

令和6年度医学科入学試験問題

英 語

〔注意事項〕

- 1 監督者の指示があるまで、この冊子を開いてはいけない。
- 2 解答用紙に受験番号と氏名を必ず記入すること。
- 3 この問題冊子の本文は、18ページからなっている。落丁、乱丁及び印刷不鮮明な箇所等があれば、手をあげて監督者に知らせなさい。
- 4 この問題冊子の白紙と余白は、適宜下書きに使用してもよい。
- 5 解答は、すべて別紙「解答用紙」の指定された場所に記入すること。
- 6 この問題冊子は持ち帰ること。

I Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

Related to the misinformation effect, but with more potentially serious consequences, are recovered and false memories. Under therapy, some adults have claimed to have recovered memories of abuse in childhood that have led to criminal convictions. But in these situations, are people truly recovering memories of genuine events that occurred during their childhood, or are they being encouraged to remember things that didn't actually happen? Substantial research has shown that, under certain circumstances, false memories can be created. Sometimes these are harmless — for example, Roediger, McDermott and colleagues have conducted an extensive body of research since the 1990s showing that people can be encouraged to remember an item that has a related meaning to a series of previously presented items, but which itself was not presented (for example, people may come to remember having been presented with the word '(1)', when they were previously presented with a series of words that have meanings associated with '(1)', such as 'dark', 'moon', 'black', 'still', 'day'...).

It is also possible to create — using suggestions and misleading information — memories for events that the individual very strongly believes happened in their past but which are, in fact, false. So it remains at least plausible that some abusive events that people claim to remember are in fact false memories.⁽²⁾

In her laboratory experiments, Elizabeth Loftus found that people respond just as rapidly and confidently to misleading questions as they do to questions asked without bias. In such situations, even if the participant notices that new information has been introduced, this can still become part of their false memory of the incident — so memory bias can be introduced retrospectively (even if it is consciously identified as such).⁽³⁾ In one experiment, Loftus and Palmer asked some students to watch a series of films, each showing a traffic

accident. Afterwards they had to answer questions about the events. One of the questions was: 'How fast were the cars going when they each other?' The gap was filled with a different word for each group of students, and could be any one of the following: 'smashed', 'collided', 'bumped', 'hit' or 'contacted'. What the researchers found was that the students' estimates of the speed of the cars were influenced by the choice of (4) in that particular question. Loftus and Palmer concluded that the students' memory of the accident had been altered by the (5) information provided in the question.

Loftus and Palmer went on to research this issue further by asking students to watch a film of a multiple-car accident. Again, the students were asked about the speed of the cars, with the word 'smashed' (implying greater collision speed) being used for one group of students and 'hit' for another. A third group of students weren't asked this particular question. A week later, the students were asked to answer more questions, one of which was 'Did you see any broken glass?' at the scene of the accident.

Loftus and Palmer found not only that the (4) used in the speed question influenced the students' estimates of speed, but also that this question subsequently influenced their answer to the broken glass question that was asked a week later. So, those students who had estimated a higher speed were (6) to remember seeing broken glass at the scene of the accident — although there hadn't, in fact, been any broken glass in the film. Those students who hadn't been asked the speed question previously were (7) to remember seeing broken glass when asked about this a week later.

In another study, Loftus again showed participants a film of a traffic accident. This time she asked some of the participants: 'How fast was the white sports car going when it passed the barn while travelling along the country road?' In fact, there had been no barn in the film. A week later, those

participants who had been asked this question were (6) to say they remembered seeing a barn in the film. Even if participants were asked simply 'Did you see a barn?' shortly after viewing the film, they were (6)—a week later—to falsely remember seeing it.

Loftus concluded from these results that the memory representation of an event can be changed by the subsequent introduction of (8) information. Some researchers argued, however, that the participants in these studies were simply conforming to what was expected of them—just as children will give the answer they think is expected of them, rather than say that they 'don't know'. However, Loftus proceeded to find more convincing evidence to support her conclusion.

