

## 令和4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. 監督者から指示があったら、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記入しなさい。その他の欄に記入してはいけません。
3. 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。
4. この冊子は持ち帰りなさい。
5. 落丁、乱丁または印刷不備があったら申し出なさい。





I 次の文章を読んで、問1～6に答えなさい。\*が付いている表現には本文の後に注があります。また、本文中[...]とあるのは原文を中略していることを示しています。

When people reflect on what it takes to be mentally fit, the first idea that comes to mind is usually intelligence. <sup>(1)</sup>The smarter you are, the more complex the problems you can solve — and the faster you can solve them. Intelligence is traditionally viewed as the ability to think and learn. Yet in a turbulent\* world, there's another set of cognitive skills that might matter more: the ability to rethink and unlearn.

Imagine that you've just finished taking a multiple-choice test, and you start to second-guess one of your answers. You have some extra time — should you stick with your first instinct or change it?

About three quarters of students are convinced that revising their answer will *hurt* their score. Kaplan, the big test-prep company, once warned students to “exercise great caution if you decide to change an answer. Experience indicates that many students who change answers change to the wrong answer.”

With all due respect to the lessons of experience, I prefer the rigor of evidence. When a trio of psychologists conducted <sup>(2)</sup>a comprehensive review of thirty-three studies, they found that in every one, the majority of answer revisions were from wrong to right. This phenomenon is known as the first-instinct fallacy\*.

In one demonstration, psychologists counted eraser marks on the exams of more than 1,500 students in Illinois. Only a quarter of the changes were from right to wrong, while half were from wrong to right. I've seen it in my own classroom year after year: my students' final exams have surprisingly few eraser marks, but those who do rethink their first answers rather than staying anchored to them end up improving their scores.

Of course, it's possible that second answers aren't inherently\* better; they're

only better because students are generally so reluctant to switch that they only make changes when they're fairly confident. But recent studies point to a different explanation: (3) it's not so much changing your answer that improves your score as considering whether you should change it.

We don't just hesitate to rethink our answers. (4) We hesitate at the very idea of rethinking. Take an experiment where hundreds of college students were randomly assigned to learn about the first-instinct fallacy. The speaker taught them about the value of changing their minds and gave them advice about when it made sense to do so. On their next two tests, they still weren't any more likely to revise their answers.

Part of the problem is cognitive laziness. Some psychologists point out that we're mental misers\*: we often prefer the ease of hanging on to old views over the difficulty of grappling with\* new ones. Yet there are also deeper forces behind our resistance to rethinking. Questioning ourselves makes the world more unpredictable. It requires us to admit that the facts may have changed, that what was once right may now be wrong. Reconsidering something we believe deeply can threaten our identities, making it feel as if we're losing a part of ourselves.

Rethinking isn't a struggle in every part of our lives. When it comes to our possessions, we update with fervor\*. We refresh our wardrobes when they go out of style and renovate\* our kitchens when they're no longer in vogue. When it comes to our knowledge and opinions, though, we tend to stick to our guns. Psychologists call this seizing and freezing. We favor the comfort of conviction over the discomfort of doubt, and we let our beliefs get brittle\* long before our bones. We laugh at people who still use Windows 95, yet we still cling to opinions that we formed in 1995. We listen to views that make us feel good, instead of ideas that make us think hard.

At some point, you've probably heard that if you drop a frog in a pot of scalding\* hot water, it will immediately leap out. But if you drop the frog in

lukewarm\* water and gradually raise the temperature, the frog will die. It lacks the ability to rethink the situation, and doesn't realize the threat until it's too late.

I did some research on this popular story recently [...]. <sup>(5)</sup>It isn't true.

Tossed into the scalding pot, the frog will get burned badly and may or may not escape. The frog is actually better off in the slow-boiling pot: it will leap out as soon as the water starts to get uncomfortably warm.

It's not the frogs who fail to reevaluate. It's us. <sup>(6)</sup>Once we hear the story and accept it as true, we rarely bother to question it.

