

英語 I (選択)

次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[31]から[40]の空所を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を 1 から 3 の中から選び、その番号を解答欄 (31) から (40) にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[41]から[45]の設問には、1 から 4 の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄 (41) から (45) にマークしなさい。

- 1 When Members of Parliament (MPs) published a set of new proposals in early January on ways to improve the integration of immigrants in the UK, one of the most controversial concerned speaking English. The report from the All Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration, chaired by the Labour MP Chuka Umunna, proposed that: All immigrants should be [31](1. deferred 2. predicted 3. expected) to have either learned English before coming to the UK or be enrolled in compulsory ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) classes upon arrival.
- 2 The assumption here is that migrants don't speak English, or not well enough to integrate within British society. However, this [32](1. highlights 2. disregards 3. criticises) the fact that English is a global language, spoken by up to two billion multilingual people around the world. It is a case of what the linguist Adrian Holliday termed "native-speakerism" – the belief in the linguistic superiority of "native speakers" and the consequent discrimination of those who are considered "non-native speakers". But the distinction between native speakers and non-native speakers is often not just based on actual language skills, but, far more disturbingly, on assumptions based on ethnicity.
- 3 An example of the sensitivities around this issue were clearly on display during a Channel 4 news report on the MPs' report on January 5th. The report included brief interviews with two women currently living in the UK, one from Somalia and the other from Gambia. They were [33](1. enlightened 2. meant 3. disallowed) to represent examples of the particular category of migrants requiring compulsory English language classes under the new proposals. But both women spoke good English when answering the interviewer's questions about the current lack of English class provision.
- 4 The two women were from Sub-Saharan Africa, were of an ethnicity that was [34](1. visibly 2. subtly 3. genetically) different from that of a typical white British person and, in the case of the Gambian woman, wore clothes that marked non-Judaeo-Christian cultural and religious affiliations. They not only represented migrants needing English language tuition but prototypical migrants, exhibiting suitably "exotic" traits that identified them as such.
- 5 There are two widespread [35](1. overt 2. underlying 3. conflicting) assumptions here that need to be challenged. The first relates to the ways in which national identity is often understood in terms of ethnicity. As the cultural scholar Paul Gilroy remarked in his book *There Ain't No Black in the Union*

Jack, in Britain “conceptions of national belonging and homogeneity ... not only blur the distinction between ‘race’ and nation, but rely on that very ambiguity for their effect”. The second assumption is that there is an [36](1. abusive 2. exclusive 3. intrusive) bond between a language and the nation it naturally belongs to. In turn, these two assumptions combined produce a third one: only those who are the rightful members of a nation, by birth and by race, are legitimate speakers of the language of that nation.

6 Citing a number of research studies, Holliday made the point that native-speakerism is not a matter of language [37](1. alone 2. initially 3. overall), but is closely connected to ethnicity and race, even though this connection is rarely made explicit. It produces situations of great inequality around the world. In the field of English language teaching, for example, it is not [38](1. impossible 2. realistic 3. uncommon) for jobs to be available only for native speakers (sometimes explicitly defined as “white” or “Caucasian”), or for non-native speakers to receive significantly lower remuneration even when they possess higher qualifications.

7 This kind of inequity affects migrants in [39](1. theory 2. general 3. contrast). A 2011 study found that African migrants’ “accents and varieties of English had been treated as inferior by ‘native speakers’ in traditional English speaking countries”. According to the study, migrants were also, “made to feel as if they were unproficient in English, weak in communication skills, or unintelligible. They got the impression that only speaking in the prestige/native varieties of English counted for proficiency and educational or professional success.”

8 Native-speakerism is also intertwined with a colonial view of the world where the coloniser is attributed with cultural superiority over the colonised. This mentality has persisted well after the end of colonialism and is so pervasive that it affects the ways non-native speakers see themselves too – as inadequate and defective users of English. Tellingly, the Gambian woman in the Channel 4 segment said, “I don’t have confidence for myself to speak English” – [40](1. making 2. showing 3. summing) up this mindset exactly.

9 It is important that we become more conscious of the fact that English is not just an “English” language and that the ability to speak it has nothing to do with how “English” a person looks or behaves.

—Based on Saraceni, M. (2017). *The Conversation*.

[41] What is the implication of the phrase “far more disturbingly” in the 2nd paragraph?

1. The concept is problematic but widely accepted.
2. The idea is unfounded but often praised.
3. The concept is vague and thus confusing.
4. The idea is a mixture of science and emotion.

[42] The Gambian woman in the 3rd and 4th paragraphs is **NOT** represented as

1. a woman from a non-Judaeo-Christian background.
2. an immigrant in need of employment.
3. a competent speaker of English.
4. someone from a different ethnic group.

