

I. 次の文章に関して、空所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、文章の内容から見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。

If we are asked to describe the personality of our best friend, we say something like he is honest or she is kind. All of us, when it comes to personality, naturally think in terms of [1] (1. relationships 2. relatives 3. absolutes): that a person is a certain way or is not a certain way. However, character isn't what we think it is; or rather, what we want it to be. It isn't a stable, easily identifiable set of closely related traits; it only seems that way because of a glitch in the way our brains are organized. The reason we [2](1. fall into 2. get into 3. take on) the error of thinking of character as something unified and all-encompassing is that we tend to think in terms of [3](1. strict 2. circumstantial 3. inherent) traits and forget the role of situations. According to some social scientists, in doing this, we are deceiving ourselves about the ways humans behave. In fact, psychologists call this tendency the Fundamental Attribution Error (FAE), which is a fancy way of saying that when it comes to interpreting other people's behavior, human beings invariably make the mistake of overestimating the importance of fundamental character traits and underestimating the importance of the situation and context. We will always reach for a "dispositional" explanation for events, [4](1. in addition to 2. as opposed to 3. by virtue of) a contextual explanation. Many experiments have been devised in order to explain this aspect of human decision-making.

In one experiment, for example, a group of people are told to watch two similarly talented sets of basketball players, the first of whom are shooting baskets in a well-lighted gym and the second of whom are shooting baskets in a badly lighted gym, and obviously missing a lot of shots. Then they are asked to judge how good the players were. The players in the well-lighted gym were considered superior.

In another example, a group of people are brought in for an experiment and told they are going to play a quiz game. They are [5](1. carried away 2. paired off 3. handed off) and they draw lots. One person gets a card that says he or she is going to be the “Contestant.” The other is told he or she is going to be the “Questioner.” The Questioner is then asked to draw up a list of ten “challenging but not impossible” questions based on his or her own areas of particular interest or expertise, so someone who is into Ukrainian folk music might [6](1. come up with 2. go together with 3. come down with) a series of questions based on Ukrainian folk music. The questions are posed to the Contestant, and after the quiz is over, both parties are asked to estimate the level of general knowledge of the other. [7](1. Indiscreetly 2. Unexpectedly 3. Invariably), the Contestants rated the Questioners as being a lot smarter than they themselves are.

You can do these kinds of experiments a thousand different ways, and the answer almost [8](1. never 2. always 3. rarely) comes out the same way. This happens even when you give people a clear and immediate environmental explanation of the behavior they are being asked to evaluate: the gym, in the first case, has few lights on; the Contestant is being asked to answer the most impossibly biased and rigged set of questions. [9](1. In the end 2. In the beginning 3. As a result), this doesn’t make much difference. There is something in all of us that makes us instinctively want to explain the world around us in terms of people’s essential attributes: he’s a better basketball player; that person is smarter than I am.

We do this because we are a lot more [10](1. responsible for 2. independent of 3. attuned to) personal cues than contextual cues. The FAE also makes the world a much simpler and more understandable place. In recent years, for example, there has been much interest in the idea that one of the fundamental factors in explaining personality is birth order: older siblings are domineering and conservative; younger siblings are more creative and rebellious. Psychologists actually tried to [11](1. verify 2. hypothesize 3. resolve) this claim and showed that we do reflect the influences of birth order. However, as the psychologist Judith Harris points out in *The Nurture Assumption*, this “character” [12](1. modifies 2. applies 3. notifies) only within family situations, and not once the children are in independent situations.

When they are away from their families—in different contexts—older siblings are no more likely to be domineering and younger siblings no more likely to be rebellious than anyone else. The birth order myth is an example of the FAE in [13](1. suspicion 2. doubt 3. action). But you can see why we are so drawn [14](1. to 2. by 3. in) it. It is rather easy to define people just in terms of their family personality. It's a kind of short-hand. If we constantly had to qualify every assessment of those around us, how would we [15] (1. remain loyal to 2. run away with 3. make sense of) the world? How much harder would it be to make the thousands of decisions we are required to make about whether we like someone, love someone, trust someone, or want to give someone advice?

