令和４年度入学者選抜学力検査問題

（前期日程）

# 英　　語

（注　意）

1　問題紙は指示があるまで開いてはいけません。

2　問題紙は本文 11 ページです。答案用紙は 3 枚あります。

3　答えはすべて答案用紙の指定のところに記入してください。

4　問題紙と下書き用紙は持ち帰ってください。

**I** The following passage is a magazine article on human memory. Read the passage and answer the questions.

## Our Memory Is Even Better Than Experts Thought

We've all felt the fog come over us when we mistake someone's name right after being introduced, fail to remember where we left our car in the parking lot or tell a friend the same story twice. Our memory is rarely as reliable as we'd like.

But at times, it also surprises us. We may somehow remember family stories told to us long ago, the names of our middle school teachers or trivia facts buried deep in back of our brain. Despite the standard glitches[1], our memory can retain far more than either experts or we expect.

Conclusions about its reliability vary tremendously. Some studies conclude that memory is extremely accurate, whereas others conclude that it is not only faulty but utterly unreliable. Even memory experts can struggle to predict how accurate our recollections are. In a recent study at the University of Toronto, such experts were asked to predict the accuracy of memories of events that happened two days earlier. While recollections of these events were very good — more than 90 percent correct on average — the experts predicted they would be only 40 percent correct. Why is our memory so mysterious?

Studies that conclude memory is good typically test recollections of more recent events and emphasize the astounding accuracy of their details. In the University of Toronto study, researchers measured memories of verifiable (E) experiences by focusing on those regarding an audio guided tour of a hospital. Two days after taking part in the tour, participants were asked to recall what had happened. While, on average, they recalled only about 20 percent of the events that they had experienced, the memories they did recall were, on average, 93 or 94 percent correct. These results are broadly consistent with those of

similar studies, including one at the National Institute of Mental Health in which people were asked to memorize a set of photographs and then draw them later. Taken together, these studies suggest that although we don't recall a large fraction of what we experience, what we do remember is accurate, at least for a few days.

Given that conclusion, it makes sense that memory performance drops when an experiment probes(F) memory of a random set of all of the events that happened (as opposed to the events an individual recalls). In one study with this type of design, researchers at Harvard Medical School focused on memories of a prescribed walk around a city. In their experiment, different people walked the same route but at different times. And as they did so, researchers recorded their experiences with a helmet-mounted video camera. The next day, the researchers tested each participant's memory by asking them to judge whether different video clips were drawn from things that they had experienced or the experiences of others. The fact that the clips they did not experience were taped by different participants walking the same route at different times made the task particularly challenging. Average memory performance on this task was low (56 percent correct) and only slightly higher than guessing (50 percent correct). These results suggest that when we are asked about whether we have experienced a particular event, we tend to get confused by things that are similar to those that actually happened. That is consistent with recent work suggesting that when police are compiling faces for a lineup, the results will be more accurate if the faces that an eyewitness has to choose among are more distinct.

A number of other factors can also impact memory performance. Because we tend to forget things with time, such performance depends on how much of it has elapsed(G) since an event. Following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, memories of verifiable events one week after were fairly accurate (88 percent correct) but declined moderately over the first year (to 77 percent correct). Another important factor is training. In one study, six weeks of

memory training improved the number of words that participants could recall from a list one day after viewing them (from 16.1 to 56.2 of 72 possible words), and those training effects persisted for at least four months, which was the longest time frame tested.

These results may help experts predict memory performance in real-world scenarios. Yet often their estimates are far off the mark(H). This discrepancy is reflected in the University of Toronto study in which the highly reliable memory performance of the participants was vastly underestimated by the panel of memory experts. I suspect that the pessimism of the experts followed from their research's emphasis on *how* memory works (as opposed to *how well* it does so). Research focused on *how* has a natural tendency to focus on a system's flaws because some of the most useful insights into how a system works are reflected in the specific ways it fails. As a field matures, however, there is a natural progression from qualitative[2] descriptions of *how* to quantitative[3] predictions that include *how well*. The University of Toronto study is a reminder that it is important for memory research to take this next step toward understanding our memory enough to accurately predict, and appreciate, its power.

(Adapted and modified from "Our memory is even better than experts thought," *Scientific American*, May 25, 2021)

glitch[1] : a small problem that prevents something from working correctly

qualitative[2] : relating to the quality or standard of something, rather than the amount or number

quantitative[3] : relating to the quantity or amount of something, rather than the quality or standard of something

**Question 1:** Based on the passage, answer questions (A) to (D) in English. Your answers should not be more than 15 words each.

(A) How do our memories sometimes surprise us?

(B) What result do the research by the University of Toronto and that by the National Institute of Mental Health have in common?

(C) What factors can have a strong impact on the memory performance of humans?

(D) Why were the experts' predictions so pessimistic?

**Question 2:** Which of the following is closest to the meaning of the words (E) to (H) underlined in the text?

(E) "verifiable"

1) testable
2) uncontrollable
3) impressionable
4) desirable

(F) "probe"

1) uninstall
2) activate
3) examine
4) use

(G) "elapse"

1) find
2) understand
3) utilize
4) pass

(H) "off the mark"

1) invisible
2) incorrect
3) innocent
4) incapable

**Question 3:** While our memory is said in the passage to be better than experts thought, we forget things. What are the advantages, or disadvantages, of forgetting things? Discuss your view in 25 to 35 words in English.

Ⅱ The following passage is an opinion article on remote working. Read the passage and answer the questions.

**Remote Working Has Been Life-changing for Disabled People, Don't Take It Away Now**

The sudden increase in street dining since lockdown eased in England has been great for businesses, but not so much for wheelchair users and people with mobility conditions, who report being unable to get around their home towns due to the new blockages.