[43] According to Paul Gilroy, what is being blurred in the 5th paragraph?

1. Being British and being Caucasian.
2. Being a migrant and being a bad speaker of English.
3. Being white and being a colonialist.
4. Being multilingual and being educated.

[44] According to the article, the concept of “native-speakerism” is most closely connected to

1. capitalism.
2. colonialism.
3. globalism.
4. patriotism.

[45] Which of the following is the central idea being presented by the author?

1. World Englishes are the future of global communication.
2. Native-speakerism ideals are on the decline worldwide.
3. Overcoming communication problems between different races is hard.
4. Your ability to speak English could be judged by how you look.

英語Ⅱ（全員解答）

次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[46]から[55]の空所を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を 1 から 3 の中から選び、その番号を解答欄（46）から（55）にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[56]から[60]の設問には、1 から 4 の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄（56）から（60）にマークしなさい。

- 1 Whatever your motives, if you want to help the poor in faraway places, you have to be able to identify them. For several decades, rich nations assumed that the rural populations of the developing countries – countries that had not industrialized and had low Gross National Income per capita – were “the poor”. Around 1990, however, rich nations began to adopt [46](1. broadly 2. increasingly 3. generously) refined ways of identifying poor people.

- 2 *The Oxford Dictionary* defines poverty as the “want of the necessities of life”. But there are fierce debates about what those necessities are. While some of these debates are highly technical, most have a strong values dimension. [47](1. Try 2. Get 3. Take), for example, the different ways of setting a poverty line: the minimum income that a person or family needs to meet their necessities. This can be done in absolute or relative terms. In poor countries absolute measures are used: the minimum income needed to meet the body’s calorie needs and to provide basic shelter. Since 2015 the World Bank estimated this as around US \$1.90 a day in poor countries. By contrast, in the EU we measure poverty in relative terms. If someone has an income of less than 60% of their country’s median income, then they are classed as poor. In Europe that means around US \$20 to US \$40 per person a day. In the US in 2015 it was US \$32.25 a day for a single adult. With that a poor person can afford a varied [48](1. feed 2. diet 3. nutrition), changes of clothing, have a television and a mobile phone – maybe even take their children to the zoo for their birthday. They are counted as relatively poor as they cannot do many of the things that the majority of their fellow citizens take for granted – going out to a restaurant, owning a laptop computer, or having a foreign holiday. These [49](1. contrasting 2. interacting 3. protective) measures are not just a technical choice; they mean that people officially classed as poor in a rich nation are much better-off in material terms than those classed as poor in a poor country.

- 3 For most people in rich countries, the mental image of the extreme poor is of women and children in [50](1. emergency 2. imminent 3. sustainable) situations: after a cyclone or an earthquake, or running away from a violent conflict. Such humanitarian relief has always been an important part of rich-nation support for the distant needy, but it can [51](1. assure 2. obscure 3. refute) the evidence that most extremely poor are trapped in grinding poverty. They are not simply the victims of a recent disaster or conflict. [52](1. Instead 2. However 3. Likewise), they make a living in a context that means they cannot meet their families’ basic needs – even if they work 12 or 14 hours a day. For those lucky enough to just be able to meet their basic needs, conditions are very insecure – a sickness in the household, an

accident at work, or a downturn in the local labour market will see them [53](1. leap 2. break 3. slide) into poverty again.

- 4 The ideas that you have about poverty are important. They shape “who” you think is poor and “what” should be done about it. If you see poverty [54](1. profitably 2. relatively 3. simply) as a lack of income, as many people do, then you are likely to see economic growth (and perhaps job creation) as the answer and look for market-based solutions. If you see poverty as multidimensional, then you are likely to also see a need for basic services (health, education, potable water, sanitation, etc.) and may well see a major role for public provision by the government. If you see poverty as caused by inequality or the abrogation of human rights, then you are likely to look for more radical action: the [55](1. re-creation 2. redistribution 3. restoration) of economic assets and/or social political power.

—Based on Hulme, D. (2016). *Should rich nations help the poor?*

[56] Why does the author state that it is important to identify the poor in the 1st paragraph?

1. Because the divide between rich and poor nations cannot be reconciled.
2. Because EU citizens have a different criterion for defining poverty for themselves.
3. Because by doing so we can effectively support those classed as impoverished.
4. Because we are better off focusing our attention on developing countries.

[57] According to the article, which of the following might the relatively poor not be able to afford?

1. Access to clean water.
2. Vacationing abroad.
3. Shopping for clothing.
4. Owning home electronics.

[58] Which of the following is an essential component of the definition of poverty in the EU?

