

英 語

注 意

1. 問題は全部で21ページである。
2. 解答用紙に氏名・受験番号を忘れずに記入すること。(ただし、マーク・シートにはあらかじめ受験番号がプリントされている。)
3. 解答はすべて解答用紙に記入すること。
4. 問題冊子の余白等は適宜利用してよいが、どのページも切り離してはいけない。
5. 解答用紙は必ず提出のこと。この問題冊子は提出する必要はない。

マーク・シート記入上の注意

1. 解答用紙(その1)はマーク・シートになっている。HBの黒鉛筆またはシャープペンシルを用いて記入すること。
2. 解答用紙にあらかじめプリントされた受験番号を確認すること。
3. 解答する記号・番号の○を塗りつぶしなさい。○で囲んだり×をつけたりしてはいけない。

解答記入例(解答が1のとき)

1	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> 6	<input type="radio"/> 7	<input type="radio"/> 8	<input type="radio"/> 9	<input type="radio"/> 0
---	----------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

4. 一度記入したマークを消す場合は、消しゴムでよく消すこと。×をつけても消したことになる。
5. 解答用紙をよごしたり、折り曲げたりしないこと。

問題 1 次の文章を読み、その内容を踏まえて設問に答えなさい。

Back in mid-1997, the candy company Mars noticed an unexpected increase in sales of its Mars candy bar. The company was surprised because it hadn't changed its marketing in any way. It wasn't spending additional money on advertising, it hadn't changed its pricing, and it hadn't run any special promotions. Yet sales had gone up. What had happened?

NASA had happened. To be more precise, NASA's Pathfinder mission.

The mission was designed to collect samples of atmosphere, climate, and soil from a nearby planet. The undertaking took years of preparation and millions of dollars in funding. When the vehicle finally touched down on the alien landscape, the entire world was fascinated, and all news reports featured NASA's triumph.

Pathfinder's destination? Mars.

Mars bars are named after the company's founder, Franklin Mars, not the planet. But the media attention the planet received acted as a trigger that
(A) reminded people of the candy and increased sales. Perhaps the makers of Sunny Delight should encourage NASA to explore the (1).

Music researchers Adrian North and David Hargreaves examined how triggers might affect supermarket buying behavior more broadly. You know background music you're used to hearing while you shop for groceries? Well, North and Hargreaves subtly replaced it with music from different countries. Some days they played French music while other days they played German music. Then they measured the type of wine people purchased.

When French music was playing, most customers bought French wine. When German music was playing, most customers bought German wine. By triggering consumers to think of different countries, the music affected sales. The music made ideas related to those countries more accessible, and those accessible ideas spilled over to affect behavior.

When a colleague of ours heard about the study he wondered whether triggers would impact an even more socially significant behavior: voting.

Where did you vote in the last election?

(X) people will answer this question with the name of their city or state. If asked to clarify, they might add “near my office” or “across from the supermarket.” (Y) will be more specific. And why should they be? Although geography clearly matters in voting—the East Coast leans Democratic while the South supports Republican, (Z) people would think that the exact place in which they vote matters.

But it does.

Political scientists usually assume that voting is based on rational and stable preferences: people possess core beliefs and weigh costs and benefits when deciding how to vote. If we care about the environment, we vote for candidates who promise to protect natural resources. If we’re concerned about health care, we support initiatives to make it more affordable and available to greater numbers of people. In this model of voting behavior, [affect behavior / happen to / in / people / shouldn’t / the particular kind of building / vote].⁽³⁾

But in light of what we were learning about triggers, we weren’t so sure. Most people in the United States are assigned to vote at a particular polling location. Typical voting sites are public buildings—firehouses, courthouses, or schools—but can also be churches or private office buildings.

Different locations contain different triggers. Churches are filled with religious images, which might remind people of church doctrine. Schools are filled with lockers, desks, and blackboards, which might remind people of children or early educational experiences. And once these thoughts are triggered, they might change behavior.

Could voting in a church lead people to think more negatively about same-sex marriage? Could voting in a school lead people to support education funding?

To test this idea, my colleagues and I acquired data from each polling place in Arizona's 2000 general election. We used the name and address of each polling location to determine whether it was a church, a school, or some other type of building. 40 percent of people were assigned to vote in churches, 26 percent in schools, 10 percent in community centers, and the rest in a mix of apartment buildings, golf courses, and even parks.