The psychologist Walter Mischel argues that the human mind has a kind of “reducing valve” that creates and maintains the perception of [16](1. interval 2. modification 3. continuity) even in the face of perpetual observed changes in actual behavior. He writes:

“When we observe a woman who seems hostile and fiercely independent some of the time but passive, dependent and feminine on other occasions, our reducing valve usually makes us choose between the two patterns. We decide that one pattern is in the service of the other, or that both are in the service of a third motive. She must be a really ruthless lady with a façade of passivity—or perhaps she is a warm, passive-dependent woman with a surface [17](1. trickery 2. defense 3. offense) of aggressiveness. But perhaps nature is bigger than our concepts and it is possible for the lady to be an intimidating, fiercely independent, passive, dependent, feminine, aggressive, warm, brutal person [18](1. nothing-but-one 2. all-in-one 3. one-for-all). Of course which of these she is at any particular moment would not be random—it would depend on who she is with, when, how, and much, much more. But each of these aspects of herself may be a quite genuine and real aspect of her total being.”

This illustrates that character is not something which is stable across different situations. It is more like a bundle [19](1. of 2. with 3. in) habits and tendencies and interests, loosely bound together and dependent, at certain times, on circumstance and context. Once we

understand the effect of context on our assessment of character, it is possible to consider teaching about the power of context in educational settings. This may help reduce our tendency to judge people inaccurately, which can lead to prejudice. The challenge of [20](1. forcing 2. turning 3. breaking) the concept of FAE into a practical educational tool is enormous, but the benefits to our society could make this challenge worth attempting.

—Adapted from Malcolm Gladwell (2000). *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. New York: Little, Brown & Company.

[21] Based on the 1st paragraph, which of the following best describes the author's main concern?

1. Inherent human traits play the most important role in determining what a person is.
2. We will lose sight of reality if we disregard context in describing human behavior.
3. We tend to rely on our intuition too much when judging others, resulting in poor decisions.
4. Faulty analysis of fundamental characteristics leads to misunderstanding.

[22] In the 2nd and 3rd paragraphs, the author gives the examples of the basketball players and the Contestant/Questioner in order to illustrate that

1. it is human nature to rely on context and hunch in determining people's traits.
2. it is humane to think positively of others irrespective of context.
3. it is unreasonable for people to judge players under different conditions.
4. we have a propensity to overlook context in assessing people's capability.

[23] According to the article, people tend to make a mistake in judging character by

1. over-relying on perceived stable traits rather than on observation.
2. underestimating nurture rather than nature.
3. attributing errors to unstable character traits.
4. attributing errors to stable character traits.

[24] Which of the following best matches the statement, “The FAE also makes the world a much simpler and more understandable place” in the 5th paragraph?

1. You can simplify your life by not judging people by their personalities.
2. Considering every possible contextual factor would make life rather complicated.
3. Innocuous errors people make don’t affect society in any significant way.
4. It would be simpler to deal with basic errors than critical ones.

[25] In the 5th and 6th paragraphs, what does the author say about the birth order theory?

1. It does not hold outside the context of the family.
2. It generally holds across different social situations.
3. It works differently even within a family, depending on the occasion.
4. It works equally well in the social context and in the family context.

[26] In the 7th paragraph, Walter Mischel proposes the image of the “reducing valve” in order to illustrate how the mind prefers

1. character over inherent traits.
2. situations over complex flows.
3. stable categories over daily flux.
4. stable observation over stereotypes.

[27] In the quote by Walter Mischel, we find the statement, “We decide that one pattern is in the service of the other.” What does that mean?

1. We maintain a façade in public to protect our inner character.
2. We tend to use aggressiveness to serve our goals in work situations.
3. When faced with multiple motives for a person’s behavior, we choose one as a primary motive.
4. When faced with multiple motives for a person’s behavior, we give equal weight to all.

[28] Which of the following best expresses the meaning of the phrase “perhaps nature is bigger than our concepts” in the quote by Walter Mischel?

1. Human concepts cannot capture the totality of nature.
2. Nature should be appreciated more than the human mind.
3. Conceptual thinking conquers all.
4. Humans are children of nature.

[29] According to the last paragraph, an implication of the theory of FAE for education is that it may be possible

1. to change one's identity according to context.
2. to help people to judge others without bias.
3. to give people power to control others.
4. to help people to behave themselves.

[30] Which of the following is the key idea of the article?

1. The importance of understanding context in assessing human character.
2. The importance of developing ethical education.
3. The importance of critical thinking in understanding humanity.
4. The importance of understanding the impact of society on the human mind.