1. It is regarded as a lifestyle choice.
2. It is relative to US standards.
3. It is based on necessity.
4. It is not absolute.

[59] What does the phrase “grinding poverty” in the 3rd paragraph mean?

1. Changes in quality of life due to poverty.
2. Poverty due to natural disasters.
3. Human rights violations in poor nations.
4. Lasting and inescapable poverty.

[60] Based on the article, what might the author suggest as the best way to understand issues of poverty?

1. Stimulating the economy and lowering unemployment.
2. Broadening perspectives on what it means to be poor.
3. Demonstrating to affect social and financial policy.
4. Providing greater access to publicly funded programs.

英語Ⅲ（全員解答）

次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題の二つがあります。まず、[61]から[80]の空所を埋めるのに、文脈的に最も適切な語を 1 から 3 の中から選び、その番号を解答欄（61）から（80）にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[81]から[90]の設問には、1 から 4 の選択肢が付されています。そのうち、文章の内容からみて最も適切なものを選び、その番号を解答欄（81）から（90）にマークしなさい。

- 1 Why do many problems in life seem to stubbornly stick around, no matter how hard people work to fix them? It turns out that a [61](1. tilt 2. quirk 3. bend) in the way human brains process information means that when something becomes rare, we sometimes see it in more places than ever.
- 2 Think of a “neighborhood watch” made up of volunteers who call the police when they see anything suspicious. Imagine a new volunteer who joins the watch to help lower crime in the area. When they first start volunteering, they [62](1. hoist 2. lift 3. raise) the alarm when they see signs of serious crimes, like assault or burglary.
- 3 Let’s [63](1. assume 2. believe 3. see) these efforts help and, over time, assaults and burglaries become rarer in the neighborhood. What would the volunteer do next? One possibility is that they would relax and stop calling the police, as the serious crimes they used to worry about are [64](1. an object 2. a thing 3. the matter) of the past. But you may share the intuition my research group had – that many volunteers in this situation wouldn’t relax just because crime went down. Instead, they’d start calling things “suspicious” that they would [65](1. never 2. always 3. eventually) have cared about back when crime was high, like jaywalking or loitering at night.
- 4 You can probably think of many similar situations in which problems never seem to go away, because people keep changing how they define them. This is sometimes called “concept creep”, or “moving the goalposts”, and it can be a [66](1. fulfilling 2. fanatic 3. frustrating) experience. How can you know if you’re making progress solving a problem, when you keep redefining what it means to solve it?
- 5 My colleagues and I wanted to understand when this kind of behavior happens, why, and if it can be [67](1. animated 2. bullied 3. prevented). To study how concepts change when they become less common, we brought volunteers into our laboratory and gave them a simple task – to look at a series of computer-generated faces and decide which ones seemed “threatening”. The faces had been carefully designed by researchers to range from very [68](1. engaging 2. intimidating 3. assimilating) to very harmless.
- 6 As we showed people fewer and fewer threatening faces over time, we found that they expanded their definition of “threatening” to include a wider range of faces. In other words, when they

[69](1. caught sight 2. kept track 3. ran out) of threatening faces to find, they started calling faces threatening that they used to call harmless. Rather than being a consistent category, what people considered “threats” depended on how many threats they had seen lately.

7 This kind of inconsistency isn’t limited to judgments about threat. In another experiment, we asked people to make an even simpler decision: whether colored dots on a screen were blue or purple. As blue dots became rare, people started calling [70](1. slightly 2. tastefully 3. meaningfully) purple dots blue. They even did this when we told them blue dots were going to become rare, or offered them cash prizes to stay consistent over time. These results suggest that this behavior isn’t entirely under conscious control – otherwise people would have been able to be consistent to earn a cash prize.

8 After looking at the results of our experiments on facial threat and color judgments, our research group wondered if maybe this was just a [71](1. humorous 2. funny 3. sarcastic) property of the visual system. Would this kind of concept change also happen with [72](1. divisive 2. invisible 3. nonvisual) judgments?

9 To test this, we ran a final experiment in which we asked volunteers to read about different scientific studies, and decide which were ethical and which were unethical. We were [73](1. skeptical 2. emphatic 3. apathetic) that we would find the same inconsistencies in these kinds of judgments that we did with colors and threat. Why? Because moral judgments, we suspected, would be more consistent across time than other kinds of judgments. [74](1. After all 2. Before long 3. In retrospect), if you think violence is wrong today, you should still think it is wrong tomorrow, regardless of how much or how little violence you see that day. But surprisingly, we found the same pattern. As we showed people fewer and fewer unethical studies over time, they started calling a wider range of studies unethical. In other words, just because they were reading about fewer unethical studies, they became harsher judges of what counted as ethical.