Loftus and colleagues again presented participants with a traffic accident, but this time it was on a series of slides. The accident showed a red Datsun turning at an intersection and hitting a person, but one group of participants i) saw the car stopping first at a 'Stop' sign, while another group ii) saw it stopping at a 'Yield' ('Give Way') sign. The critical question this time was: "Did another car pass the red Datsun while it was stopped at the 'Stop' sign?", or "Did another car pass the red Datsun while it was stopped at the 'Yield' sign?". For half the participants from each group, the word 'Stop' was used, and for the other half of the participants from each group, 'Yield' was used. Half of the participants in each group received information that was consistent with what they had seen in the accident, and the other half of each group received (8) information.

Twenty minutes later, all the participants were shown pairs of slides, where one of each pair of slides showed what they had actually seen and the other was slightly different. The participants had to choose the most accurate slide for each pair. One of the pairs showed the car halting at a 'Stop' sign, while the other slide showed it halting at a 'Yield' sign. The researchers found that those participants who had been asked the question earlier that had been

consistent with what they had seen in the original slides were (6) to choose the correct slide when they were asked to choose the most accurate slide, twenty minutes later. By contrast, those participants who had been asked a misleading question earlier were (6) to choose the wrong slide when they were asked to choose the most accurate slide, twenty minutes later. Although somewhat complicated to evaluate, this finding suggests that some people were actually *remembering* according to the information that had been introduced concerning the ‘Stop’ or ‘Yield’ sign after the event, rather than simply conforming to what was expected of them — as some of Loftus’ opponents had previously suggested (because each participant now had two equally plausible responses to choose from at the time of test).

(9) These findings have great significance for interviewing techniques undertaken by police officers, lawyers, judges and other workers in the legal system. Conversely, some other findings suggest that, under certain conditions, memory can operate in such a way that subsequent relevant information is inappropriately *not* incorporated (as it should be). This complementary body of research indicates that, although people may remember corrections to earlier misinformation, they may nevertheless continue to rely on the false information (as observed in laboratory investigations conducted by Lewandowsky and colleagues). With respect to real-world examples of this phenomenon, consider the following: approximately one year after the invasion of Iraq in 2003, 30% of respondents in a US survey still believed that weapons of mass destruction had been found in the country. And several months after President George Bush declared the war against Iraq to have ended (in May 2003), 20% of Americans believed that Iraq had used chemical or biological weapons on the battlefield during the conflict. Therefore, in some situations, there appears to be a retention of incorrect information in memory — a phenomenon which can also have profound social consequences. Characterizing further the environmental conditions which

increase the probability of either i) erroneous retrospective bias of memory (identified by Loftus and colleagues) or ii) inappropriate (10) to incorporate (11) information presented (12) the original event (identified by Lewandowsky and colleagues) represents an important challenge for future research.

(Adapted from: *Memory: A Very Short Introduction* by Jonathan K. Foster, Oxford University Press, 2009.)

QUESTIONS

Blank 1: Choose the best word to fill in the blank in accordance with the logic of the passage.

- (A) cave
- (B) night
- (C) tunnel
- (D) sun
- (E) wolf

Underlined 2: Why does the author say this? In Japanese, explain the reason(s) in detail according to the context.

Underlined 3: Answer the following two questions in Japanese.

- (A) What does “as such” mean here?
- (B) Explain in detail how it can occur.

Blank 4: Choose the best word to fill in the blank in accordance with the logic of the passage.

- (A) accident
- (B) film
- (C) place
- (D) meaning
- (E) verb

Blank 5: Choose the best word to fill in the blank in accordance with the logic of the passage.

- (A) clarified
- (B) gathered
- (C) implied
- (D) scattered
- (E) secret

Blanks 6 & 7: Choose the best combination of words to fill in each blank in accordance with the logic of the passage.

- (A) 6. able 7. unable
- (B) 6. least likely 7. most likely
- (C) 6. less likely 7. more likely
- (D) 6. more likely 7. less likely
- (E) 6. less likely 7. least likely
- (F) 6. more likely 7. most likely

Blank 8: Find ONE word in the passage to fill in the blank in accordance with the logic of the passage.

Underlined 9: Why does the author say this? In Japanese, explain the reason(s) in detail according to the context.

Blanks 10, 11 & 12: Choose the best combination of words to fill in each blank in accordance with the logic of the passage.

- | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| (A) | 10. failure | 11. relevant | 12. after |
| (B) | 10. failure | 11. relevant | 12. before |
| (C) | 10. failure | 11. unknown | 12. prior to |
| (D) | 10. mistakes | 11. relevant | 12. along with |
| (E) | 10. mistakes | 11. unknown | 12. after |
| (F) | 10. mistakes | 11. unknown | 12. before |

II Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

The first time I ordered takeout in New York, two things surprised me: the terrific speed with which the food arrived, and the fact that, after I'd paid for it, the man from the Chinese restaurant and I stood on either side of the doorway staring at each other, though only one of us understood why. After a minute of this, I closed the door. An American friend sat on the sofa, openmouthed:

“Wait — did you just close the door?”

In London, you don't tip for delivery. A man on a motorbike arrives and hands over an oil-soaked bag, or a box. You give him the exact amount of money it costs or wait and look at your shoes while he hunts for change. Then you close the door. Sometimes all this is achieved without even the removal of his motorcycle helmet. The dream (an especially British dream) is that the whole awkward exchange passes wordlessly.

Every New Yorker has heard a newly arrived British person complain about tipping. The British add a lecture: food-industry workers shouldn't need to depend on the good nature of customers — they should be paid a decent wage (although the idea that the delivery people of Britain are paid a decent wage is generally an untested assumption). Now when I'm in London, I find myself tipping ⁽⁴⁾ all kinds of people, most of whom express a sort of natural amazement, even if the tip is tiny. What they never, ever do, however, is tell me to have a nice day. “Have a good one”— said slowly and seriously with a slightly sad air, as if trying to avoid the far greater likelihood of an evil “one”— is the most you are likely to hear.

But I'm not going to complain about Britain's “lack of a service culture”— it's one of the things I cherish about the place. I don't think any nation should elevate service to the status of culture. At best, it's a practicality, to be enacted politely and decently by both parties, but no one should be asked to

pretend that the intimate satisfaction of her existence is servicing you, the “guest,” with a shrimp sandwich wrapped in plastic. If the choice is between the all-singing, all-dancing employees in New York restaurants and the cold lack of interest of just about everyone behind a food counter in London, I’ll take the latter. We are subject to enough delusions in this life without adding⁽⁶⁾ to them the belief that the girl worker with the name tag is secretly in love with us.

In London, I know where I stand.⁽⁷⁾ The corner shop at the end of my road is about as unlikely to “bag up” a few samosas, some milk, a packet of cigarettes, and a melon, and bring them to my home or office as it is to come to my office and write my novel for me. (Its slogan, printed on the sunshade, is “Whatever, whenever.” Not in the cheerful American sense.)

In New York, a restaurant makes some “takeout” food, which it fully⁽⁸⁾ intends to take out and deliver to someone. In England, the term is “takeaway,” a subtle difference that places the responsibility on the eater. And it is surprisingly common for London restaurants to request that you come and take away your own food, thank you very much. Or to inform you arrogantly that they will deliver only if you spend twenty pounds or more. In New York, a delivery person will bring a single burrito to your door. That must be why so⁽⁹⁾ many writers live here.

Another treasurable thing about London’s delivery service is its frankly loose attitude toward time⁽¹⁰⁾ (taxis are equally creative in this respect). They say, “The delivery person will be with you in fifteen minutes.” Thirty minutes pass. You call. They say, “He’s turning onto the corner of your road, one minute, one minute!” Five minutes pass. You call. “He’s outside your door! Open your door!” You open the door. He is not outside your door. You call. He is now five minutes away. He “went to the wrong house.” You sit on the doorstep. Ten minutes later, your food arrives. My most extreme encounter with this uniquely British form of torture was when, a few years back, I

ordered from an Indian restaurant four minutes from my house. I was still being told he was on the corner of my road when I walked through the restaurant's door, cell phone in hand, to find the delivery person sitting on a bench, texting. As was his God-given right. It's not as if anyone were going to tip him.

(Adapted from: "TAKE IT OR LEAVE IT" by Zadie Smith. In *The New Yorker*. September 6th, 2021.)

QUESTIONS

Underlined 1: Which one of the two people standing at the door understood why they remained standing? Write your answer in English.

Underlined 2: Why was the writer's friend on the sofa shocked when the author closed the door after receiving the delivery of food? Write your answer in English.

Underlined 3: Fill in the blank with an appropriate English word/appropriate English words to explain the meaning of the underlined part.

The British dream is that exchanges with delivery people are conducted without _____.