II. 次の文章に関して、空所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、文章の内容から見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。

When I consider the effect of the Internet on my thought, I keep coming back to the same metaphor. What makes the Internet a fundamentally new human communication system is the many-to-many connections it allows: suddenly any two Internet-equipped humans can transfer essentially any information, flexibly and efficiently. We can transfer words, code, equations, music or video anytime to anyone, essentially for free. We are no longer dependent on publishers or media producers to connect us. This [31](1. parallels 2. contradicts 3. supports) what happened in animal evolution, as we evolved complex brains controlling our behavior, partially displacing the basically hormonal, one-to-many systems that came before. So let's consider this new mode of communication from the long evolutionary viewpoint, by [32](1. adding 2. comparing 3. subordinating) it to the information revolution that occurred during animal evolution over the last half-billion years: the evolution of brains.

Our planet has been around for 4.5 billion years, and life appeared very early, almost 4 billion years ago. But for three quarters of the subsequent period, life was [33](1. indivisibly 2. invisibly 3. exclusively) unicellular, similar to today's bacteria, yeast or amoebae. The most profound organic revolution, after life itself, was thus the transition to complex multi-cellular organisms like trees and mushrooms.

Consider this transition from the viewpoint of a single-celled organism. An amoeba is a self-sufficient entity, moving, sensing, feeding and reproducing [34](1. independent of 2. in addition to 3. at a distance from) other cells. For three billion years of evolution, our ancestors were all free-living cells like this, independently "doing it for themselves," and were evolved over this long period into tiny organisms more [35](1. versatile and competent 2. intense and energetic 3. strategic and influential) than any cell in our multi-cellular bodies. Were it capable of scorn, an amoeba would surely scoff

at a red blood cell as little more than a bag of protoplasm*, barely alive, over-domesticated by the tyranny of multi-cellular specialization.

Nonetheless, being “jacks of all trades,” such cells were [36](1. rulers 2. dictators 3. masters) of none. Cooperative multi-cellularity allowed cells to specialize, focusing on the individual tasks of support, feeding, and reproduction. Specialization and division of labor allowed teams of cells to vastly outclass their single-celled ancestors in terms of size, efficiency, and complexity, leading to a whole new class of organisms. But this new organization created its own problems of communication: how to [37](1. empower 2. ensure 3. entitle) smooth, effective cooperation among all of these independent cells. This question directly parallels the origin of societies of specialized humans.

Our bodies have essentially two ways of solving the organizational problems raised by coordinating billions of semi-independent cells. In hormonal systems, master control cells broadcast potent signals all other cells must obey. Hormones enter the body’s cells, penetrating their nuclei and directly controlling gene expression. The hormonal system is like an [38](1. intimately 2. immensely 3. intricately) powerful dictatorship, issuing sweeping orders that all must obey.

The other approach involved a novel cell type specialized for information processing: the neuron. While the hormonal approach works fine for plants and fungi, multi-cellular animals move, sense and act, [39](1. transforming 2. making 3. requiring) a more subtle neural form of control. From the beginning, neurons were organized into networks: they are teamworkers collaboratively processing information and reaching group decisions. Only neurons at the final output stage, like motor neurons, retain direct power over the body. And even motor neurons must act together to produce [40](1. moderate 2. accelerated 3. coordinated) movement rather than uncontrolled twitching.

In humans, language provided the beginnings of a communicative organizational system, [41](1. identifying 2. unifying 3. categorizing) individuals into larger, organized collectives. Although all animals communicate, their channels are typically narrow and do not [42](1. receive 2. support 3. broadcast) expression of any and all thoughts. Language enables humans to move arbitrary thoughts from one mind to another, creating a new, cultural level of group organization. For most of human evolution, this system was

very local, allowing small bands of people to form local clusters of organization. Spoken language allowed hunter-gatherers to organize their foraging efforts, or small farming communities their harvest, but not much more.

The invention of writing allowed the first large-scale societies, organized on [43](1. hierarchical 2. horizontal 3. diagonal) lines: a few powerful kings and scribes had control over the communication channels and issued orders to all. This one-to-many model is essentially hormonal. Despite their [44](1. chronological 2. ecological 3. technological) sophistication, radio and television share this mode. The proclamations and legal [45](1. maneuvers 2. properties 3. decisions) of the ruler (or television producer) parallel the orders carried by hormones within our bodies: commands issued to all, which all must obey.