10 Why can’t people help but expand what they call threatening when threats become rare? Research from cognitive psychology and neuroscience suggests that this kind of behavior is a [75](1. misunderstanding 2. consequence 3. complexity) of the basic way that our brains process information – we are constantly comparing what is in front of us to its recent context. Instead of carefully deciding how threatening a face is compared to all other faces, the brain can just store how threatening it is compared to other faces it has seen recently, or compare it to some [76](1. ideal 2. factor 3. average) of recently seen faces, or the most and least threatening faces it has seen. This kind of comparison could lead directly to the pattern my research group saw in our experiments, because when threatening faces are rare, new faces would be judged relative to mostly harmless faces. In a sea of mild faces, even slightly threatening faces might seem scary.

- 11 It turns out that for your brain, relative comparisons often use less energy than absolute measurements. To get [77](1. a query 2. an impulse 3. a sense) for why this is, just think about how it's easier to remember which of your cousins is the tallest than exactly how tall each cousin is. Human brains have likely evolved to use relative comparisons in many situations, because these comparisons often provide enough information to safely [78](1. navigate 2. sustain 3. nurture) our environments and make decisions, all while expending as little effort as possible.
- 12 Sometimes, relative judgments work just fine. If you are looking for a fancy restaurant, what you count as “fancy” in Paris, Texas, should be different than in Paris, France. But a neighborhood watcher who makes relative judgments will keep expanding their concept of “crime” to include milder and milder transgressions, long after serious crimes have become rare. As a result, they may never fully [79](1. investigate 2. appreciate 3. eradicate) their success in helping to reduce the problem they are worried about. From medical diagnoses to financial investments, modern humans have to make many complicated judgments where being consistent matters.
- 13 How can people make more consistent decisions when necessary? My research group is currently doing follow-up research in the lab to develop more effective interventions to help [80](1. expel 2. counter 3. verify) the strange outcomes of relative judgment. One potential strategy: When you're making decisions where consistency is important, define your categories as clearly as you can. So, if you do join a neighborhood watch, think about writing down a list of what kinds of transgressions to worry about when you start. Otherwise, before you know it, you may find yourself calling the cops on dogs being walked without leashes.

—Based on Levari, D. (2018). *The Conversation*.

[81] In the 3rd paragraph, what are jaywalking and loitering examples of?

1. Frivolous complaints
2. Legal behavior
3. Absolute measurements
4. Unavoidable problems

[82] The term “concept creep” in the 4th paragraph refers to the way in which

1. a concept’s definition narrows as it is better understood.
2. a concept moves closer to objective truth the more it is explained.
3. a concept will unconsciously enter your mind when you don’t expect it.
4. a concept’s definition broadens as it becomes more uncommon.

[83] According to the article, carrying out consistent judgment is

1. more reliable when done slowly.
2. less effective in abstract conditions.
3. not subject to conscious control.
4. positively influenced by rewards.

[84] According to the article, which of the following is true?

1. There is a clear path to eliminating errors in judgment by making specific interventions.
2. Moral judgments involve the same issues as other types of judgments.
3. Neighborhood watches are ineffective at reducing crime because of faulty judgment.
4. Offering money improves people’s ability to make judgments.

[85] According to the 10th paragraph, it is sometimes hard to identify threats because

1. of the severe limitations of long-term memory on cognitive tasks.
2. what constitutes a threat is different for people living in different neighborhoods.
3. the mind tends to use data from a short while ago as a reference point.
4. it depends on how recently the person doing the identifying felt threatened.

[86] Which of the following is claimed about relative measurements in the passage?

1. They are more accurate.
2. They are suited to important tasks.
3. They are irrelevant due to evolution.
4. They are more energy efficient.

[87] What is meant by the phrase “before you know it” in the 13th paragraph?

1. Your criterion for making judgments will become skewed unconsciously.
2. You will have no control over the judgments of neighborhood watches.
3. Your ethics will become compromised by perceiving threats everywhere.
4. You will have a more instinctive awareness of what is right and wrong.

[88] Which of the following is **NOT** an experimental subject discussed in this article?

1. Faces
2. Colors
3. Ethics
4. Height

[89] Which of the following idioms best exemplifies the main concept of the article?

1. Jumping through hoops.
2. It’s a slippery slope.
3. Haste makes waste.
4. Every cloud has a silver lining.

[90] Which of the following would be the best title for this article?

1. Why Your Brain Never Runs Out of Problems to Find
2. Crime Incidents Reduced Due to Well-trained Neighborhood Watch Programs
3. Rewarding Relative Judgments: The Key to Understanding Decision Making
4. How to Train Your Mind to Make Sound Judgments