Many of these people have been stuck indoors for up to a year shielding[1], and on their first taste of freedom are now being blocked from getting to the shops or bars. "All I want to do is go and meet my friends and have a drink," said Katie Pennick, a campaigner and wheelchair user, recently on BBC Radio 4. It's not your typical civil rights slogan, but it characterises the difficult situation of so much disability politics: disabled people deserve the right to have a life like everyone else.

This sort of thoughtless planning would be frustrating at any time, but it is all the more so as we come out of a period when the inclusion of disabled people was finally given attention. At the start of the first lockdown, I reported that society was opening up to millions of disabled and chronically ill[2] people as "virtual living" became the standard — from online job interviews and streamed gigs[3] and theatre to NHS (National Health Service) phone consultations with doctors. But just as it took the non-disabled public to experience a dose of what disabled people have had for years before access was improved, the fear is that any gains made during the pandemic will be discarded now that the wider public no longer need them themselves.

Take work for example. The shift to working at home over the past year brought new opportunities to those previously excluded from the workforce. As

one woman with agoraphobia[4] told me: "Lockdown has opened my world" — it allowed her to work from home. But as ministers and some employers push for a return to the office, many disabled workers are worried their hard-won progress will go backwards. A research scientist with endometriosis[5] told me her employer has already stopped letting her work from home full-time, even though her job can be done remotely. "The office is 'going back to normal' and they don't want us at home even though I can do a better job [here]," she said.

The disability employment gap in the UK is vast — in 2020, the employment rate for disabled people was just 53.7%, compared with 82% for non-disabled people — and has remained largely unchanged for years. Retaining flexible working is one way to address it. Such working patterns will help many others beyond disabled workers, from working parents to carers of elderly parents. Rather than being reduced in coming months, these schemes should be extended; a survey by the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development found that almost half of workers currently don't have flexible working arrangements such as flexitime, part-time hours or job shares.

Or look at socialising. Online social events became very common during lockdown, but what many of us did informally with friends was also replicated by companies, with art exhibitions streaming online or bars running virtual club nights. As places where public events are held open back up, I'm hearing from scores of disabled people losing out: from the parishioner[6] whose church's online coffee meetings allowed her to speak to people from her congregation[7] for the first time in 15 years but which has now been stopped, to the person who "went" to an LGBTQ+ club night for the first time in their life when it went online during lockdown but has now watched it close.

Too often, cultural prejudice around disability assumes disabled people don't need the same pleasures as everyone else, but health doesn't change who you are. As one music-loving young housebound woman shared on Twitter: "Magically, over the past year I've seen countless live gigs and the thought of

that being taken away is terrible."

It doesn't have to be this way. The Young Vic theatre in London announced in May that it plans to livestream all of its future productions, and gym companies say online workouts are here to stay, despite the popular return of "in person" classes. This doesn't mean good access is about moving everything online: many disabled people want face-to-face settings, and besides, even if there is a sudden increase in virtual experiences, companies should not neglect to provide physical spaces that are often still inaccessible. It simply means that it is right to keep the option, and that we need a culture in which companies think about disabled people — and our cash — as valuable.

As we rightly celebrate a return to normal, it should be remembered that, for disabled people, "normal" too often means being excluded from everyday life. Anyone who has experienced the sharp feeling of pain of missing nights with mates in the bar over the past year can understand and support disabled people as they are being restricted and isolated now. If you spot a restaurant blocking a wheelchair entrance, tweet a photo and hashtag your local council. If your employer is taking back flexible working rights, talk to your union (or join one).

Attempts to gain access for disabled people are often met with pushback: it's too much trouble, too expensive or simply unnecessary. And yet lockdown showed that sweeping changes can be made practically overnight with ease. The question is, if it was done for non-disabled people then, why not disabled people now?

(Adapted and modified from "Remote working has been life-changing for disabled people, don't take it away now," *The Guardian*, June 2, 2021)

shielding[1] : term used in the UK to describe staying at home to avoid spreading COVID-19

chronically ill[2] : to be suffering from an illness over a long period of time

gig[3] : a live musical performance

agoraphobia[4] : a fear of being in situations where escape may be difficult

endometriosis[5] : a medical condition suffered by women

parishioner[6] : someone who regularly goes to a local church

congregation[7] : members of a particular church

**Question 1:** Based on the passage, answer questions (A) to (D) with one complete sentence in English. Your answers should not be more than 25 words each.

(A) What has been one of the main effects of lockdown on the lives of disabled people?

(B) What did the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development find?

(C) With regard to online policies, what is the author's opinion?

(D) Why does "normal" too often mean being excluded from everyday life for disabled people?

**Question 2:** For statements (E) to (I), write T if the statement is true according to the content of the passage. Write F if the statement is false according to the content of the passage.

(E) Disabled people have had trouble getting around town since lockdowns ended.

(F) Employment rates for disabled people in the UK have changed dramatically in recent years.

(G) The author recommends that restaurants which are unfriendly to disabled people should be exposed on the Internet.

(H) Improving access for disabled people is often labeled as too expensive.

(I) According to the author, some disabled people hope that lockdown will be continued.

**Question 3:** The author concludes the passage by asking the following question: "The question is, if it was done for non-disabled people then, why not disabled people now?" Do you agree with the author's stance or not? Why do you think so? Write your stance and your reason(s) in 25 to 35 English words.

Ⅲ According to the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Japan's food self-sufficiency rate (on a calorie basis) in 2020 was about 37%. This means that the remaining 63% consisted of imports from overseas. What are two possible problems that countries with low food self-sufficiency might have? Write your answer, giving reasons to support each problem, in one paragraph of at least 80 words in English.