Then we examined whether people voted differently at different types of polling places. In particular, we focused on an initiative that proposed raising the sales tax from 5.0 percent to 5.6 percent to support public schools. This initiative had been hotly debated, with good arguments on both sides.⁽⁴⁾ Most people support education, but few people enjoy paying more taxes. It was a tough decision.

If where people voted didn't matter, then the percent supporting the initiative should be the same at schools and other polling locations.

But it wasn't. More than 10,000 more people voted ⁽⁵⁾ (6) the school funding initiative when the polling place was a school. Polling location had a dramatic impact on voting behavior.

And the initiative passed.

This difference persisted even after we controlled for things like regional differences in political preferences and population statistics. To double-check our findings, we even compared two similar groups of voters: people who lived near schools and were assigned to vote at one versus people who lived near schools but were assigned to vote at a different type of polling place (such as a firehouse). A significantly higher percentage of the people who voted in schools were in favor of increasing funding for schools. The fact that they were in a school when they voted triggered more school-friendly behavior.

A 10,000 vote difference in a nation-wide election might not seem like much. But it was more than enough to shift a close election. In the 2000 presidential election, the difference between George W. Bush and Al Gore

came down to less than 1,000 votes. If 1,000 votes are enough to shift an election, 10,000 certainly could. Triggers matter.

設問A

下線部(A)を和訳しなさい。(解答用紙(その2)を使用すること)

設問B

- 1) カッコ内に入るべき最も適切な語はどれか。
 1. moon
 2. sun
 3. universe
- 2) (X), (Y), (Z)に入るべき語の最も適切な組み合わせはどれか。
 1. Few, Most, most
 2. Most, Few, few
 3. Most, Most, few
- 3) []内を適切な語順に並べる場合, 5番目に来るのはどれか。
 1. in
 2. people
 3. shouldn't
- 4) この文が意味することはどれか。
 1. 多くの人が賛成か反対かで意見を決めかねている。
 2. 賛成の意見にも反対の意見にもうなずけるところが多々ある。
 3. 賛成派にも反対派にもたくさんの論客がいる。
- 5) "it" が指しているのはどれか。
 1. the initiative
 2. the percent
 3. where people voted

- 6) カッコ内に入るべき最も適切な語はどれか。
1. about
 2. against
 3. for
- 7) NASA の計画とマーズ・キャンディバーの売り上げの関係についての記述として最も適切なものはどれか。
1. マーズ社と NASA の計画は無関係であるが、NASA の計画によってマーズ・キャンディバーの売り上げが伸びることは予想されていた。
 2. NASA の計画によってマーズ・キャンディバーの売り上げが伸びたことは予想外だった。
 3. NASA の計画はマーズ社のはたらきかけによって実現した。
- 8) 学校での投票と投票結果に関連性があった理由として、著者が示唆するのはどれか。
1. 学校の施設を目にすることによって、子供のことや学校時代の思い出が喚起されたから。
 2. 学校の近くに住んでいる人は、投票場所として学校を割り当てられるから。
 3. 教育に関心の高い人は学校を投票場所を選ぶから。
- 9) お菓子の購買、スーパーマーケットでの商品の選択、投票の三つの行動の共通点として最も適切なものはどれか。
1. いずれも、社会に重大な影響をおよぼす行動である。
 2. いずれも、本人が意識しないことに左右されうる行動である。
 3. いずれも、理性的な判断を伴う行動である。

10) 本文の内容と合致するものはどれか。

1. 公立学校の財政援助のための増税案は、可決されるべきではなかった。
2. スーパーマーケットは、店内に流れる音楽を変えることによって、特定の商品の売り上げを伸ばすことができる。
3. 製菓会社が販売戦略を変えなくとも、消費者の味覚の変化によって、商品の売り上げは変わりうる。

問題 2 英訳しなさい。(解答用紙(その2)を使用すること)

我々が食べている野菜には、日本の風土や日本人の味覚に合うように改良が重ねられてきたものが多い。

問題 3 注を参考にして次の文章を読み、その内容を踏まえて設問に答えなさい。

A few years ago, Timothy Bickmore, a computer scientist at Northeastern University, developed an artificial-intelligence (A.I.) program to help low-income patients at Boston Medical Center prepare for their return home from the hospital. The virtual nurse, called Elizabeth, appeared as an animated figure on a screen. It began by asking patients whether they were baseball fans, then walked them through what they should do after they were discharged. “Your doctor has prescribed Pantoprazole. This medication is for your stomach. You will take one pill in the morning,” she said, for example. Bickmore has since created a number of these programs—an A.I. couples counsellor, an exercise coach, an end-of-life care consultant—all aimed at disadvantaged clients. “It’s where we think we can have the most impact,” he told me recently. “Hopefully, the A.I. is better than nothing.”