Underlined 4: Fill in the blank with an appropriate English word/appropriate English words to explain the meaning of the underlined part.

The author's belief that British delivery people are paid decent wages is an untested assumption because she has no real _____ of the wage scale of delivery people.

Underlined 5: Fill in each blank with an appropriate English word/appropriate English words to explain the meaning of the underlined part.

An exchange regarded as mere practicality would be one conducted with _____ but without much _____.

Underlined 6: Fill in the blank with an appropriate English word/appropriate English words to explain the meaning of the underlined part.

A belief that we can have a genuine _____ with restaurant staff is one of life's delusions.

Underlined 7: What does the underlined part mean? Choose the best answer.

- (A) The author knows how long she should stand before becoming angry.
- (B) The author knows the suitable characteristics for delivery people.
- (C) The author knows her position within a structured class system.
- (D) The author knows a lot about the neighborhood.
- (E) The author knows the disregard for customer service in her home country.

Underlined 8: Fill in each blank with an appropriate English word/appropriate English words to explain the meaning of the underlined part.

“Takeout” food in the U.S. is intended for _____, whereas “takeaway” food in London must be the _____ of the _____.

Underlined 9: Choose the best answer to fill in the following blank.

The author thinks that so many writers live in New York because _____.

- (A) most writers prefer writing alone to working with others
- (B) so many varieties of ethnic food are available for “takeout”
- (C) writers like the company of many other writers during meal times
- (D) writers like the luxury of meals prepared and delivered to them at their convenience
- (E) writers are often very good cooks

Underlined 10: Choose the best answer to fill in the following blank.

The “loose attitude toward time” among British delivery people implies that they _____.

- (A) are allowed to have other interests while supposedly at work
- (B) are often dishonest about how long a delivery will take
- (C) are paid a wage that is not raised based on a record of “on-time” deliveries
- (D) believe that time is a commodity, like money
- (E) have no interest in time because they are paid by the distance travelled during delivery

11. What is the occupation of the narrator? Write your answer in English.

III Read the following passage and answer the questions which follow.

When President Franklin Roosevelt told his economic advisers that he was about to take the U.S. off the gold standard, they strongly disagreed with his idea. The President was leading the country into “uncontrolled inflation and complete chaos,” one of them said. Another said that it was “the end of Western civilization.” Roosevelt’s advisers were not crazy; their view was conventional wisdom.

The gold standard, almost everyone agreed, was the natural way to do money. Under its rules, anybody who wanted to could trade in paper money for a fixed amount of gold. In the U.S., \$20.67 got you an ounce of gold, year in and year out. That unchanging value was the whole point of the gold standard. Take away the gold, and the money would obviously be just worthless paper.

This worldview turned out to be completely wrong. Clinging to the gold standard was part of what created the Great Depression in the first place. Leaving it in 1933 was an essential step toward economic recovery. So why were Roosevelt’s advisers, and most of the leading economists of the day, blinded by their devotion to gold?

There is this thinking error we almost always make with money. The way money works at any given moment feels like part of the natural order, as with water or gravity. Any alternative to the way money works seems like some absurd game. Paper money not supported by anything? That is like expecting water to flow uphill!

Then some political or technological or financial shock comes along, and suddenly there is something new: paper money supported by metal, or paper money supported by nothing, or simply numbers on a screen. Pretty soon, we get used to the new money. It comes to seem like the natural state of things, and anything else is foolishness.

We may be on the point of one of those shifts now. It is impossible to say for sure how things will develop, but history provides some deep insights into what should make us hopeful about the future of money — and what should scare us.

Around A.D. 100, a Chinese court official crushed and mixed together tree bark, rags, and fishnets, and invented paper. A few centuries later, someone — maybe a Buddhist monk who was tired of writing the same sacred text again and again — carved a sacred text into a block of wood and invented printing.

A few centuries after that, a merchant in the capital of Sichuan set out to solve another problem: the money his customers were using was terrible. It was mostly iron coins, and it took 1.5 kilograms of iron to buy one kilogram of salt. It would be the modern equivalent of going shopping with nothing but pennies.

So, the merchant told his customers that they could leave their coins with him. In exchange, he gave them a claim check — a piece of paper that could be used to retrieve the coins. People started using the claim checks themselves to buy stuff, and paper money was born. It was a huge hit.

