human development, the landscape will not be able to support the revived populations.

Others worry about the limited genetic diversity* of any once extinct species brought back

to life and question the assumption that reviving a genome is the same thing as recovering the animal's behavior and identity, which evolved over thousands of years. There is also the (3) particularly upsetting concern that such aggressive manipulation of wildlife might actually end up decreasing our desire (and our limited resources) to conserve still-existing species — and that it would involve harmful interference in the lives of animals.

(4) The most troubling aspect of de-extinction, however, is what it might mean for us. Attempting to revive lost species is in many ways a refusal to accept our moral and technological limits in nature. De-extinction thus reflects a new kind of Promethean* spirit, proud and daring, that attempts to take risks with our boundless cleverness and powerful tools for "conservation" rather than for human enhancement*.

Leopold was aware of our tendency to let our technological advancements get out in front of our ethics. (5) "Our tools," he cautioned in the late 1930s, "are better than we are, and grow better faster than we do. They suffice to crack the atom, to command the tides, but they do not suffice for the oldest task in human history: to live on a piece of land without spoiling it." The real challenge is to live more lightly on the land and to address the moral and cultural forces that drive unsustainable* and ecologically* destructive practices.

That is why there is great virtue in keeping extinct species extinct. Thinking of their loss reminds us of our imperfections and limitations. We are a smart but not always wise species and occasionally a heroic one, but we are a species that often becomes blinded by its own power.

It would be silly to deny the reality of that power, but we should also treasure and protect the capacity of nature, including those parts of nature that are no longer with us, to teach ourselves something profound about the value of collective self-restraint and human limits. Few things teach us this sort of modesty any more.

It cuts against the progressive aims of science to say it, but there can be wisdom in slowing down, in resisting the impulse to further control and manipulate; to fix nature.

(出典：*Nature* 509, 261 [15 May 2014]より改変引用；参考文献 A.W. Schorger. *The Passenger Pigeon.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1955.)

注　passenger pigeons ＝ 旅行鳩；リョコウバト：今や絶滅してしまった米国産の群生する移動性のハト。

genetic diversity ＝ 遺伝子の多様性

Promethean < Prometheus ＝（ギリシャ神話の中の登場人物）プロメテウス。彼は神々から火を盗んで人類に与えたため，主神であるゼウスから罰として岩場につながれて毎日，大ワシに肝臓をついばまれるという責め苦を受けた。

enhancement ＝ 価値を高めること

unsustainable ＝ 維持できない

ecologically ＝ 生態学的に，エコロジー的に

設問 1　十九世紀前半までの北米における “passenger pigeons”（旅行鳩）の絶滅前の生息状態は，本文によると具体的にどのようであったか説明せよ。

設問 2　著者は，“the de-extinction movement” の根本姿勢と目標がどのようなものであると指摘しているか。

設問 3　下線部 (1) を和訳せよ。

設問 4　下線部 (2) の “considerable concerns” とは何か，文意に沿って三つの点を説明せよ。

設問 5　下線部 (3) の “particularly upsetting concern” とは何か，文意に沿って説明せよ。

設問 6　下線部 (4) の “The most troubling aspect of de-extinction” とは何か，文意に沿って説明せよ。

設問 7　下線部 (5) の “Our tools” に対してどのような批判が述べられているか。

設問 8　我々人間はどのような種(species)であると述べられているか。

設問 9　最後のパラグラフに示される筆者の考え方をわかりやすく説明せよ。

Ⅲ. With Section One〔問題Ⅰ〕of this exam in mind, reflect on your own experiences interacting with strangers through eye contact, facial expressions such as smiling, greetings, asking questions, or other means. Then, write an English essay of about 120–150 words interpreting one such experience of yours (or someone else's) that led to a significant, impressive and/or unexpected result. (配点　40 点)