以下の英文はAugus Trumble, *A Brief History of the Smile*（2004）からの抜粋に基づいている。これを読んで次の設問に答えなさい。

（I）下線部（1）"the incongruity of television news" とはどういうことか，本文に即して30字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

（II）下線部（2）を日本語に訳しなさい。

（III）　(3)　に入る最も適切な語を下から選び，記号で答えなさい。

　　（a）Admittedly　（b）Consequently　（c）However　（d）Moreover

（IV）次の日本語の文意に合うように，下線部（4）の（　）内の単語を並べかえ，1番目と7番目の語を書きなさい。

　　　　彼らが何か素晴らしいものを目にしたかのように述べる。

（V）下線部（5）"this" の内容を表す最も適切な文を下から選び，記号で答えなさい。

　　（ア）A crop of student nurses were asked to view two kinds of videotaped statements.

　　（イ）A nurse in each segment was requested to describe an agreeable image.

　　（ウ）If given an opportunity to observe the liar twice, we can rightly correct the second statement more often.

　　（エ）If given the truth first, we can much better guess when she is lying.

（VI）　(6)　に入る最も適切な語を下から選び，記号で答えなさい。

　　（A）doubt　　　（B）pretend　　　（C）respect　　　（D）suspect

（VII）下線部（7）を日本語に訳しなさい。

（VIII）下線部（8）"The Margaret Thatcher illusion" という現象を明らかにした先行研究と実験とはどのようなものか，120字以上，150字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。

（Ⅸ）下線部（９）を日本語に訳しなさい。

（Ⅹ）次の日本語を英語に訳しなさい。

現代人は，他のいかなる情報源よりも，インターネットに依存しがちである。

解答はすべて解答用紙の指定の箇所に書きなさい。

Most people have from time to time found themselves having to pose for a photograph in which they are expected to smile. For the benefit of those who find it difficult to do so consciously, without strain or artifice, the photographer may assist by inviting them to say "cheese." For those who have no difficulty in smiling naturally for the camera, saying *cheese* will be redundant. Yet they respond, not wishing to seem uncooperative. For others, having to pose for this particular photograph may for various reasons seem amusing or ridiculous; they will break into an involuntary smile, suppress a laugh, or both, and will not need prompting. For the rest of us, however, speaking the word *cheese* will apparently reproduce the appearance and effect of a natural smile for the benefit of the camera and, at least in theory, will relieve us of any need to simulate or feign a happy mood that may for any number of reasons elude us. Such assisted or simulated smiles may vary in effectiveness. In the resulting photograph they might seem entirely natural or hesitant or boisterous or pretty or ugly or slightly deranged, as the case may be. Inevitably these impressions will vary from person to person.

Who has not been struck by (1) the incongruity of television news? Having read bulletins rich in famine, war, or some other manmade catastrophe, newscasters beguile us with some carefully chosen oddity or snippet, the purpose of which is to lighten the burden of bad tidings and prevent us from jumping out the window. Such stories are not necessarily trivial, although a scientific discovery with potentially enjoyable applications, celebrity weddings, an exotic arrival at the zoo, and other topics considered to be of human interest – as if for those affected, earthquake or flood were not – save the day at times when something is needed to lighten our impression of what is happening in the world.

At these moments, newscasters, those responsible for mediating all this

information with varying degrees of formality, give the audience a radiant, dentally flawless smile. It is part of the performance. The newscaster in question may have a headache. She may be concentrating on a stream of instructions sent through her invisible earplug by a producer sitting in the booth upstairs. Yet she will smile, and her smile will make a fundamental difference to the way we absorb what she has told us.

We may be perfectly aware that the winning smile of the newscaster is part of a seamless performance, but we are also aware that it conforms to wider expectations in respect of public behavior. The person behind a desk whose smile flickers in the ghostly blue light of the television set would presumably look rather similar if we found ourselves sitting in the same room on opposite sides of a boardroom table, or being interviewed by her for a job. (2) Not for one moment do we suppose that her posed smile is in any situation a sincere expression of fondness directed to us personally, but we have some difficulty locating the precise degree to which she depends upon its masking function. Is the smile of the newsreader a highly evolved version of the mask of comedy, primarily a piece of theater, or is it inherently deceitful? Does the truth lie somewhere in between?

Setting aside the important question "What is truth?" as Pontius Pilate* did – and one has some sympathy for him – psychologists have for many years been intrigued by the subject of deceit. This term, which for most of us is laden with moral connotations, is in the psychological field generally treated as neutrally as possible. In other words, issues of deceit and lying are often kept separate from the larger ethical questions of which we are aware in day-to-day life, although as everyone knows there can be morally defensible lies, just as there can be situations in which to tell someone the plain truth with all its consequences can be cruel. （ 3 ）, the ability of a person to succeed in telling a lie, or of another to detect it, is in this context treated largely as an exercise in perception. Numerous studies and experiments have sought to pin down the various ways in which we try to find out whether somebody is lying, or at least disguising various degrees of insincerity, by observing in minute detail their behavior and their facial expressions: whether or not, for example, our interlocutor makes eye

---

* Pontius Pilate: Roman governor of Judaea and judge at the trial of Jesus Christ.

contact, moves his head, blinks, pats his thighs, touches himself in some other way, makes flourishing hand gestures, pauses mid-sentence, or smiles.

