

英 語

(英語Ⅰ・英語Ⅱ・リーディング・ライティング・
オーラルコミュニケーションⅠ・オーラルコミュニ
ケーションⅡ)

試験時間 120分

文学部, 教育学部, 法学部, 医学部,
工学部(物質生命化学科及び社会環境工学科を除く)

問 題	ページ
Ⅰ ~ Ⅳ	1 ~ 8

注 意 事 項

1. 試験開始の合図があるまで, この冊子を開いてはいけません。
2. 各解答紙に志望学部及び受験番号を必ず記入しなさい。
なお, 解答紙には, 必要事項以外は記入してはいけません。
3. 試験開始後, この冊子又は解答紙に落丁・乱丁及び印刷の不鮮明な箇所などがあれば, 手を挙げて監督者に知らせなさい。
4. この冊子の白紙と余白部分は, 適宜下書きに使用してもかまいません。
5. 解答は, 必ず解答紙の指定された場所に記入しなさい。
6. 解答紙は, 持ち帰ってはいけません。
7. 試験終了後, この冊子は持ち帰りなさい。

I 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

As anyone who has read the Declaration of Independence knows, the right to the pursuit of happiness is part of the nation's founding principles in the United States. But when it comes to where to look for it, the instructions are less than clear. ⁽¹⁾

Many think money holds the key.

For years researchers, from psychologists to economists, have examined whether there is a direct connection between one's financial and emotional wealth. Studies suggest that more money can lead to a significant increase in positive outlook when it brings people out of poverty, but when simply taking a person up a pay grade, there's often only a minor change in attitude. And while the purchase of material possessions can offer temporary pleasure, the effects of a new watch, car, or dress, studies show, are almost always short-lived. ⁽²⁾

But new research by one Harvard scholar suggests that happiness can be found by spending money on others. Michael Norton, assistant professor at the Harvard Business School, conducted a series of studies with his colleagues at the University of British Columbia (UBC). Together they showed that people are happier when they spend money on others rather than on themselves.

"This study dealt with a paradox ⁽³⁾ that economists have talked about for a long time — that increases in income don't tend to lead to big increases in happiness," said Norton. "People buy bigger and bigger houses, but they don't seem to get much happier as a result."

The work included a national survey in which the group asked 632 American men and women how much they made annually; how much they spent each month on bills, expenses, and gifts for themselves; and what they spent monthly on gifts for other people and contributions to charities. They also asked them to rate their level of happiness. The findings showed that those who reported spending more on others also reported a greater level of happiness, while how much they spent on themselves had no impact on happiness.

Another study ⁽⁴⁾ examined how 16 employees spent a bonus at a Boston-based company. A month before receiving the bonus, which averaged about \$5,000, the employees were asked to rate their level of happiness. After they received the bonus, they were again asked what their happiness level was, along with a series of questions about how they spent the money. Those who spent more of their bonus on others registered a higher level of happiness than those who spent it on themselves. In addition, the actual size of the bonus appeared to have no influence on a person's happiness. "The dollar amount of the bonus had no impact on happiness over time," said Norton. "People were just as happy whether they received \$3,000 or \$8,000. All that mattered was the percent spent on other people."

In a third study, researchers at UBC handed envelopes of money to students on campus.
(5) The students were told they should spend the money (either \$5 or \$20) by the end of that day either on themselves — to cover a bill or expense or get themselves a gift — or on others, a gift for someone or contributions to charity. The results mirrored those from their other studies. “We found that people who spent the money on themselves that day weren’t happier that evening,” said Norton, “but people who spent it on others were. The amount of money, \$5 or \$20, didn’t matter at all. It was only how people spent it that made them happier.”

