

I. 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、[1]から[20]の空欄を埋めるのに、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(1)から(20)にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[21]から[30]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(21)から(30)にマークしなさい。

Over the recent decades, a vast and diverse flock of parenting experts has arisen. Anyone who tries even casually to follow their advice may be stymied, for the conventional wisdom on parenting seems to shift by the hour. Sometimes it is a case of one expert differing from another. At other times, the most vocal experts suddenly agree *en masse* that the old wisdom was wrong and that the new wisdom is, for a little while at least, irrefutably right. The typical parenting expert, like experts in other fields, is [1](1. prone 2. unlikely 3. afraid) to sound exceedingly sure of himself. An expert doesn't so much argue the various sides of an issue as plant his flag firmly on one side. That's because an expert whose argument reeks of restraint or nuance often doesn't get much attention. An expert must be bold if he hopes to alchemize his homespun theory into conventional wisdom. His best chance of doing so is to [2](1. dispute 2. ignore 3. engage) the public's emotions, for emotion is the enemy of rational argument. And as emotions go, one of them — fear — is more potent than the rest. Mad-cow disease, crib death, avian flu — how can we fail to heed the expert's advice on these horrors when, like that mean uncle telling too-scary stories to too-young children, he has reduced us to quivers?

No one is more [3](1. indifferent to 2. suspicious of 3. susceptible to) an expert's fear-mongering than a parent. Fear is, in fact, a major component of the act of parenting. A parent, after all, is the [4](1. beneficiary 2. steward 3. successor) of another creature's life, a creature who in the beginning is more helpless than the newborn of nearly any other species. This leads a lot of parents to spend a lot of their parenting energy simply being scared.

The problem is that they are often scared of the wrong things. It's not their fault, really. Separating facts from rumors is always [5] (1. hard work 2. hard-line 3. hard luck), especially for a busy parent. And the white noise generated by the experts — to say nothing of the pressure exerted by fellow parents — is so [6](1. overwhelmed 2. overwhelming 3. being overwhelmed) that they can barely think for themselves. The facts they do manage to glean have usually been varnished or exaggerated or otherwise taken [7](1. into consideration 2. out of context 3. by surprise) to serve an agenda that isn't their own.

Consider the parents of an eight-year-old girl named, say, Molly. Her two best friends, Amy and Imani, live nearby. Molly's parents know that Amy's parents keep a gun in their house, so they have forbidden Molly to play there. Instead, Molly spends a lot of time at Imani's house, which has a swimming pool in the backyard. Molly's parents feel good about having made such a smart choice to protect their daughter. But according to the data, their choice isn't smart at all. [8](1. In any given 2. In a certain 3. In one particular) year, there is one drowning of a child for every 11,000 residential pools in the United States. In a country with 6 million pools, this means that roughly 550 children under the age of ten drown each year. Meanwhile, there is 1 child killed by a gun for every 1 million-plus guns. In a country with an estimated 200 million guns, this means that roughly 175 children under ten die each year from guns. The likelihood of death by pool (1 in 11,000) versus death by gun (1 in 1 million-plus) isn't even close: Molly is roughly 100 times more likely to die in a swimming accident at Imani's house than in gunplay at Amy's.

But most of us are, like Molly's parents, terrible [9](1. risk takers 2. risk assessors 3. risk controllers). Peter Sandman, a self-described "risk communications consultant" in Princeton, New Jersey, made this point in early 2004 after a single case of mad-cow disease in the United States prompted an anti-beef frenzy. "The basic reality," Sandman told *The New York Times*, "is that the risks that scare people and the risks that kill people are very different."

Sandman offered a comparison between mad-cow disease, a super-scary but exceedingly rare threat, and the spread of food-borne pathogens in the average home kitchen, exceedingly common but somehow not very scary. "Risks that you control are much less a source of outrage than risks that are out of your control," Sandman said. "In the case of mad-cow, it feels like it's beyond my control. I can't tell if my meat has prions in it or not. I can't see it, I can't smell it. On the other hand, dirt in my own kitchen is very much in my own control. I can clean the floor."