It sounds like a classic techno-dystopia—human warmth displaced by a cold computer. But this was not the same old story of the endless drive for efficiency generating a dehumanizing tool. There was a surprise buried in Bickmore’s experiment: 74 percent of his subjects preferred Elizabeth to her real-life counterparts. Human health-care providers spend an average of seven minutes with patients at discharge, Bickmore told me, but some patients need more time, like an hour, than others. With the virtual nurse, his subjects could proceed at their own pace, digesting the information without the embarrassment of doing so too slowly. As one patient remarked, “Doctors are always in a hurry.”

Most contemporary writing about A.I. tends to focus on the vital concerns of labor-market changes, privacy, and algorithmic bias. But there is an equally important conversation to be had about shame and vulnerability. We often respond more frankly to computers and robots than we do to our fellow-humans. In online surveys, for example, people admit to financial stress and

illegal or immoral acts more readily than they do over the phone, and potential blood donors report riskier behaviors. When a virtual interviewer is asking the questions, children are more frank about bullying and adults show sadness more intensely. Part of this openness stems from the presumption that individual identity is not revealed when telling something to a machine: computers seem private because of their very facelessness.

Some philosophers note the dangers of these findings. “If it turns out that humans are reliably more truthful with robots than they are with other humans, it will only be a matter of time before robots will examine humans with authority and take all the information about them,” Matthias Scheutz, a philosopher and computer scientist at Tufts University, warned in 2011, just as engineers funded by the Department of Homeland Security were developing an A.I. officer for use in border screenings. The officer asks questions such as “If we searched your bag, would we find anything you haven’t declared?” and relies on sensors measuring voice, eyes, and pulse to detect lying.

Yet, in caring work, what could be wrong with allowing people to feel less embarrassment? Neeta Gautam, a physician, in California, told me that breaking down these emotions is a critical part of her practice. You can’t get patients to do what they need to do, she said — from making changes in diet and life style to taking their medicines — unless they trust you enough to be honest about their failings. Gautam said that she tries to make sure her exam room is “a safe environment to talk about things like ‘I can’t afford’ or ‘I don’t like this’ or ‘I don’t know how to cook it’ or ‘I don’t have time to do it.’” Shame can suppress patients, causing them to keep their inability and unhealthy behaviors hidden. For some populations, including former soldiers, who feel embarrassed in therapy, it can prevent them from seeking treatment in the first place. In these cases, A.I. is not just “better than nothing” but, indeed, better than humans.

Still, some health practitioners believe that vulnerability has its uses.

“Treatment is not about the simple act of telling secrets,” Sherry Turkle, a psychoanalyst, writes in her book; rather, it is about the patient speaking to someone who can “push back.” Turkle argues that “when we talk to robots, we share thoughts with machines that can offer no such resistance. Our stories fall, literally, on deaf ears.” When I spoke with Andreas Paepcke, a senior research scientist and data analyst, he made a similar point about teaching. Humans offer “an audience that matters,” he said, and it could well be impossible to “project enough humanness onto a robot that you want to make it proud of you.” Shame might be too important to eliminate, Paepcke said, because the relief from it is so vital that it leads to “the understanding that here is a person who did not attack me in my vulnerability”—an understanding that can lead, in turn, to personal growth.

By leaving aside shame entirely, A.I. may offer only the thinnest version of care. Several of the doctors and teachers I spoke with suggested that automating or using A.I. to deliver care would be the same as relying on a “cloth monkey”—a reference to a cruel experiment, carried out in 1959, in which infant monkeys were given a choice between two substitute mothers, one made of wire, the other from soft cloth. (The infants preferred the cloth mother, even when only the wire mother gave them milk.) A.I.-driven care was a sorry version of the real thing, they argued. The only reason that people might think they preferred it was because the care they normally received was full of judgment without support—in other words, full of unbearable shame.

Paepcke's point echoes what Bickmore, the computer scientist, found in the reaction to Laura, an A.I. exercise coach that his lab created. One of the testers wrote, “Laura was very repetitive, so it was actually more motivating in the beginning to talk to her than later on. She would go through the same routine every single time. As a result, I didn't feel like I had to impress her in any way.” The downside of freedom from shame, it seems, is freedom from

caring at all.

