

2011年度

# T 英語 問題

## 注 意

1. 試験開始の指示があるまでこの問題冊子を開いてはいけません。
2. 解答用紙はすべてHBの黒鉛筆またはHBの黒のシャープペンシルで記入することになっています。HBの黒鉛筆・消しゴムを忘れた人は監督に申し出てください。(万年筆・ボールペン・サインペンなどを使用してはいけません。)
3. この問題冊子は16ページまでとなっています。試験開始後、ただちにページ数を確認してください。なお、問題番号はI～Vとなっています。
4. 解答用紙にはすでに受験番号が記入されていますので、出席票の受験番号が、あなたの受験票の番号であるかどうかを確認し、出席票の氏名欄に氏名のみを記入してください。なお、出席票は切り離さないでください。
5. 解答は解答用紙の指定された解答欄に記入し、その他の部分には何も書いてはいけません。
6. 解答用紙を折り曲げたり、破ったり、傷つけたりしないように注意してください。
7. この問題冊子は持ち帰ってください。

### マーク・センス法についての注意

マーク・センス法とは、鉛筆でマークした部分を機械が直接よみとって採点する方法です。

1. マークは、下記の記入例のようにHBの黒鉛筆で枠の中をぬり残さず濃くぬりつぶしてください。
2. 1つのマーク欄には1つしかマークしてはいけません。
3. 訂正する場合は消しゴムでよく消し、消しきずはきれいに取り除いてください。

マーク記入例：

A	1	2	3	4	5
	○	○	●	○	○

 (3と解答する場合)

I . 次の文を読み、下記の1～9それぞれに続くものとして、本文の内容ともっともよく合致するものを、各イ～ニから1つずつ選び、その記号を解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

Do you rejoice at the sound of barking but feel frightened at a meow? Or do you look at a cat and feel an instant connection? With the increase of websites offering photos and videos of animals doing cute things, it's easier than ever to satisfy your interests in the variety of pet you have, or wish you had. Ever wonder what your preference for cats or dogs says about you?

A team of researchers led by psychologist Sam Gosling at the University of Texas wanted to find out. They posted a questionnaire online as part of a larger study about personality called the Gosling-Potter Internet Personality Project. About 4,500 participants answered questions that measured their personality inclinations in five areas: openness, conscientiousness, \*extroversion, agreeableness, and \*\*neuroticism. These five dimensions have been shown in previous research to encompass most personality traits. The participants also indicated whether they considered themselves cat people, dog people, both or neither.

It turns out that the “dog people”—based on how people identified themselves, not on what animals they actually own—tend to be more social and outgoing, whereas “cat people” tend to be more neurotic but “open,” which means creative, philosophical, or nontraditional in this context. Dog people scored significantly higher on extroversion, agreeableness and conscientiousness measures, and lower on neuroticism and openness than cat people, the survey found. The effect persisted regardless of the gender of the respondent.

“Once you know the findings, it kind of falls into place,” Gosling said. “You think, of course, agreeableness and extroversion—dogs are companionable, they hang out, they like to be with you, they like your company, whereas cats like it for as long as they want it, and then they’re off.” But this inquiry into your deeper pet subconscious isn’t the final word, Gosling says—after all, if the findings had been reversed, they would also make sense to some people. These are, of course, generalizations and don’t apply to every individual.

The findings do make sense to 12-year-old Naveen Rajur, a “dog-loving boy” in Andover, Massachusetts, who considers dog people to be outgoing and active. He

also agrees about the agreeableness and conscientiousness of dog people because they “always want to take care of the dog and be by its side.”

Cat rescue volunteer Eddye Sheffield, of Gadsden, Alabama, said she’s seen all kinds of cat owners, but can’t pin down personality traits that apply to all cat people. Outsiders might label Sheffield herself a “crazy cat lady” because she has 11 cats, she said, but she doesn’t view herself that way. “All of them are rescued cats and they need a place to go, and I had room, that’s how I ended up with that many,” she said. Owning that many has also got her more involved in rescue efforts, which has put her into more contact with other people, not less.

\*\*\*  
Veterinarian David Bessler, senior clinician at NYC Veterinary Specialists in New York City, said he was a dog person growing up, but that owning a cat has “converted” him. It hasn’t changed his personality, but he can imagine that dog people and cat people have personality differences. “To love cats, you have to be able to love things for themselves; they have their own life and aren’t necessarily dependent on you,” he said. “Your dog kind of lives for you.”