(問 1) 下線部(1)を 2 番目の “it” が指すものを明らかにして日本語に直しなさい。

(問 2) 下線部(2)を日本語に直しなさい。

(問 3) 下線部(3)はどうか、日本語で説明しなさい。

(問 4) 下線部(4)の結果明らかになったことを、二点日本語で説明しなさい。

(問 5) 下線部(5)ではどのような方法で調査を行ったか、70 字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

Ⅱ 次の英文を読んで設問に答えなさい。

Two approaches have tended to define the debate about sustainable prosperity in recent years. The first is conscious consumption, also known as “green shopping.” The second approach, “green technology” (ecological technology) is a topic which covers everything from energy to transportation, housing to product design. These two approaches are mutually supportive, and both have a lot to offer as we try to find our way to a “green future.”

But there is a danger concerning these approaches, in thinking that all we have to do is design better, greener products to replace those we already consume, and then convince people to buy them. I call this idea “the Swap.” It’s sort of a middle stage on the road to a better future, where people have accepted that something must change, but not yet realized that everything must change. Therefore, the Swap is a form of denial.

It’s an attractive fantasy — instead of driving a big car, living in a big house and shopping at “The Gap,” I can drive a Toyota Prius, live in an eco-home and shop at a “green” online shopping site. However this doesn’t work, because the systems, such as highways and suburbs, that support such choices are unsustainable. For instance, highways are destructive, even when full of hybrid cars, and suburbs are unsustainable, even when the individual houses are ecological.

If we’re going to avoid ecological destruction, we need to not only do things differently, rather we need to do different things. We need to build dense neighborhoods where people can do more walking, composed of “green” buildings, well-planned bicycle pathways with adequate bicycle parking, and public transportation served by bicycle. We also need good design choices and smart technologies that let us live in a different set of relationships with the things we own. By accepting innovation in technology, design, planning, and policy, we can transform the systems around us, and provide ourselves with much more sustainable choices. “Green” lives will not look like the lives we live today. That doesn’t mean that they’ll be less attractive. On the contrary, both our quality of life and our prosperity may increase dramatically.

But there is a side to this change which is more an art than a science: understanding how we can reconnect with one another in our communities. I believe that to ignore the creative, emotional, even spiritual aspects of this transformation is to fail.

Many of the unsustainable systems we’re trying to change seem to give us individual independence by inserting goods and commercialism between the citizen and his or her community. However, as we change such systems, we will need to enter a new reality — one of interdependence. We need to remind people how to be good neighbors, how to build

friendships, how to share, how to see their own best interests in public goods. That is, how to be a good citizen.

So, one of the major design challenges we face is figuring out how to successfully develop architecture, urban planning, the arts, new forms of community engagement, and new forms of commerce. At the same time, I don't think that when we approach changing the world, we ought to exclude the possibility of changing ourselves.

NOTE

sustainable: able to be maintained without destroying the environment

Complete the following sentences in English.

- (1) The author considers two current ecological approaches to be a potential danger for the future. These are: _____ and _____.
- (2) According to the author, the term _____ indicates that people have “not yet realized that everything must change.”
- (3) The author feels that _____ and _____ are unsustainable systems.
- (4) Three different facilities the author recommends to be created in planning new neighborhoods are: _____, _____ and _____.
- (5) According to the author, failure means _____.
- (6) In this essay, “interdependence” most directly implies being _____.

III

次の文の、日本語で書かれた部分(1)(2)(3)を英語に直しなさい。

Facial expressions are important for connecting with the audience, but the skillful speaker does not want to manipulate the audience by using them. 聴衆はたいてい話し手の笑顔が本物かどうかわかるものである。As in all body movements, facial expressions should be natural extensions of the spoken message. (1)

Of all the different parts of the face, the eyes are the most important in establishing the speaker-audience relationship. Good eye contact helps to establish a connection and belief in the speaker. A speaker who looks at the audience appears more honest than one who does not. In a study on the effect of eye contact on audience response, アイコンタクトのより多い話し手の方が、少ない話し手よりうまく自分のメッセージを伝えることができるとわかった。The relationship between eye contact and belief in the speaker has also been supported through research. (2)

Although eye contact is important in delivering the message, it is impossible to look at the entire audience at one time. The effective speaker looks directly at individual audience members seated in various locations. An empty stare or wandering eyes do not add to your delivery. アイコンタクトの効果を上げるには、すべての聴衆に一人ずつ話しかけているかのよう(3)に思わせる努力を話し手はすべきである。

注: manipulate (人や世論など)を操る

IV 次の会話を読んで設問に答えなさい。

Ben: I just read a magazine article that said robots were bad for humanity.