出典：Adam Grant, *Think Again: The Power of Knowing What You Don't Know* (New York: Viking, 2021), pp. 2-4. 一部改変。

- (注) turbulent 激動の  
fallacy 誤った考え  
inherently 内在的に  
misers けちな人  
grappling with 取り組む  
fervor 情熱  
renovate 改装する  
brittle 壊れやすい  
scalding やけどするほど熱い  
lukewarm なまぬるい

問 1 下線部(1)を和訳しなさい。

問 2 下線部(2)の結果わかったことを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 3 下線部(3)を和訳しなさい。

問 4 下線部(4)の理由として筆者が挙げている2つのことを日本語で簡潔に説明  
しなさい。

問 5 下線部(5)のように筆者が言える理由を日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

問 6 下線部(6)を和訳しなさい。

II 次の文章を読んで、問1～8に答えなさい。\*が付いている表現には本文の後に注があります。また、本文中[...]とあるのは原文を中略していることを示しています。

It felt good to love again, in that big empty house. Virginia Kellner got the cat last November, around her ninety-second birthday, and now it's always nearby. It keeps her company as she moves, bent over her walker, from the couch to the bathroom and back again. The walker has a pair of orange scissors hanging from the handlebar, for opening mail. Virginia likes the pet's green eyes. She likes that it's there in the morning, when she wakes up. Sometimes, on days when she feels sad, she sits in her soft armchair and rests the cat on her soft stomach and just lets it do its thing. Nuzzle\*. Stretch. Vibrate. Virginia knows that the cat is programmed to move this way; there is a motor somewhere, controlling things. Still, she can almost forget. "It makes you feel like it's real," Virginia told me, the first time we spoke. "I mean, mentally, I know <sup>(1)</sup>it's not. But — oh, it meowed again!"

She named the cat Jennie, for one of the nice ladies who work at the local Department of the Aging in Cattaraugus County, a rural area in upstate\* New York, bordering Pennsylvania. It was Jennie (the person) who told her that <sup>(2)</sup>the county was giving robot pets to old people like her. Did she want one? She could have a dog or a cat. A Meals on Wheels\* driver brought Virginia the pet, along with her daily lunch delivery. He was so eager to show it to her that he opened the box himself, instead of letting Virginia do it. The Joy for All Companion pet was orange with a white chest and tapered\* whiskers\*. Nobody mentioned that it was part of a statewide loneliness intervention. [...]

In 2018, New York State's Office for the Aging launched <sup>(3)</sup>a pilot project, distributing Joy for All robots to sixty state residents and then tracking them over time. Researchers used a six-point loneliness scale, which asks respondents to agree or disagree with statements like "I experience a general sense of



emptiness.” They concluded that seventy per cent of participants felt less lonely after one year. The pets were not as sophisticated as other social robots being designed for the so-called silver market or loneliness economy, but they were cheaper, at about a hundred dollars apiece.

In April, 2020, a few weeks after New York aging departments shut down their adult day programs and communal dining sites, the state placed a bulk order for more than a thousand robot cats and dogs. The pets went quickly, and caseworkers\* started asking for more: “Can I get five cats?” [...] People liked the pets so much that the batteries ran out. Caseworkers joked that (4) their clients had loved them to death. [...]

By April, 2021, [...] New York had given out twenty-two hundred and sixty animatronic pets\* and was waiting for a delivery of around a thousand more. Other states, along with independent nursing homes\* and hospice agencies\*, had also started robot programs, some paid for by pandemic-relief funding\*. Today, aging departments in twenty-one states have distributed more than twenty thousand Joy for All pets as part of formal initiatives to help lonely older people. Florida has bought the most: around eight and a half thousand, as of this May. “You know, it sounds like a cute story, but it’s so much more than that,” Richard Prudom, the secretary for the Florida Department of Elder Affairs, told me. “These are not just cuddly\* toys. They’re not toys!”

Then what are they? Joy for All robots were, in fact, (5) inspired by toys. In 2015, Ted Fischer, then the head of an innovation team at Hasbro, noticed that some of the company’s animatronic pets, designed for four-to-eight-year-old girls, were being bought for grandparents. Fischer recruited product testers in their seventies and eighties and brought them to Hasbro’s FunLab, where engineers watched them play from behind one-way glass\*. Researchers learned that older people wanted the animals to be as realistic as possible. It mattered that the cat’s whiskers were tapered just so.

In 2018, Fischer and his team bought the Joy for All brand from Hasbro and

started a new company, Ageless Innovation. Over time, he grew certain that his robots could give older people's lives "meaning." In 2020, a study in the *Journals of Gerontology* seemed to support <sup>(6)</sup>this; it found that elderly users who interacted with the pets for sixty days reported greater optimism and "sense of purpose," and were sometimes less lonely. (This study, like many others, did not compare the robot intervention with other interventions. It did not consider how robots measured up to humans.) [...]