Is it that people choose pets that are like them, or that pets change people over time? Research has not come to a conclusion on this question, experts say. Beyond personality characteristics, people may have physical features in common with the animals they like or own. A study by University of British Columbia psychologist Stanley Coren found that women with long hair liked beagles, which have long ears, and women with short hair liked the short-eared huskies.

A study by Michael Roy and Nicholas Christenfeld found that participants could match photographs of owners to their purebred dogs about 67 percent of the time, based on appearance alone. Results suggested that the owners selected dogs that looked like themselves and did not grow to look like the dogs over time, as there was no relationship between how long the people had lived with the animals and how similar they looked.

According to Hal Herzog, professor of psychology at Western Carolina University, there are plenty of reasons why a cat person would own a dog, or vice versa: allergies as well as other lifestyle factors, such as space for the animal, come into play. Herzog and his wife consider themselves dog people, but own a cat, Tilly, because they can easily leave her alone when they go away for the weekend.

About 37 percent of American households have dogs and 32 percent have cats, but the cat population (82 million) is significantly higher than the dog population (72 million), said Herzog, citing 2007 data from the American Veterinary Medical Association. That's because people tend to own multiple cats, as they fit more easily into many people's lifestyles.

People tend to be drawn to the animals they were raised with, Herzog said. Cat owners tend to be raised in cat families, and dog owners tend to be raised in dog families. In fact, one study found the animal you like is the one your grandparents lived with.

All of these questions are the focus of the new field of anthrozoology, the study of how animals and people relate to one another. "I think our interactions with animals shed a lot of light on larger issues in human psychology," said Herzog. "With pets it's things like attachment and why we're compassionate toward other creatures, especially creatures that we're not genetically related to."

\* extroversion : 外向性

\*\* neuroticism : 神經症的傾向

\*\*\* veterinarian : 獸医

1. The main purpose of Sam Gosling's research was to examine

- イ. people's preferences for cats and dogs as pets.
- ロ. the relationship between personality traits and pet preferences.
- ハ. people's self-identification as a dog person or a cat person.
- ニ. the relationship between gender and pet preference.

2. The underlined expression "pin down" (paragraph 6) is closest in meaning to

- イ. analyze.
- ロ. imagine.
- ハ. investigate.
- ニ. specify.

3. The passage mentions all of the following traits of dog people EXCEPT

- イ. active.
- ロ. agreeable.
- ハ. brave.
- ニ. outgoing.

4. David Bessler thinks that

- イ. owning a cat has changed his personality.
- ロ. it's best for children to have a dog as a pet.
- ハ. cat people and dog people are basically the same.
- ニ. cat owners must accept that their pet is independent.

5. Research suggests that pet owners may look like their pets because

- イ. pets and their owners share many personality traits.
- ロ. owners choose pets that look like them.
- ハ. pets grow to look like their owners.
- ニ. owners grow to look like their pets.

6. The Herzogs chose a cat as a pet because they

- イ. have allergies.
- ロ. are cat people.
- ハ. lack space in their house for a dog.
- ニ. sometimes travel on weekends.

7. The underlined word "compassionate" (paragraph 13) is closest in meaning to

- イ. caring.
- ロ. polite.
- ハ. selfish.
- ニ. shy.

8. The passage suggests that

- イ. research on dog and cat people is still limited.
- ロ. dog people tend to be philosophical.
- ハ. most cat people are women.
- ニ. most people like dogs and cats.

9. The most appropriate title for this passage is

- イ. The Personalities of Cats and Dogs.
- ロ. How are Dog People and Cat People Different?
- ハ. Choosing a Pet That's Right for You.
- ニ. How to Be a Successful Pet Owner.

- II. 次の文を読み、下記の1～10それぞれに続くものとして、本文の内容ともっともよく合致するものを、各イ～ニから1つずつ選び、その記号を解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

When people have an important decision to make in the workplace, they often arrange to discuss the issues with a group of well-informed and level-headed colleagues. On the face of it, it seems a reasonable plan. After all, when making up your mind, it is easy to imagine how consulting people with a variety of backgrounds, experience and expertise could help provide a more considered and balanced perspective. But are several heads really better than one? Psychologists have conducted hundreds of experiments on this issue, and their findings have surprised even the strongest supporters of group consultations.