Sandman's "control" [10](1. predicament 2. contradiction 3. principle) might also explain why most people are more scared of flying in an airplane than driving a car. Their thinking [11](1. goes like 2. disagrees with 3. passes judgment on) this: since I control the car, I am the one keeping myself safe; since I have no control of the airplane, I am at the mercy of myriad [12](1. external 2. internal 3. undisputed) factors.

So which should we actually fear more, flying or driving? It might first help to ask a more basic question: what, exactly, are we afraid of? Death, presumably. But the fear of death needs to be [13](1. acted upon 2. narrowed down 3. held out). Of

course we all know that we are bound to die, and we might worry about it casually. But if you are told that you have a 10 percent chance of dying within the next year, you might worry a lot more, perhaps even [14](1. chose 2. being chosen 3. choosing) to live your life differently. And if you are told that you have a 10 percent chance of dying within the next minute, you'll probably panic. So it's the [15](1. eminent 2. immanent 3. imminent) possibility of death that drives the fear — which means that the most sensible way to calculate fear of death would be to think about it on a per-hour basis.

If you are taking a trip and have the choice of driving or flying, you might wish to consider the per-hour death rate of driving versus flying. It is true that many more people die in the United States each year in motor vehicle accidents (roughly forty thousand) than in airplane crashes (fewer than one thousand). But it's also true that most people spend a lot more time in cars than in airplanes. The per-hour death rate of driving versus flying, [16](1. likewise 2. however 3. all the more), is about equal. The two contraptions are equally likely— or, in truth, unlikely — to lead to death.

So why is a swimming pool less frightening than a gun? The thought of a child being shot through the chest with a neighbor's gun is gruesome, dramatic, horrifying — in a word, outrageous. Swimming pools do not [17](1. inspire 2. contain 3. limit) outrage. This is due in part to the familiarity factor. Just as most people spend more time in cars than in airplanes, most of us have a lot more experience swimming in pools than shooting guns. But it takes only about thirty seconds for a child to drown, and it often happens noiselessly. An infant can drown in water as shallow as a few inches. The steps to prevent drowning, meanwhile, are pretty straightforward: a watchful adult, a fence around the pool, a locked back door so a toddler doesn't slip outside [18](1. unwarned 2. unpunished 3. unnoticed).

If every parent followed these precautions, the lives of perhaps four hundred young children could be saved each year. That would [19](1. outnumber 2. succeed 3. proceed) the lives saved by two of the most widely promoted inventions in recent memory: safer cribs and child car seats. The data show that car seats are, [20](1. in the least 2. for the most 3. at best), nominally helpful. It is certainly safer to keep a child in the rear seat than sitting on a lap in the front seat, where in the event of an accident he essentially becomes a projectile. But the safety to be gained here is from preventing the kids from sitting in the front seat, not from strapping them into a \$200 car seat. Nevertheless, many parents so magnify the benefit of a car seat that they trek to the local police station or firehouse to have it installed just right. Theirs is a gesture of love, surely, but also a gesture of what might be called obsessive parenting.

—Adapted from Steven D. Levitt and Stephen J. Dubner, *Freakonomics*. New York: William Morrow, 2005.

[21] According to the 1st paragraph, parenting experts tend to

1. be indecisive when discussing controversial issues on parenting.
2. firmly stand by their views on parenting in order to attract public attention.
3. disregard the public's emotional side, as emotions run counter to logical theory.
4. put forward conservative views since they want to be well received by the public at large.

[22] In the 3rd paragraph, the expression “white noise” is used as a metaphor for

1. a storm of severe criticism.
2. a cascade of diverse opinions.
3. a shower of little white lies.
4. a torrent of abusive commentary.

[23] According to the hypothetical case of Molly's parents mentioned in the 4th paragraph, which of the following is true?