<注> vulnerability 傷つきやすさ bullying いじめ

設問

- 11) What role does Elizabeth mainly perform?
 1. She gives patients a surgical operation.
 2. She gives patients a walking tour.
 3. She gives patients oral instructions.
- 12) Timothy Bickmore created a number of A.I. programs for disadvantaged clients because
 1. he believes that using A.I. is superior to human interaction with them.
 2. he thinks there is room for A.I. to be of good use to them.
 3. he wishes to impress the public as much as possible.
- 13) The image of techno-dystopia does not apply to Elizabeth because she
 1. herself can provide patients with physical examinations.
 2. is a human nurse who avoids using technology whenever possible.
 3. is ready to spend more time with individual patients than doctors typically do.
- 14) Which topic has received less attention with regard to A.I?
 1. Protection from embarrassment.
 2. Protection of employment.
 3. Protection of privacy.

- 15) Some philosophers point out that one danger of having interviews with A.I. is that
1. people might behave too shamefully.
 2. people might speak too honestly.
 3. people might take the result too carelessly.
- 16) What does the introduction of an A.I. officer in border screenings indicate?
1. Higher walls will be built in border regions.
 2. It will be easier for people to cross borders.
 3. Robots will decide who can cross borders.
- 17) According to Neeta Gautam, removing the feeling of shame from patients is important because
1. A.I. interaction is better than human interaction.
 2. honest confession is essential for appropriate treatment.
 3. keeping in good shape is the first step of treatment.
- 18) For Sherry Turkle, A.I. is an insufficient caregiver in respect that
1. robots cannot keep the secrets of their patients.
 2. robots do not fully understand patients.
 3. robots embarrass patients too much.
- 19) The example of the 1959 experiment is drawn in order to show
1. the difficulty of realizing what is in your own best interest.
 2. the necessity of the warm touch as seen in the cloth monkey.
 3. the similarities between monkeys and human beings.
- 20) Which of the following is NOT mentioned in the article?
1. A.I. must replace human caregivers in the future.
 2. Relying too much on A.I. can be harmful to humans.
 3. Patients may respond more openly to A.I. than to humans.

問題 4 空所に入るべき最も適切なものを選びなさい。(同じものを二回以上用いてはいけません)

- 21) I'm sorry I didn't () yesterday but I had to go see my brother.
- 22) I don't want to () but I scored the highest in my class on all the exams.
- 23) Could you () for just a minute while I get a pencil and some paper?
- 24) I haven't seen you for a long time. We must meet and ()!
- 25) What does the abbreviation LGBT ()?
- 26) The match has been () until next Tuesday because of the bad weather.
- 27) I'm going to () my new shirt to see whether it goes well with my trousers.
- 28) You've been thinking about it for a week now. It's time to () your mind.
- 29) During my stay in Shanghai, I managed to () a little Chinese.
- 30) I usually don't () words in a dictionary. I like to guess their meanings.

- | | | | |
|-------------|------------|-------------|--------------|
| 1. catch up | 2. hold on | 3. look up | 4. make up |
| 5. pick up | 6. put off | 7. show off | 8. stand for |
| 9. try on | 0. turn up | | |

問題 5 注を参考にして次の文章を読み、下線部の書き換えとして最も適切なものを選びなさい。

Not long ago, economist Michael Housman was leading a project to find out why some customer service agents stayed in their jobs longer than others. Armed with data from over thirty thousand employees who handled calls for banks, airlines, and cell-phone companies, he suspected that their employment histories would contain signs revealing something about their commitment. He thought that people with a history of job-hopping would quit sooner, but they didn't: employees who had held five jobs in the past five years weren't any more likely to leave their positions than those who had stayed in the same job for five years.

Hunting for other hints, he noticed that he had captured information about which internet browser employees had used when they logged in to apply for their jobs. On a whim, he tested whether that choice might be related to quitting. He didn't expect to find any correlation. However, when he looked at the results, he was astonished: employees who used Firefox or Chrome to browse the Web remained in their jobs 15 percent longer than those who used Internet Explorer or Safari.

Thinking it was a coincidence, Housman ran the same analysis for absences from work. The pattern was the same: Firefox and Chrome users were 19 percent less likely to miss work than Internet Explorer and Safari fans.

Then he looked at performance. He had assembled data points on sales, customer satisfaction, and average call length. The Firefox and Chrome users had significantly higher sales, and their call times were shorter. Their customers were happier, too: after 90 days on the job, the Firefox and Chrome users had customer satisfaction levels that Internet Explorer and Safari users reached only after 120 days at work.

Why were the Firefox and Chrome users more committed and better performers on every point of analysis?

