

## 英語問題

2024(令和6)年度

## 【注意事項】

1. この問題冊子は「英語」である。
2. 試験時間は90分である。
3. 試験開始の合図まで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。ただし、表紙はあらかじめよく読んでおくこと。
4. 試験開始後すぐに、以下の5および6に記載されていることを確認すること。
5. この問題冊子の印刷は1ページから10ページまでである。
6. 解答用紙は問題冊子中央に3枚はさみこんである。
7. 問題冊子に落丁、乱丁、印刷不鮮明な箇所等があった場合および解答用紙が不足している場合は、手をあげて監督者に申し出ること。
8. 試験開始後、3枚ある解答用紙の所定の欄に、受験番号と氏名を記入すること（1枚につき受験番号は2箇所、氏名は1箇所）。
9. 解答は必ず解答用紙の指定された箇所に記入すること。解答用紙の裏面に記入してはいけない。
10. 問題番号に対応した解答用紙に解答していない場合は、採点されない場合もあるので注意すること。
11. 問題冊子の中の白紙部分は下書き等に使用してよい。
12. 解答用紙を切り離したり、持ち帰ってはいけない。
13. 試験終了時刻まで退室を認めない。試験中の気分不快やトイレ等、やむを得ない場合には、手をあげて監督者を呼び、指示に従うこと。
14. 試験終了後は問題冊子を持ち帰ること。





〔 I 〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

\*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

One of the most famous—if \*contentious—studies in social science is known as the marshmallow test. In the 1970s, that experiment probed kids' ability to delay \*gratification when faced with a yummy snack. It turned out some kids can resist the \*temptation to eat one marshmallow immediately if you tell them that waiting will earn them two marshmallows later.

But will a kid pass up a yummy snack altogether—not just delaying gratification but \*forgoing it entirely—if there's a stranger nearby who seems to want the snack?

It turns out even a baby will engage in this sort of altruism, according to a new study conducted by the University of Washington's Institute for Learning and Brain Sciences and published last week in *Scientific Reports*. Altruism, it seems, may well begin in infancy.

Researchers studied how nearly 100 babies, all 19 months old, behaved when presented with sweet fruits like blueberries and grapes. When a researcher pretended to drop a fruit onto a tray and reach for it unsuccessfully, signaling a desire for the snack, 58 percent of the babies picked up the fruit and gave it to the researcher. (When the researcher didn't bother reaching for the fruit, only 4 percent of the babies tried to help out.)

The researchers were also curious about whether the babies would be so generous if they were hungry. After all, part of altruism is helping others even when it means \*incurring a personal cost. So the researchers brought in a different sample of infants just before their scheduled snack or mealtime, when they were likely to be hungry, and repeated the experiment.

Even under these conditions, an impressive 37 percent of hungry babies picked up the fruit and offered it to the researchers who pretended to have trouble reaching it.

“The infants in this second study looked longingly at the fruit, and then they gave it away!” said co-author Andrew Meltzoff in a press release. “We think this captures a kind of baby-sized version of altruistic helping.”

When we step back and look at behavior from an evolutionary perspective, the fact that we sometimes help perfect strangers—even when it means giving up our own resources or risking

our lives—seems to make zero sense. Aren't we supposed to act in a way that maximizes our genes' chance of survival?<sup>(7)</sup>

Human altruism seems even stranger when we consider it against the backdrop of the animal kingdom. Chimpanzees, our primate cousins with whom we share a recent common ancestor and 98 percent of DNA, do not voluntarily hand over food. Some mammals and birds do share food with their kin, but they don't generally engage in that behavior \*unprompted with non-kin or strangers.

So why do we humans?

Philosophers, psychologists, biologists, primatologists, and others have debated this question for centuries. It remains contentious today, with a few dominant hypotheses emerging.

Some evolutionary psychologists argue that we act altruistically to boost our reputation or prove we've got resources to spare, which may help us win an attractive partner with whom we can then reproduce. Others say we do kind things for others in the hopes that they (or the broader culture whose norms we're helping to shape) will \*reciprocate one day when we're in need.

Another hypothesis suggests we engage in altruism because it causes us emotional \*turmoil to see someone in need and *not* help them; in other words, we're trying to alleviate our own pain, evoked by empathetic impulses.