Perhaps the best known work in this area was initiated in the early 1960s by MIT graduate James Stoner, who examined the important issue of risk taking. It will come as no great surprise to discover that research shows some people like to live life on the edge, while others prefer to avoid risk. However, Stoner wondered whether people tended to make more (or less) risky decisions when part of a group and, to find out, he devised a simple but brilliant experiment.

In the first part of his study, Stoner asked people to play the role of a life coach. They were presented with various scenarios in which someone faced a dilemma, and asked to choose which of several options offered the best way forward. Stoner had carefully constructed the options to ensure that each represented a different level of risk. For example, one scenario was about a writer named Helen, who earned her living writing cheap thrillers. Helen had recently had an idea for a literary novel, but to pursue the idea she would have to give up writing cheap thrillers for a while, and face a drop in income. On the positive side, the novel might be her big break and she could earn a large amount of money. On the down side, the novel might be a complete failure and she would have wasted a great deal of time and effort. Participants were asked to think about Helen's dilemma, and then indicate how certain she should be that the novel was going to be a success before she gave up her regular income from the cheap thrillers.

If a participant was very conservative, they might indicate that Helen needed to be almost 100 percent certain. If the participant felt much more positively

towards risk, they might indicate that even a 10 percent likelihood of success was acceptable. Stoner then placed participants into small groups of about five people. The groups were told to discuss the scenarios and reach a consensus. His results clearly showed that the decisions made by groups tended to be far riskier than those made by individuals. Time and again, the groups would advise Helen to drop everything and start work on the novel, while individuals would urge her to stick with the thriller writing.

Hundreds of further studies have shown that this effect is not so much just about making riskier decisions, but “polarization”—the tendency for people in a group to move towards a more extreme opinion. In Stoner’s classic studies, various factors caused the group to make riskier decisions, but in other experiments groups have become more conservative than individuals. In short, being in a group exaggerates people’s opinions, causing them to make a more extreme decision than they would on their own. Depending on the initial inclinations of the individuals in the group, the final decision can be extremely risky, or extremely conservative.

This curious phenomenon has emerged in many different situations, often with worrying consequences. Gather together a group of racially prejudiced people, and they make even more extreme decisions about racially sensitive issues. Arrange a meeting of business people who are open to investing in failing projects, and they become even more likely to throw good money after bad. Have aggressive teenagers hang out together, and the gang are far more likely to act violently. Allow those with strong religious or political beliefs to spend time in one another’s company, and they form more extreme and often violent viewpoints. The effect even emerges on the Internet, with individuals participating in discussion lists and chat rooms voicing more extreme opinions and attitudes than they would normally.

What causes this strange, but highly consistent, phenomenon? Teaming up with people who share your attitudes and opinions reinforces your existing beliefs in several ways. You hear new arguments, and find yourself openly expressing a position that you may have only vaguely considered before. You may have been keeping some of your thoughts secret because you believed them to be unusual, extreme or socially unacceptable. However, surrounded by other like-minded people, these secret thoughts often find a way of bubbling to the surface, which in turn



encourages others to share their extreme feelings with you.

Polarization is not the only tendency of group thinking that can influence the hearts and minds of individuals when they get together. Other studies have shown that, compared to individuals, groups are more likely to see their actions as highly moral and more likely to form stereotypical views of outsiders. In addition, when strong-willed people lead group discussions, they can pressure others into conforming and create an illusion of total agreement.

Two heads are not necessarily better than one. Over fifty years of research suggests that irrational thinking occurs when people try to reach decisions in groups, and this can lead to a polarization of opinions and a highly biased view of a situation.

1. The first paragraph suggests that

- ㄱ. most people like to decide things by themselves.
- ㄴ. psychologists have little data on the topic of group decision-making.
- ㄷ. groups can make more balanced decisions than individuals.
- ㄹ. research findings on group decision-making are contrary to expectations.

2. In his research, James Stoner wanted to examine

- ㄱ. the effect of education on group identity.
- ㄴ. how being in a group influences people's decisions.
- ㄷ. whether group decisions lead to good or bad results.
- ㄹ. how people perform in the role of life coach.

3. The underlined word "face" (paragraph 3) is closest in meaning to

- ㄱ. be surprised by.
- ㄴ. deal with.
- ㄷ. stare at.
- ㄹ. think about.