Since Gutenberg, human society has slowly groped its way towards a new organizational principle. Literacy, mail, telegraphs and democracy were steps along the way to a new organizational metaphor, more like the nervous system than hormones. The Internet completes the process: now [46](1. necessarily 2. slightly 3. arbitrarily) far-flung individuals can link, share information, and base their decisions upon this new, shared source of meaning. [47](1. Like 2. As for 3. As in) individual neurons in our brain, each human can potentially influence and be influenced, rapidly, by information from anyone, anywhere. We, the metaphoric neurons of the global brain, are on the brink of a wholly new system of societal organization, one spanning the globe with the metaphoric axons** of the Internet linking us together.

These axons are already essentially [48](1. in place 2. in touch 3. in shape). Universal protocols for information transfer such as HTML and TCP/IP are the neurotransmitters of the emerging global brain. Soon a few dominant languages like English, Chinese and Spanish will provide for universal information exchange. Well-connected collective entities like Google and Wikipedia will play the role of brainstem nuclei to which all other information nexuses must [49](1. apply 2. adapt 3. distribute).

Two main problems mar this “global brain” metaphor. First, the current global brain is only weakly linked to the organs of international power. Political, economic and

military power remains insulated from the global brain, and powerful individuals can be expected to cling tightly to the [50](1. hormonal 2. neuronal 3. collective) model of control and information exchange. Second, our nervous systems evolved over 400 million years of natural selection, during which billions of competing false starts and miswired individuals were ruthlessly weeded out. But there is only one global brain today, and no trial and error process to extract a functional configuration from the trillions of possible configurations. This formidable design task is left up to us.

Notes:

*protoplasm: a colorless substance like jelly which forms the living part of an animal or plant cells.

**axon: the extension of the neuron that transmits impulses away from the cell body.

—Adapted from W. Tecumseh Fitch (2010). “*Evolving a Global Brain.*” (http://www.edge.org/q2010/q10_3.html.)

[51] In the 1st paragraph, words, code, equations, music and videos are offered as examples of information that

1. are created by publishers for global readers.
2. can flow without restriction.
3. displace hormonal communications.
4. are part of the animal evolutionary process.

[52] The metaphor of the evolutionary specialization of cells is intended to portray

1. the demand for division of labor as society grows more complex.
2. the relationship between evolution and reproduction.
3. the complexity of the human evolutionary story.
4. the need for masters and subordinates in class-based societies.

[53] According to the 7th paragraph, why is communication among animals other than humans limited?

1. Other animals do not possess a verbal communication system.
2. Other animals do not possess culture.
3. Other animals do not possess minds.
4. Other animals do not possess organizational skills.

[54] Which of the following is not mentioned as a characteristic of language?

1. Language enables humans to form social groups.
2. Spoken language and written language function in a different way.
3. Language can be used in either a hormonal model or a neuronal model.
4. Written language is superior to spoken language.

[55] Which of the following is not mentioned as a characteristic of the hormonal model or system of control?

1. Kings can control society through their scribes.
2. Communication is one-to-many.
3. Teamwork enables collaborative information processing.
4. Powerful individuals use the system to retain power.

[56] Which of the following is in agreement with the author's argument?

1. All cells in one body receive all hormonal signals.
2. Hormonal communication works similarly to neuronal communication.
3. Neuronal signals support broadcast communication.
4. Neurons and hormones work together.

[57] In the 9th paragraph, the author suggests that the Internet society allows people to influence each other and

1. a person in power can dominate the relationship.
2. people tend to move in the direction of democratization.
3. one cannot predict how and where one will be influenced by others.
4. people can base their decisions on the structure of the Internet.

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

1. The Internet, like the nervous system, requires the coordination of its components.
2. Internet connections, like signals on the nervous system, are restricted to limited distances.
3. The Internet, like the nervous system, has many specialized communication mechanisms.
4. Individuals on the Internet, like parts of the nervous system, can be connected one-to-one.

[59] With regard to universal protocols as mentioned in the 10th paragraph, which of the following is true?

1. Diplomatic protocols help make political treaties more universal.
2. Universal protocols make it possible to translate any message into English, Chinese or Spanish.
3. Without a common language and agreed-upon way to transfer information, data cannot be shared.
4. Without universal protocols, only a few languages dominate over the others.

[60] According to the author, what are the two problems with the “global brain” metaphor referred to in the last paragraph?

1. The Internet is strongly connected to society, and trial and error will force it to evolve.
2. The Internet is not used by the military, but there are too many choices for configuring the global brain.
3. Some holders of power protect themselves from the Internet, and the design configuration is left open.
4. The Internet has no internal organs, and is not a natural phenomenon.