The obvious answer was that they're more tech savvy, so I asked Housman if he could explore that. The employees had all taken a computer skills' test, which assessed their knowledge of keyboard shortcuts, software programs, and hardware. But the Firefox and Chrome group didn't prove to have significantly more computer expertise. Even after accounting for those scores, the browser effect persisted. Technical knowledge wasn't the source of their advantage.

What made the difference was how they obtained the browser. If you use Windows, Internet Explorer is built in. If you're a Mac user, your computer came preinstalled with Safari. Almost two thirds of the customer service agents used the default browser, never questioning whether a better one was available.

To get Firefox or Chrome, you have to demonstrate some resourcefulness and download a different browser. Instead of accepting the default, you take a bit of initiative to seek out an option that might be better. And that act of initiative, however tiny, is a window into what you do at work.

The customer service agents who accepted the defaults of Internet Explorer and Safari approached their job the same way. They stayed on script in sales calls and followed standard operating procedures for handling customer complaints. They saw their job descriptions as fixed, so when they were unhappy with their work, they started missing days, and eventually just quit.

The employees who took the initiative to change their browsers to Firefox or Chrome approached their jobs differently. They looked for novel ways of selling to customers and addressing their concerns. When they encountered a situation they didn't like, they fixed it. Having taken the initiative to improve their circumstances, they had little reason to leave. They created the jobs

they wanted. But they were the exception, not the rule.

We live in an ⁽³⁷⁾“Internet Explorer” world. Just as almost two thirds of the customer service representatives used the default browser on their computers, many of us accept the defaults in our own lives. Political psychologist John Jost explored how people responded to undesirable default conditions. Compared to people in the highest income category, people in the lowest income category were 17 percent more likely to view economic inequality as necessary. Jost concluded, “People who suffer the most from a given state of affairs are paradoxically the least likely to question, challenge, reject, or change it.”

To explain this peculiar phenomenon, Jost developed a theory of system justification. Its core idea is that people are motivated to rationalize the ⁽³⁸⁾status quo as acceptable — even if it goes directly against their interests.

Justifying the default system serves a calming function. It’s an emotional painkiller: if the world is supposed to be this way, we don’t need to be dissatisfied with it. But ⁽⁴⁰⁾acquiescence also robs us of moral anger to stand against injustice and the creative will to consider alternative ways that the world could work.

<注> Firefox, Chrome, Internet Explorer, Safari インターネットブラウザの
名称

設問

- 31) 1. who didn't like their jobs
2. who had changed jobs many times
3. who had created new jobs
- 32) 1. Casually
2. Gradually
3. Virtually
- 33) 1. had to be explained somehow
2. happened by pure chance
3. shouldn't have been that way
- 34) 1. critical of modern technology
2. familiar with technology
3. in need of technical advice
- 35) 1. be inventive
2. have some money
3. offer some explanation
- 36) 1. didn't leave the office
2. filled in the same forms
3. only spoke as trained
- 37) 1. ignored
2. irresponsible
3. rare
- 38) 1. a world where Internet Explorer is the default
2. a world where Internet Explorer is the top seller
3. a world where the defaults are mostly accepted
- 39) 1. current situation
2. ideal situation
3. quoted statement
- 40) 1. acceptance
2. misunderstanding
3. rejection

問題 6 次の三組の会話文において空所に入るべき最も適切なものを選びなさい。

(同じものを二回以上用いてはいけません)

A : So, how long have you been in the Peace Corps?

B : (41)

A : Do you enjoy it?

B : Most of the time. (42)

A : What's the most challenging thing about being in the Peace Corps?

B : (43) It can be frustrating!

A : And what's the most rewarding thing?

B : (44) The most rewarding thing about being in the Peace Corps is learning about another culture.

C : What's your favorite club, Eric?

D : The Sugar Club. They have great music, and one nice thing is that it's never crowded.

C : (45) There's always a long wait outside my favorite club. And I like it because it's absolutely packed most nights.

D : (46)

C : Well, it just opened a couple of months ago, everything is brand new and modern, and there are lots of fashionable people who go there. It's called The Eglantine.

D : Oh, right. It's the coolest place at the moment. (47)

C : Exactly! Do you want to go some night?

D : I thought you'd never ask!

E : I hear Maggie is going to work in India.

F : India! Wow! I hear it's a beautiful place, but I don't think I could ever live there.

E : (48)

F : Well, it's too far from home. I'd miss my family.

E : I don't think I'd mind moving to a foreign country. (49)

F : Yeah, but wouldn't you miss your friends?