The English mathematician Alan Turing famously judged, in 1950, that <sup>(7)</sup>a machine can be said to possess "intelligence" when it can fool a human into believing that it is not a machine. Producers of the latest companion robots don't seem to care much about achieving Turing test-level authenticity. For a robot to win the affinity\* of a human, it doesn't have to seem real; real enough will do. Researchers have found that humans will naturally attribute agency to machines — and, in turn, qualities like "intention" and "caring." Designers can encourage the process along. Studies have shown that, if a person is required to perform a nurturing task for her robot, she will become more attached to it. Physically embodied robots, as opposed to disembodied\* voices (like Siri or Alexa), can be better at building trust. And a bit of unpredictable behavior can give the impression that, inside a machine, somebody is home. Some social robots appear to sulk\* when they are ignored. ElliQ\* can dip her lamp head in shame when she misunderstands a request.

"What we have observed is that, actually, in a few days, you create a kind of dependency," Marc Alba, whose company recently bought the rights to a social robot called Jibo, said. (Jibo also looks like a cute lamp, and can connect to medical devices.) Alba thinks that loneliness makes it easier for older people to feel close to a robot: "Just conversation — not very profound, whatever — creates this sense of warmth, proximity\*." This even applies to robots that make no claim to social function. One study found that lonely people are more likely to form attachments to their Roomba vacuum cleaners. When the vacuums break,

some owners do not want a replacement Roomba; they want their Roomba fixed.<sup>(8)</sup>

出典：Katie Engelhart, “What Robots Can — and Can’t — Do for the Old and Lonely,” *New Yorker* (May 24, 2021). 抜粋のうえ，一部改変。

- (注) nuzzle 鼻をすり寄せる  
upstate 州北部の  
Meals on Wheels 高齢者への食事宅配サービス団体  
tapered 先細になった  
whiskers ひげ  
caseworkers 社会福祉士  
animatronic pets ロボットのペット  
nursing homes 老人ホーム  
hospice agencies ホスピス施設  
pandemic-relief funding 全世界的流行病救済資金  
cuddly 抱きしめたくくなるような  
one-way glass マジックミラー  
affinity 親近感  
disembodied 体をもたない  
sulk すねる  
ElliQ 高齢者向けのランプ型対話ロボット  
proximity 近さ

問 1 下線部(1)を，指示語の指示対象と省略された内容を明示した英語に書き換えなさい。

問 2 下線部(2)が行われていた趣旨を日本語で答えなさい。

問 3 下線部(3)の結果を日本語で説明しなさい。

問 4 下線部(4)が具体的にどのような状況を表しているのかを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 5 下線部(5)のきっかけとなったことを日本語で説明しなさい。

問 6 下線部(6)が指す部分を本文から英語で抜き出しなさい。

問 7 下線部(7)を和訳しなさい。

問 8 下線部(8)のような反応をするのはどのような人たちで、なぜそのようなことをするのかを日本語で説明しなさい。



Ⅲ 次の1～10の上下の英文が同様の意味になるように、空欄に入る3～5語の英語表現を書きなさい。ただし、太字で書かれた単語をそのままの形で含めること。

例) The manager probably wouldn't mind Matt leaving work early today.

**objection**

The manager probably wouldn't have any objection to Matt leaving work early today.

1. No one took much notice of David's awful lies.

**attention**

No one \_\_\_\_\_ David's awful lies.

2. I regret not trying harder at university.

**wish**

I \_\_\_\_\_ harder at university.

3. You must do precisely what the police officer instructs you.

**carry**

You must \_\_\_\_\_ instructions precisely.

4. Abebi is walking too quickly for me to keep pace with her.

**enough**

Abebi \_\_\_\_\_ for me to keep pace with her.

5. I used to find living alone strange, but it is no longer strange for me.

**used**

I used to find living alone strange, but now I'm \_\_\_\_\_.

6. I was almost asleep when the alarm rang.

**about**

I was \_\_\_\_\_ asleep when the alarm rang.

7. "Do you know when the trial begins?" Rudy asked him.

**if**

Rudy asked him \_\_\_\_\_ time the trial began.

8. I won't organize the meeting unless you arrange the schedule.

**long**

I'll organize the meeting \_\_\_\_\_ arrange the schedule.

9. When did Gina leave her job?

**since**

How long is it \_\_\_\_\_ her job?

10. Volunteering for the mission was not required.

**obliged**

You \_\_\_\_\_ for the mission.