1. They thought a house with a gun was not remotely as dangerous as a house with a swimming pool.
2. They told her to play at Imani's house to teach her to be afraid of guns.
3. They thought Amy's parents might accidentally pull the trigger of their gun.
4. They did not make a very sensible choice from a statistical point of view.

[24] According to this article, which of the following statements is not true?

1. More people are afraid of unusual ways of dying than of dying of sickness.
2. More children die in pool accidents than in shooting accidents.
3. Driving and flying are equally hazardous, based on death rates per hour.
4. Both car seats and child placement in a car save an equal number of children's lives.

[25] Which of the following sets of adjectives best expresses the author's attitude toward parenting experts?

1. Skeptical, doubtful, and dubious.
2. Sympathetic, friendly, and warm.
3. Respectful, admiring, and supporting.
4. Unbiased, objective, and fair.

[26] According to Peter Sandman, the threat of mad-cow disease

1. drives people to clean their kitchens to remove food-borne pathogens.
2. scares people primarily because they are not familiar with the disease.
3. frightens people because they cannot control the possible dangers.
4. outrages people because it is not only exceedingly widespread but also deadly.

[27] According to this article, which of the following statements about parenting is true?

1. Rumors are just as relevant as facts in evaluating risks.
2. Experts' opinions are more valuable than parental instincts in making choices in child rearing.
3. Parents should be overprotective when it comes to the safety of their children.
4. Parents should weigh data on risks when considering how to keep their children safe.

[28] Which of the following is not mentioned in the comparison between the fear involved in driving and flying?

1. Control factors.
2. Familiarity factors.
3. Gruesomeness of death.
4. Death rate per hour.

[29] What does the author mean by "a gesture of love" in the last paragraph?

1. A way of showing love.
2. A physical demonstration of love.
3. An attempt at obtaining love.
4. Pretense of love.

[30] Which of the following would be most appropriate as the author's implied message for parents?

1. Let go of your fears about parenting.
2. Do not be scared of the wrong things.
3. Keep everything under control.
4. Trust the advice of parenting experts.

II. 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[50]の空欄を埋めるのに、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(50)にマークしなさい。次に、内容に関する[51]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(51)から(60)にマークしなさい。

The idea of the museum as a public institution is primarily a creation of the Enlightenment. The museum was construed to be fundamentally educational, a venue for the systematic organization and presentation of artistic, natural, and scientific phenomena. [31](1. Inherent in 2. Indifferent to 3. Insistent on) this is the idea of the museum as a public space, dedicated to the diffusion of knowledge. The great museums of the Enlightenment — the British Museum or the Louvre, for instance — epitomize this effort to create a taxonomy of both the natural and artistic worlds in order to make them [32](1. intelligible 2. irresistible 3. intangible) and accessible to a broad public.

The great museums of the United States founded in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, or the Philadelphia Museum of Art, were founded on the Enlightenment model, but unlike the British Museum or the Louvre, they were privately owned and financed institutions. They depended for support not only on the relatively few wealthy individuals who founded and subsequently supported them, but also on their ability to establish and nurture a relationship with the [33](1. locations 2. tribes 3. communities) in which they exist.

In the United States alone there are currently some 3,500 art museums and according to the most recent statistics they are visited by over 68 million adults a year, an astonishing number that [34](1. holds out 2. gives out 3. works out) to roughly one out of every three men and women in the population. Supported by a booming economy, intense civic [35](1. strife 2. pride 3. resentment) and the local and state governments' growing awareness of the economic benefits of cultural tourism, museums across America have become the defining public institutions of their communities, often housed in spectacular new buildings or additions designed by internationally celebrated architects.

Given the success and popularity of art museums there is a certain irony that their credibility is now being questioned. [36](1. As long as 2. As far as 3. As) art museums dramatically increased their audiences, adopted marketing strategies from the business world, and began demonstrating that they could generate substantial

economic returns for their communities, the public and the media started to take a much closer look at their operations. And with this attention came an [37](1. awareness 2. attack 3. anticipation) that art museums, like other institutions, are not perfect, that they occasionally engage in questionable practices, whether allowing a sponsor to effectively buy an exhibition, or giving control of exhibition content to a donor or collector, or programming exhibitions solely to generate income, or entering into arrangements that involve real or perceived conflicts of interest.