Pretty soon, the government took over the business of printing paper money, and it spread throughout China. In an era when there was no mechanized transport, the ability to move value around on a few pieces of paper — rather than a wagon full of metal coins — was a breakthrough.

Paper money relied on paper and printing, which were a kind of technology. But paper money itself was also a new technology — a tool that made trade easier. This led to an increased exchange of ideas and more economic specialization, which in turn meant that people could grow more food and make more stuff. At the same time, that new technology came with risks — it meant rulers could print lots of money, which sometimes led to ruinous inflation.

One key dynamic to watch as digital currency evolves is the tension between the government and private firms, a theme that runs like a golden thread through the history of money.

Consider the case of America in the mid-nineteenth century, when almost any bank could print its own paper money. The \$2 bill from Stonington Bank in Connecticut had a whale on the front; the \$5 bill from the St. Nicholas Bank of New York City had a picture of Santa Claus. At one point, private banks were printing more than 8,000 different kinds of money.

This was still the era when paper money was a claim check for gold or silver. If a bank went bankrupt, the valuable claim check was suddenly just a piece of paper with a picture of Santa Claus on it.

This presented a problem for merchants who faced customers using thousands of kinds of money. How could they know which banks were reliable? For that matter, how could they tell real money from fake money? Publications called “bank note reporters” were created to solve both problems. They were little magazines that listed bills from all around the country, with brief physical descriptions and recommendations for whether to accept the money at full value or, if an unreliable bank, to accept it only at a discount from the marked value.

That world disappeared around the time of the Civil War, when a new federal tax on paper money drove most of the old banknotes out of existence. But even as the quantity of paper money declined, money created by private banks persisted.

Even today, banks create new money from nothing every time they make a loan. This money, stored as balances in checking and savings accounts, is not so different from the paper money banks used to print. Well into the twentieth century, depositors in the U.S. could lose their money when a bank went bankrupt — just like their ancestors who were left holding worthless pieces of paper.

It was only in the 1930s, when the federal government started insuring most bank deposits, that this risk disappeared. In other words, modern banks create money that is in turn guaranteed by the federal government. Is this money public or private? It is both!

The original dream of cryptocurrency was purely private money—a currency that needed neither governments nor banks. And although this remains a technical possibility, it is striking that more than a decade after Bitcoin was invented, almost no one uses cryptocurrency in the ordinary way people use money—to buy stuff in everyday life. If cryptocurrency does become ordinary money, it probably will not be as purely private money, but as the kind of public-private hybrid that money has always been. In fact, regulators have started to regulate so-called stablecoins, a kind of cryptocurrency designed to substitute for our existing money.

(Adapted from: “WHAT THE HISTORY OF MONEY SAYS ABOUT WHAT’S COMING” by Jacob Goldstein. In *Time*. October 25/November 1, 2021.)

QUESTIONS

According to the content of the passage, write T for True, F for False or N for Not mentioned in the text for each statement. Answer a question with “N” only if the statement is either not present in the text or cannot be inferred from the information in the text.

1. When Roosevelt took the U.S. off the gold standard, his advisers feared that inflation would result because gold had been widely regarded as the fixed standard.

2. Before Roosevelt's drastic action, anyone could exchange a fixed quantity of gold for a variable amount of paper money in U.S. dollars depending upon the exchange rate.
3. Paper money, unlike money made of metal, was convenient because it could be transported more easily in China.
4. In the U.S., the federal government has always had a monopoly on the printing of paper money.
5. It is now recognized that in fact money does not need anything to "support it," for it can be created out of nothing.
6. When the federal government began to insure bank deposits in the U.S., much of the risk associated with different forms of money disappeared.
7. The issuance of money has always blended the private and the public sectors.
8. Cryptocurrencies have no real use yet, as they are created from nothing with no real government support.

IV Read the following and write an essay in English in about 200 words in total.

In recent years, the Japanese government has promoted the recruitment of foreign workers. As a result, the foreign populations of many smaller cities and rural areas have increased dramatically in the last 10 years or so. Write an essay that (1) explains two possible problems that medical doctors and/or nurses may encounter as a result of increasing immigration, and (2) for each problem, discusses one possible measure that you think should be taken to help overcome that problem.