What all these explanations have in common is the underlying notion that when we act altruistically, it's not really "pure" altruism—we're getting some long-term benefit out of it, even if we're not consciously aware of it.<sup>(8)</sup>

But others hypothesize that altruism may not serve an evolutionary purpose now that we live among non-kin in huge groups like nation-states; rather, it's a leftover trait from when we lived in small groups where everyone was genetically close to us. The moral conditioning that we receive—from our parents in particular and our culture in general—may reinforce the belief that we must act altruistically.

The authors of the infant study lean toward that last explanation. "We speculate that certain childrearing practices and values ... convey the expectation to infants that people tend to help

others and may \*engender in children a generalized feeling of interpersonal obligation towards other humans in need,” they write.

\*In tandem with this cultural influence, the authors add, there may be an evolutionary mechanism at work: By giving away food to strangers, an individual might promote \*affiliation with another individual as well as broader group \*cohesion, ultimately promoting the success of their species.

Both biological and cultural influences play a role in altruism, but to find out exactly what those influences are and how they interrelate, we need a lot more experimental research.

(出典 Sigal Samuel, “The surprising altruism of babies,” *Vox*, Feb. 10, 2020, 一部改変)

## Notes

contentious: likely to cause disagreement and argument.

gratification: pleasure or satisfaction.

temptation: a strong desire to do something even though you know you should not.

forgo: to give up or do without something pleasant or enjoyable.

incur: to experience something, usually something unpleasant.

unprompted: done without somebody asking you to do it.

reciprocate: to return the favor.

turmoil: a state of confusion or uncertainty.

engender: to make people have a particular feeling.

in tandem with: besides.

affiliation: the relation of being closely associated.

cohesion: the situation when the members of a group are united.

(1) 下線部 (ア) を和訳しなさい。

(2) 下線部 (イ) の altruism とは、どのようなことか。本文中の実験の内容を例にあげながら、日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

(3) 下線部 (ウ) は、どのような意味か。本文に即して、日本語で簡潔に説明しなさい。

- (4) 下線部 (エ) について、これらの説明に共通する点とは何か。本文に即して、日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。
- (5) 人間が altruism に従って行動をする理由について、下線部 (オ) の具体的な内容を簡潔に示した1文のはじめの3語を抜き出しなさい。

〔Ⅱ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

この文章は、他者とともに世界を共有することの意味について哲学者ジュディス・バトラーが論じた本の一部です。

\*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

In recent years, I've tried to think about wars and public attacks on human life and asked the question *whose life is a candidate for public \*mourning, and whose is not?* It struck me as significant then that the United States never mourns those they kill but only its own citizens, and mainly those who are white and \*propertied and married more easily than those who are poor, \*queer, Black or brown, or without papers. Living humans bear a sense of whether they belong to the \*grievable classes, as it were. To say of a living person that they are grievable is to say that they would be grieved were they to be lost. It is also to say that the world is, or should be, organized to sustain that life, to support the open-ended future of that life. And those who live with the sense that there is no certainty about food or shelter or health care also live with a sense of their dispensability. Living with a \*somatic sense of dispensability is the feeling that one could die and pass from the earth leaving no mark and without acknowledgment. It is a lived conviction that one's own life does not matter to others or, rather, that the world is organized—the economy is organized—so that the lives of some will be safeguarded and the lives of others will not. When the economy starts up following a pandemic \*surge, knowing full well that some people will die, a class of dispensable people is being identified and created. This is a fascist moment that emerges \*amid a market calculation, and we are living in a time when this form of calculation threatens to become the \*norm. It is, in fact, a rationality and a power that we must fight at \*quotidian and global levels.

Thus, to live as someone with a sense of being ungrievable is to understand that one belongs to that class of the dispensable and to feel \*abandonment as basic institutions of care either pass one by, once again, or are withdrawn. One is oneself the loss that cannot be mourned. This kind of \*melancholia belongs to the sense of \*foreclosed \*futura that goes along with having \*perpetually fallen through a safety network, perhaps burdened with unpayable debt, in pursuit of \*elusive health care, or subject to \*sporadic housing and uncertain income. もしこの命が守るに値しないものとみなされるなら、それは価値のない命なのだろうか。 Or has “value” itself been hijacked by a \*metric whose value we must radically question? And what sense of value is, and should be, accorded to lives, and to what metric does it belong?