E : Sure, for a while, but I'd make new ones.

F : You certainly sound very confident.

E : You know, actually, there is one thing I'd miss.

F : (50)

E : My dog!

1. For about a year now.
2. For me, it's trying to fit into a community that's very different from my own.
3. I hear the reason people go there is just to be seen.
4. That's easy.
5. That's strange.
6. The language is probably the only thing that I'd be a little worried about.
7. The work can be extremely difficult, but it has its rewards.
8. What's that?
9. Why do you think it's so popular?
0. Why not?

問題 7 注を参考にして次の文章を読み、空所に入るべき最も適切なものを選びなさい。(同じものを二回以上用いてはいけません)

(51) Women had worked for centuries on the land — as the wives of farmers, as farm servants and as day laborers. The employment of female day laborers suited the wealthy landowners who owned the increasingly large units of agricultural production. These women did hard, heavy work — digging up, cutting and loading crops on to wagons — and they could be employed for about half a man's wage. (52) The latter, like the wives of rich, urban businessmen, were withdrawn from production and became merely that symbol of success — a decorative wife.

Agriculture, however, declined as an employer in the nineteenth century and the number of women working on the land fell most sharply. In 1851, 140,000 women were employed in agriculture in England and Wales, 5,000 in Scotland and 120,000 in Ireland. By 1881 these figures were 40,000, 7,000 and 36,000. (53) In Scotland the picture was quite the reverse. Maybe this was all the result of the farmers' preference for employing adult males, maybe due to a rise in male earnings approaching a family wage or maybe due to the nineteenth-century expansion of the domestic ideology which regarded some but not other forms of women's work as unsuitable and too rough.

The rapid progress of the Industrial Revolution in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries had significant effects on women's work. The Industrial Revolution — a phrase referring to the invention of new machinery, the organization of production in factories and the rapid growth of towns — brought about a fatal separation between home and work. Generations of women in pre-industrial society had engaged in production at home, for example wool-spinning or lace-making. (54) Many women became factory workers in, for example, textiles, boot and shoe-making and in pottery-making.

Cheap labor is a fundamental requirement of the capitalist mode of

production and female labor was and is cheap labor. By introducing machinery and low-paid women into factories, manufacturers sought to break down many specialist skills into a series of mechanical operations. (55) Only in the woolen industry were women not strikingly more numerous than men. In the other textile-related industries of cotton, linen and silk, women greatly outnumbered men.

The employment of large numbers of women in factories must have brought about changes in domestic arrangements and in the relationships between men and women. (56)

It is important too, however, to remember the long hours, the dangers and the low wages earned by women. (57) Women working in the laundries, or washhouses, of Glasgow, Edinburgh or Aberdeen were working 15.5 hours per day in 1905. In the Glasgow tailoring industry in the 1890s men were paid 3s. 6d. and women just 9d. for making the same costume. Not only did women work in factories, they also labored in heavy industry, for example in the coal and iron industries, but as the nineteenth century progressed such "unfeminine" labor was regarded as particularly unsuitable for women and destructive of family life. (58) But the point is that women had been working in heavy industry and in factories for much of the nineteenth century. It was certainly not an innovation of the First World War.

Many other women were tied to the home yet were desperately in need of money to support themselves and their children. (59) This was, and still is, a particularly exploitative form of employment of women. Women made dresses at home, assembled matchboxes, stuffed mattresses, curled feathers, made paper flowers, wire brushes, ropes, nets, nails or chains, etc. Much of this work was brought to the public attention by The Sweated Industries Exhibition of 1906 and by such widely publicized action as the Cradley Heath Chain makers' strike in 1910. (60) Local research has shown that homework rapidly grew between the wars in the Luton hat trade,

Nottinghamshire lace-making and London rag trade. Further local research may well bring to light other forms of outwork which continued into the 1920s and 1930s. Homework, of course, is still carried out.

<注> 3s. 6d. 3 シリング 6 ペンス (シリングは英国の旧通貨単位)

exploitative 搾取的な

1. For many women the factory offered companionship and independence.
2. However, homework continued.
3. Industrialization shifted production into factories.
4. It was a dramatic decrease in England, Wales and Ireland.
5. Progressively, therefore, legislation pushed women out of coal mining.
6. Some form of outwork or homework was often their only option.
7. The Industrial Revolution did not create women workers.
8. This is seen in the textile industries where women were most noticeable.
9. Women often earned half the wages of men.
0. Working women in agriculture stood in contrast to the wives and daughters of the farmers.