4. In James Stoner's experiment,
- ㄱ. group decisions reflected a positive view of risk taking.
  - ㄴ. each subject was given a life coach to help them make decisions.
  - ㄷ. Helen decided to take a risk and write a literary novel.
  - ㄹ. conservative subjects made a conservative decision even in groups.
5. The underlined word "initial" (paragraph 5) is closest in meaning to
- ㄱ. early.
  - ㄴ. common.
  - ㄷ. positive.
  - ㄹ. primary.
6. The main purpose of paragraph 6 is to give examples of
- ㄱ. risky behavior.
  - ㄴ. bad decisions.
  - ㄷ. polarization.
  - ㄹ. prejudice.
7. The underlined expression "bubbling to the surface" (paragraph 7) means
- ㄱ. becoming confused.
  - ㄴ. becoming more extreme.
  - ㄷ. becoming exposed.
  - ㄹ. becoming more secret.
8. The passage suggests that, when people decide things in groups, they
- ㄱ. take more time making up their minds than when they decide alone.
  - ㄴ. try their best to defend their own beliefs.
  - ㄷ. ignore their own opinions and follow the leader.
  - ㄹ. make more extreme decisions than when they decide alone.

9. The author would probably agree that
- イ. the results of Stoner's experiment are not reliable.
  - ロ. deciding by oneself has its merits.
  - ハ. it's better to live life on the edge than to avoid risk.
  - ニ. polarization does not affect normal people.

10. The most appropriate title for this passage is

- イ. How to Make a Difficult Decision.
- ロ. The Latest Research on Group Behavior.
- ハ. Deciding as a Group.
- ニ. Two Heads are Better than One.



IV. 次の文中の空所(イ)~(ヌ)を補うのにもっとも適当なものを、それぞれ対応する下記の1~4から1つずつ選び、その番号を解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

My dad is a patient, loving and giving person but his generous spirit really (イ) across one night as we were driving home after visiting my grandmother. Pulling up at a small intersection, we saw a car (ロ) in the middle of the road. An older lady was talking on her phone and staring up (ハ) a street sign, clearly trying to work out (ニ) she was. She came back to her car, looking more confused by the second. Dad watched her out of his rear-view mirror before pulling over to see if he could help.

As he stood at her window and asked if she was OK, she broke down (ホ) tears, explaining she had lost her way.

It turned out she was a caregiver and was trying to find the house of the client she was meant to be helping that night. When she showed Dad the address she was meant to be (ヘ), Dad handed her his business card and told her to (ト) him, and to call him on the number on the card if she lost us (チ) traffic.

My dad drove to the address, only a suburb or two out of our way, and found the house for her. The look of (リ) on her face was reward enough for Dad.

The next morning as Dad was driving me to school his phone rang. It was the lady he had helped the night (ヌ), calling him to thank him again for his kind deed. I don't think I have ever been prouder to be his daughter.

- |     |                  |              |                  |             |
|-----|------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|
| (イ) | 1. came          | 2. got       | 3. ran           | 4. went     |
| (ロ) | 1. stopped       | 2. stops     | 3. to be stopped | 4. to stop  |
| (ハ) | 1. at            | 2. down      | 3. in            | 4. on       |
| (ニ) | 1. what          | 2. when      | 3. where         | 4. who      |
| (ホ) | 1. by            | 2. in        | 3. on            | 4. with     |
| (ヘ) | 1. at            | 2. for       | 3. in            | 4. on       |
| (ト) | 1. bring         | 2. follow    | 3. show          | 4. take     |
| (チ) | 1. among         | 2. at        | 3. in            | 4. on       |
| (リ) | 1. embarrassment | 2. gratitude | 3. surprise      | 4. sympathy |
| (ヌ) | 1. ago           | 2. back      | 3. before        | 4. past     |

V. 次の文中の空所(イ)～(ニ)をそれぞれ補うのに適当な1語を、解答用紙の所定欄にしるせ。

My interest in the communication patterns of boys grew ( イ ) of research I conducted early in my career on verbal interaction among boys. These interactions revealed that boys' verbal exchanges are obviously a game of hierarchy, as each one's claim tries to top the previous one.

To illustrate this, I often use video clips of preschoolers at a day care center. In one scene, four little boys are sitting together, talking about ( ロ ) high they can hit a ball. "Mine's up to there," one small boy declares, ( ハ ) his arm above his head. "Mine's up to the sky," a second responds, pointing even higher. A third boy counters, "Mine's up to heaven!" Then the fourth boy offers, "Mine's ( ニ ) the way up to God."

【以下余白】