I have argued that it is not possible to understand social inequality without understanding how grievability is unequally distributed. That unequal distribution is a key component of social inequality, one that generally has not been taken into account by social theorists. It follows that



the \*designation, whether explicit or implicit, of a group or population as ungrievable means that they can be targeted for violence or left to die without consequence. Such a targeting can be implied by a set of policies and theories and does not have to be discovered as the deliberate wish of any social actor. Hence, the kind of social inequality established by differential grievability qualifies as a form of institutional violence. In my view, the struggle for a nonviolent politics is at once a struggle for the equal value of lives and against the \*lethal logics, the necropolitical metrics, that continue to mark (or leave unmarked) populations as dispensable, lives as not worth safeguarding, lives as not worth mourning. To \*recapitulate the two parts of my argument: (1) The struggle against social inequality<sup>(\*)</sup> has to be a struggle against differential grievability; and (2) This struggle is also part of a nonviolent politics. For nonviolence is not only opposing this or that act of violence, but violent institutions and policies and states that adopt as their policy the targeting of populations for death or policies for letting people die in conditions of \*duress.

(出典 Judith Butler, *What world is this?: A pandemic phenomenology*, Columbia University Press, 2022, 一部改変)

## Notes

mourn: to feel very sad because someone has died.

propertied: owning a lot of property or land.

queer: a person whose gender identity or sexuality does not fit society's traditional ideas about gender or sexuality.

grievable (*adj.*) < grieve (*v.*): to feel extremely sad.

somatic: relating to the body as opposed to the mind.

surge: a sudden increase.

amid: in the middle of.

norm: an accepted standard.

quotidian: ordinary.

abandonment (*n.*) < abandon (*v.*): to leave a person, usually forever.

melancholia: the condition of feeling unhappy or sad for no obvious reason.

foreclose: to reject something as a possibility.

futurity: future.

perpetually: very often.

elusive: difficult to achieve.

sporadic: occasional.

metric: a system for measuring something.

designation: the act of choosing someone or something for a particular purpose.

lethal: extremely dangerous.

recapitulate: to repeat the main point of an explanation.

duress: threats used to force a person to do something.

- (1) 下線部 (ア) と対比的に述べられているグループを示す要素の組み合わせとして、適切なものを以下の選択肢から1つ選び、記号で答えなさい。
- a. Black, grievable, dispensable
  - b. unemployed, ungrievable, dispensable
  - c. poor, grievable, indispensable
  - d. without papers, ungrievable, indispensable
- (2) 下線部 (イ) とは、どのような感覚か。本文に即して、日本語で簡潔に説明しなさい。
- (3) 下線部 (ウ) について、このような状況を引き起こす経済的仕組みを示す表現を、本文から連続する2語で抜き出しなさい。
- (4) 下線部 (エ) を英訳しなさい。
- (5) 下線部 (オ) について、ニュース報道等で取り上げられている社会的不平等の具体的な例を、英語で説明しなさい(30～50 words)。

英語の試験問題〔Ⅲ〕は次に続く。

〔Ⅲ〕 次の文章を読んで、下の問いに解答欄の範囲内で答えなさい。

\*が付いている語句には本文の後ろに注があります。

When I was younger, I believed that everybody thought in photo-realistic pictures the same way I did, with images clicking through my mind a little bit like PowerPoint slides or TikTok videos.

I had no idea that most people are more word-centric than I am. For many, words, not pictures, shape thought. That's probably how our culture got to be so talky: Teachers lecture, religious leaders preach, politicians make speeches and we watch "talking heads" on TV. We call most of these people neurotypical<sup>(ア)</sup>—they develop along predictable lines and communicate, for the most part, verbally.

I was born in the late 1940s just as the \*diagnosis of \*autism was being applied to kids like me. I had no language until age 4 and was first diagnosed as brain damaged. Today, many people would say that I'm neurodivergent—a term that encompasses not only autism but also dyslexia, A.D.H.D. and other learning problems. The popularization of the term neurodivergence and society's growing understanding about the different ways that brains work are unquestionably positive developments for many individuals like me.

Still, many aspects of Western society are not set up to allow visual thinkers—which so many of us neurodivergent folks are—to thrive. In fact, many aspects of society seem set up specifically so we will fail. Schools force students into a one-size-fits-all curriculum. The workplace relies too much on \*résumés and G.P.A.s to assess candidates' worth. This must change not only because neurodivergent people, and all visual thinkers, deserve better but also because without a major shift in how we think about how we learn, American innovation will be \*stifled.