The most [38](1. ambitious 2. notorious 3. prosperous) recent example of this occurred at the Brooklyn Museum of Art, when it presented *Sensation*, an exhibition of young British artists from Charles Saatchi's collection, and found itself initially under attack by the mayor of New York [39](1. by 2. in 3. for) displaying what he perceived to be blasphemous art, and then by the press for being less than forthright about a number of facts, including whether Saatchi was also a major financial donor to the exhibition.

The crisis was provoked by the mayor's rash actions, and the museum had to fight to keep its doors open. But the museum's protection was never in doubt, as was clear from extensive pre-existing case law, and like every other major paper *The New York Times* defended Brooklyn's right to present the exhibition.

What the *Times* and other papers criticized repeatedly was Brooklyn's apparently intentional misleading of the public over the way in which the exhibition was financed. Having promoted *Sensation* with a highly [40](1. inflammatory 2. nostalgic 3. authoritative) advertising campaign that centered on the slogan, "Health Warning: the contents of this exhibition may cause shock and vomiting," and deployed the marketing tactics of a major movie studio, the museum discovered that it was now the subject of the very attention it had generated. The media, not to mention the public, did not like what it [41](1. saw 2. promoted 3. constructed). The museum's programs and practices were scrutinized and its [42](1. ethics 2. attendants 3. securities) were questioned, and even its most ardent supporters wearied of defending the institution against the constant barrage of accusations that came from the press and the public at large.

Indeed, this scrutiny was so intense, and its implications for other museums so potentially damaging, that the American Association of Museums took the unusual step in the aftermath of *Sensation* of adopting new guidelines concerning the financing of exhibitions and the avoidance of conflicts of interest in order to bolster public confidence in museums and demonstrate to lawmakers that museums are capable of policing themselves. Whatever gains the museum may have had in attendance and profile

were more than [43](1. multiplied 2. repaid 3. offset) by the fact that this came at the cost of public trust in the institution.

Public trust is a term that implies both a set of responsibilities to preserve, protect, and enhance property held [44](1. on top of 2. on behalf of 3. in addition to) the public and a code of conduct to ensure that this responsibility is discharged with the highest degree of skill and diligence. As public institutions, museums are expected to act and behave in a way that is in keeping with the perceived [45](1. thoughts 2. values 3. politics) they embody. This is true regardless of whether they are privately or publicly funded, civic or state institutions.

We want our art museums to be places of repose and contemplation — venues of discovery and learning, awe and wonder, where we can become [46](1. disinterested in 2. absorbed in 3. alienated by) the power and beauty of art. But museums, especially large metropolitan ones, long ago ceased to be simply quiet abodes of the muses, if they ever were. They have become highly complicated institutions with extensive collections, staffs, and publics that include annual visitors, members, individual and corporate supporters, artists, tourists, and scholars, as well as those who may never actually visit a museum but who believe in their mission.

The key term here is moral authority, which brings us back to the issue of responsibility and where we began. If art museums are to continue [47](1. thriving 2. sliding 3. revolving) they must recognize that their moral authority derives from the trust the public invests in them because the public believes they are acting responsibly and for the common good. Lessening of trust is ultimately a loss of a museum's authority and credibility, and once lost, that trust is very difficult to [48](1. sustain 2. regain 3. refrain). The question, however, is not whether art museums can find a way to embrace commercial culture but whether they can demonstrate that there is a clear and discernible difference between art and commerce that is worth preserving. This is not an easy task in a world where art and commerce can, and often do, merge seamlessly into each other, where museums can become part of vast entertainment complexes, and where museums are compelled to act more and more like commercial enterprises.