In the late 1980s, an experiment was conducted among nurses who were filmed on segments of video. Off camera they were shown an obviously horrifying picture and invited first to record a deliberately false statement and [4] describe (blissful / they / as / it / what / something / saw / if / were). As they did so, the whole of their body and behavior were clearly visible. Then they were asked to record a second piece of video, this time describing honestly an agreeable image, which, like the first, was shown to them off camera.

Another crop of nurses, students this time, were then asked to view the pairs of videotaped statements and assess whether they thought the nurse in each segment was uttering a true statement or a false one. This study established that we are much better at detecting lies if we are given an opportunity to observe the liar twice, once when she is lying and a second time when she is telling the truth, or vice versa. Moreover, we get it right more often if we are given the truth first.

The reason for [5] this may simply be that most people approach a task of this kind with the underlying expectation that they will be told the truth, or ought to be, which is from the social point of view reassuring. However, it was also found that when we [(6)] that a statement is deceptive, we tend to concentrate on the quality and consistency of the information contained in it, rather than on the wealth of signals carried by behavior that might better alert us to the right answer. It seems we are rather better at telling lies than detecting them. Indeed, another aspect of the same study demonstrated that nurses who were exceedingly good liars knew very well that they were, and frankly acknowledged that they lie effectively in real life.

Another, slightly earlier study showed that "the typical liar fools 86 percent of would-be detectors" and that we on the receiving end tend to base our judgments as to whether we are being told the truth on whether the teller *looks* honest. Naturally it follows that people who look honest, particularly (it seems) those with fresh, youthful, cherubic faces, make better liars. Intriguingly, it was also found that people from radically different cultural backgrounds, for example separate cohorts of Jordanian

Arabs in Amman and university students in Texas, are surprisingly consistent in their opinions about what an honest or a mendacious face should look like. It goes deeper still, because not only do many of us think we can tell if a person is dishonest by the appearance of his face, but it seems that honesty and attractiveness go hand-in-hand; statistically, the ugly man is far more likely than an Adonis to be a thief.

Which of us does not recoil from such a cold hypothesis? Surely a sound case against it would proceed from the fact that if the beautiful man is more readily believed, and makes a better liar, he is therefore more likely to get away with a crime than the bumbling thief with dirty hair and spots whom everybody distrusts. [7] Western society has amply demonstrated that what begins as distrust may soon turn into cold rejection, thus propelling the ugly or disfigured person into the category of outsider. Obviously it suits us when thieves look the part.

More recently, an attempt was made to find out exactly how smiling modifies or alters our perception of attractiveness in faces. This built on earlier work that suggested that without being aware of it, we tend to rely more heavily on the disposition of the lips and mouth than any other facial feature for guidance when we assess the attractiveness of another person's face. And we tend to process and absorb this information about the mouth in isolation from the whole face. The point is easily demonstrated by means of a curious illusion concocted some time ago in the Department of Psychology at the University of York in England. Two identical studio photographs of a smiling Margaret Thatcher[†] were obtained from an unsuspecting branch of the British Conservative Party. One photograph was untouched. The other was altered by carefully cutting out the mouth and eyes, and pasting them back in the same position but inverted, so that the upper lip took the place of the lower, and vice versa.

The two photographs were then displayed upside down and side-by-side. In this orientation, the expression of Mrs. Thatcher's face in each photograph appeared rather similar. However, when seen the right way up, the doctored photograph looked hideously disfigured, the corners of the mouth dragged menacingly down, the mad eyes leering horribly. This

---

[†] Margaret Thatcher (1925−2013): Former British prime minister.

illusion, which is easily reproduced using a photograph clipped from the newspaper, suggests that in making sense of *upside-down* faces we "forgive" the topsy-turvy orientation of individual facial features, and greet with subconscious relief the sight of a smiling mouth, right way up, in isolation. Despite its manifest wrongness, we seem far happier with this than the sight of an inverted mouth on an *upright* face, scowling where a soothing, prime-ministerial smile should be.

[8] The Margaret Thatcher illusion, as it came to be known, is not about distinguishing between doctored and un-doctored versions of the same photograph. Instead, the effect demonstrates how the uprightness of individual features on a distorted head will disturb the mind far less than distorted features on an upright head. And it is consistent with what we know about the precise way our eyes provide a complex web of data to the brain, which in fact informs our conscious mind of what we "see," obviously not what is projected onto the rear wall of the interior of our eyeballs (which is, in any case, upside down). The eyes do not capture a focused image of the face of the person standing in front of us. Instead, the eye moves over the surface of that face, fixing upon numerous separate points in rapid succession. Each point is very small, and sharply focused, but the surroundings that extend to the outer boundary of our field of vision are a blur. [9] The brain uses the information provided by each point to build an image of the whole, fooling us into thinking that our eye has captured it all, seamlessly focused. Paradoxically, this clever form of deception is what enables us to see perfectly, or imperfectly for those of us who wear spectacles. We do not understand how, between them, the brain and the eye decide where to alight, nor how a sequence is determined. The mind with its vast store of knowledge, prejudices, and expectations obviously controls this process, and ensures that our eyes never scan a familiar face in exactly the same way. However, we do know that when we look at faces our eyes tend to make the mouth a first port of call and that they focus on the other person's eyes almost as soon. There may be whole areas of the face that our eyes completely ignore, although we are generally intrigued, it seems, by anything out of the ordinary, such as a scar. We know this because for many years we have been able to track and record the precise motions of the eyeball.