When I was 7 or 8, I spent hours \*tinkering and experimenting to figure out how to make parachutes, fashioned from old scarves, open more quickly each time I tossed them into the air. This required careful observation to determine how small design changes affected performance.<sup>(イ)</sup> My single-mindedness, \*verging on \*obsession, was probably because I was autistic. At the time I loved a book about famous inventors and their inventions. It impressed me that Thomas Edison and the Wright brothers were so single-minded in figuring out how to make a light bulb or an airplane. They spent lots of time obsessively perfecting their inventions. It is likely that some of the inventors in that book also were autistic.

Americans hear a great deal about the need to fix the infrastructure in our country, but we are too focused on the things that need improving and updating rather than the people who will be able to do the work. For over 25 years, I designed equipment to handle \*livestock and

worked with the highly skilled people who built the equipment. When I look back at all the projects I designed for large companies, I estimate that 20 percent of the skilled \*welders and \*drafting technicians were either autistic, dyslexic or had A.D.H.D. I remember two people who had autism and held numerous \*patents for mechanical devices they invented and sold equipment to many companies. Our visual thinking skills were key to our success.

Today, we want our students to be well-rounded; we should think about making sure that the education we provide is as well. At the same time, I wager that the people who will fix America's infrastructure have spent hours and hours on one thing, whether it be Legos, violin or chess—hyper-focus is a classic sign of neurodivergent thinking and it's critical for innovation and invention.

I often get asked what I would do to improve both elementary and high school. The first step would be to put more of an emphasis on hands-on classes such as art, music, sewing, woodworking, cooking, theater, auto mechanics and welding. I would have hated school if the hands-on classes had been removed, as so many have been today. These classes also expose students—especially neurodivergent students—to skills that could become a career. Exposure is key. Too many students are growing up who have never used a tool. They are completely removed from the world of the practical.

I am often invited to give talks at corporations and government agencies, and the first thing I tell managers is that they need a neurodiverse work force. Complementary skills are the key to successful teams. We need the people who can build our trains and planes and internet, and the people who can make them run. Studies have shown that diverse teams will \*outperform \*homogeneous teams. 何も解決しない会議に出席したことがあるだろうか？そうになってしまう理由は、同じような考え方をする人が多すぎるからかもしれない。

Today, Taiwan produces the majority of the world's highest tech silicon chips. Much of the specialized mechanical equipment used for processing meat is made in Holland and Germany. When I visited the Steve Jobs Theater in California, pre-Covid, I discovered that the glass walls were created by an Italian company. The massive carbon fiber roof that looks like a spaceship was imported from Dubai. The reason this equipment is coming from outside the United States can be traced in part to differences in educational systems. In Italy and the Netherlands, for instance, a student at about age 14 decides whether to go the university route or the \*vocational route. The vocational route is not looked down on or regarded as a lesser form of intelligence. And that's how it should be everywhere, because the skill sets of visual thinkers are essential to finding real-world solutions to society's many problems.

(出典 Temple Grandin, “Failing visual thinkers, and how that hurts us all.” *New York Times*, Jan. 11, 2023, 一部改変)

## Notes

diagnosis: the act of discovering or identifying the exact cause of an illness or a problem.

autism: a mental condition in which a person finds it difficult to communicate or form relationships with others.

résumé: a written statement of your educational and work experience.

stifle: to stop something from happening or developing.

tinker: to make small changes to something in order to repair or improve it.

verge on: to be very close or similar to.

obsession: an extreme unhealthy interest in something.

livestock: the animals kept on a farm, for example, cows or sheep.

welder (*n.*) < weld (*v.*): to join pieces of metal together by heating their edges and pressing them together.

draft: to develop and prepare engineering designs and drawings from sketches.

patent: an official right to be the only person to make, use or sell a product or an invention.

outperform: to perform better than.

homogeneous: of the same kind; alike.

vocational: relating to an occupation or employment.

- (1) 下線部 (ア) と同じ意味で使われている 1 語を、本文から抜き出さない。
- (2) 下線部 (イ) について、筆者の体験を日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。
- (3) 下線部 (ウ) について、本文中で示されている実例を、日本語で簡潔に説明しなさい。
- (4) 下線部 (エ) を和訳しなさい。
- (5) 下線部 (オ) を英訳しなさい。
- (6) 下線部 (カ) を、本文に即して、日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。