Emiko: Bad, what do you mean?

Ben: Well, the author says that a lot of people are losing their jobs to robots.

Emiko: Really? I think robots represent the future of humanity. Don't you agree?

Ben: If it means not working, I don't think it's much of a future.

Emiko: But robots do jobs that people don't want to do; dangerous jobs, like working with poisonous chemicals or working deep underground in mines. Think of how many lives could be saved.

Ben: Well I suppose you have a point. But we still need jobs.

Emiko: That's right, but can't we train people to take new jobs, jobs that are more suited to IT and other 21st century professions?

Ben: Maybe robots could give us the free time so we can become better educated. So I guess robots mean better jobs, not fewer jobs.

Emiko: Yeah, that's what I'm saying.

Ben: I suppose in the West we tend to hold negative opinions of robots. We tend to focus on the differences, the alien head, the stiff unnatural way of walking. The mechanical is associated with remoteness, coldness, and a lack of feeling.

Emiko: Hmm, here in Japan we see robots more as friendly, helpful beings. Some of our most popular cartoon heroes are friendly, even noble robots who fight for justice. We've designed robots complete with smiling faces. One robot I know of is even designed to look exactly like a Japanese woman.

Ben: I think I'd find it easier to deal with them if they looked like machines — after all, the only thing scarier than a machine is a machine disguised as a human. In many Hollywood films with robots, they inevitably turn out to be a threat to humankind.

Emiko: But surely you can't take Hollywood fiction too seriously.

Ben: Still, you can't just dismiss the issues raised in these films. For example, who owns the robots? If only a few wealthy corporations own robots, they could control most of society without being seen and without lifting a finger. We may not even know their identity.

Emiko: Well then, I propose that each of us should own a robot! The more robots the better.

Ben: Then I suppose we could send them off to work and we could go to the beach!

Emiko: But all joking aside, there's one thing about robots that causes me concern. It has to do with robots and warfare. Did you know that right now, the military is developing

intelligent, automatic weapons systems?

Ben: Exactly — how can you fight against a robot that feels no pain, has no fear and grants no mercy?

Emiko: Yes, it's a frightening prospect. So I think we need to create laws to restrict the use of robots, so that robot technology can remain beneficial.

Ben: Yeah, and only humans can do that.

(3)

(問 1) ロボットに対して Ben が述べていることと一致しないものを、次の(A)~(D)の中から一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (A) Robots may be harmful for humanity.
- (B) Robots may help promote free time.
- (C) Robots should have smiling faces.
- (D) Robots are scary.

(問 2) ロボットに対する Emiko の考えと一致するものを、次の(A)~(D)の中から一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (A) Robots will lead in war.
- (B) Robots will educate us.
- (C) Robots will own manufacturing plants.
- (D) Robots will benefit society.

(問 3) Ben が会話の中で見方を変えた話題を、次の(A)~(D)の中から一つ選び、記号で答えなさい。

- (A) Robots and dangerous chemicals.
- (B) Robots and work.
- (C) Robots and movies.
- (D) Robots and war.

(問 4) 下線部(1)はどうか、日本語で説明しなさい。

(問 5) 下線部(2)のように Ben が考える理由を日本語で説明しなさい。

(問 6) 下線部(3)は何を指すか、日本語で説明しなさい。

SOURCES

- I Walsh, Colleen. “Money Spent on Others Can Buy Happiness.” *Harvard University Gazette Online*, 17 April 2008.
- II Steffen, Alex. “Neighborliness, Innovation and Sustainability.” *Worldchanging Online Magazine*, 7 April 2008.
- III Barker, Larry L. *Communication*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.
- IV 書き下ろし.