Art museums, in short, will be able to survive as mission-driven educational institutions only if they can continue to [49](1. provoke 2. convince 3. question) the public that they discharge their responsibilities with integrity and diligence; that there is a discernible difference between the discomfiting challenge of genuinely new art and ideas, whether created a thousand years ago or just last week, and the immediate pleasure of shopping at a designer store or going to a theme park; and that they [50] (1.

manage 2. manipulate 3. merit) the public's trust in them, and that because of this it is worth according them a special status in order to fulfill their public mission.

—Adapted from Glenn D. Lowry, "A Deontological Approach to Art Museums and the Public Trust." In *Whose Muse*. James Cuno (Ed.). Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

[51] Which of the following examples represents the concept of irony discussed in the 4th paragraph?

1. Museums, funded by people's generosity, have become profit-oriented.
2. As museums attract more visitors, they get fewer donations from corporations.
3. As museums become more popular, they become less credible.
4. Museums emphasize beauty, but their management is dirty.

[52] Which of the following hypothetical cases parallels the phrase "conflict of interest" as applied to museums in the 4th paragraph?

1. Superhighways reduce traffic jams, but they create noise and pollution.
2. Popular products are not always profitable for the company.
3. Social welfare for all requires higher taxes for some.
4. Doctors prescribe more medicine than patients need in order to make more money.

[53] The Brooklyn museum jeopardized its credibility by

1. running an ad campaign that was more sensational than the content of the exhibition.
2. trying to hide the fact that Charles Saatchi financed the exhibition.
3. not sincerely listening to the mayor's criticism.
4. criticizing *The New York Times* for not supporting the museum's freedom of exhibition.

[54] According to the 8th paragraph, which of the following explains the motive of the American Association of the Museums when it stepped into the Brooklyn Museum controversy?

1. To prevent the federal government from stepping into the fight in question.
2. To protect the reputation of American museums by setting higher professional standards.
3. To save the Brooklyn Museum of Art from attack by the mayor and the press.
4. To bolster public interest in museum management.

[55] Which of the following does not explain the nature of “public trust” in this article?

1. A museum collection is held in trust for the general public.
2. Public trust is an invisible investment by the people in the museum.
3. Museums cannot destroy their public trust because of their popularity.
4. Public trust requires museums to demonstrate responsibility for the common good.

[56] Which of the following would be the author’s interpretation of the Brooklyn Museum controversy?

1. Museums should be quiet abodes of the muses for contemplation.
2. Museums should use business strategies to become more accessible to the public.
3. Museums should be judicious in deploying modern marketing while maintaining their institutional purpose.
4. Museums should avoid commercialism and have more scholarly exhibits.

[57] Which opinion might the author hold about government-owned museums?

1. They should be privatized to be more open and efficient.
2. They should be based on public trust, not on government authority.
3. Shielding museums’ governance from political interference reduces public trust.
4. They are a legacy of old Europe and cannot survive in American democracy.

[58] What was the Brooklyn Museum’s intention in using the slogan, “Health Warning: the contents of this exhibition may cause shock and vomiting” as shown in the 7th paragraph?

1. To discourage the mayor from visiting the museum.
2. To summarize the critical response to Charles Saatchi’s art collection.
3. To warn parents not to bring their small children.
4. To capture the attention of the public.

[59] Which of the following most closely explains the phrase “they discharge their responsibilities with integrity and diligence” in the last paragraph?

1. Museums should become more transparent in balancing economics and mission.
2. Museums should serve visitors’ needs for shopping and pleasure as well as education.
3. Museums should focus their activities on education and enlightenment.
4. Museums should show both new pop art and old national heritage.

[60] The moral authority of museums depends on the trust the public bestows upon museums in that

1. there is a consensus that the public has the ultimate right to distinguish what is right from what is wrong.
2. there is a shared perception among the public that museums are acting for the common good.
3. there is an intricate relationship between the public support of museums and the number of visitors.
4. the culture of the Enlightenment is generally considered to be the height of public morality.