

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(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。

1 Half of all New Yorkers speak a language besides English at home, and many of the rest have non-English-speaking parents or grandparents. This linguistic diversity goes back a long way: as soon as the Dutch arrived, establishing more of a trading post than a colony, New York became a Babel of tongues. “On the island of Manhate [Manhattan], and in its environs,” reported the Jesuit Father Jogues in 1646, “there may well be four or five hundred men of different sects and nations: The Director General told me that there were men of eighteen different languages.” That number probably doesn’t include the varieties of Munsee spoken by New York’s native inhabitants; today Munsee lives on, but with just a few speakers left, the youngest in her seventies.

2 By the late 19th century, New York had become a melting pot of footloose Europeans—Brooklyn was a Scandinavian port, Manhattan was a great Irish metropolis, and the entire city of New York was the third-largest German-speaking city in the world. Today New York [1](1. heralds 2. hinders 3. houses) languages large and small, famous and unknown, from every corner of the globe. The way Mexico sounded before Cortés*, now in El Barrio; the languages of West Africa, arrayed [2](1. into 2. along 3. by) 116th Street; the languages of Luzon and Java alive on the Asian streets of Queens. All the big ones are here—if a language has a million speakers worldwide, most likely one of those speakers lives in New York—but so are many endangered and vanishing languages.

3 At the Endangered Language Alliance, disappearing languages are documented by recording the words of a wide variety of speakers, including immigrants, refugees, students, businessmen, activists, and many others. Recordings have been made in thirty or so of the world’s smallest and most

endangered languages: Shughni from southeastern Tajikistan, Kabardian from the northern Caucasus, Amuzgo from Mexico. Researchers work slowly with a community over months and years, delving deep into all [3](1. elements 2. ailments 3. ornaments) of language.

4 Some of the languages documented, like Purhepecha from Mexico, are “isolates,” the last remaining [4](1. representatives 2. figures 3. delegates) of a whole language family. Others have sounds or structures found nowhere else in human speech. It [5](1. should 2. might 3. will) be the way clauses are chained together, the play of stress and accent, the liberation of word order, the almost endless complexity of verb endings. The “personality” of a language is the hardest thing to study. Whatever it sounds like, every language is a sophisticated, irreplaceable record of both a world and a worldview; all have features, as the linguist Carol Genetti writes, “that give a language its beauty, its unique personality, and its genius.”

5 The great migrations, increasingly diverse [6](1. by 2. with 3. till) the early 20th century, came to a sudden halt with the Immigration Act of 1924, with its hard cap on immigrants and its racist quotas in favor of Northern and Western Europe. The city’s diversity was becoming just a little less [7](1. rational 2. sparse 3. radical). By the time the United Nations arrived in New York City in the 1950s, it was mostly a town of seven particular tribes: Irish, Italian, Jewish, African American, Puerto Rican, West Indian, and Dominican. This is what many now think of as the dynamic “old New York”—but it was the most [8](1. strategic 2. static 3. stimulating) the city has been, linguistically speaking, since its founding.

6 Then, in 1965, Congress passed the Immigration and Nationality Act, abolishing the quotas and making immigrants’ skills and family relations paramount. America’s annual [9](1. uptake 2. outtake 3. intake) of immigrants started climbing again, back toward seven figures. Asians and Africans and South and Central Americans started arriving in [10](1. swirls 2. splashes 3. waves).

Fleeing war and oppression, several thousand Cambodians came to New York's Bronx area. Thousands of Albanians moved into Italian neighborhoods, many running the old pizza parlors. The secret language of barbers changed from Italian to Russian. The Vietnamese [11](1. settled 2. saddled 3. sat) into the Chinatowns, Mexicans appeared in East Harlem, and Tibetans began selling Christmas trees on the sidewalks. No one could say why. The former Soviet Union, in all its multicultural variety, arrived on the shores of Brooklyn.

7 Immigration in New York is so fast and fluid, suffusing the city in so many different ways, that the specific [12](1. effects 2. factors 3. limitations) are easily missed. So the guy spreading flour on your pizza doesn't speak Italian—will you even notice if one day he stops speaking Albanian? The city is endlessly [13](1. incorporating 2. evaluating 3. investigating) new cultures, and no one doubts that immigrants deeply shape the city. No other archetype—not the actor, artist, or banker—is as consistently linked to New York as the figure of the immigrant. But there's still an unease: we may well be swallowing up the world's diversity and spitting out [14](1. confusion 2. monoculture 3. biodiversity).

8 New York now [15](1. ships out 2. takes in 3. passes on) more and more immigrants, speaking more languages than ever before and making up a more plausible microcosm of global linguistic diversity than any city in history. Yet the place, almost by design, seems ever less than the sum of its parts, an endpoint for cultures, “a Babel in reverse,” in the words of its most famous newspaper.

9 The Endangered Language Alliance is an attempt to “catch language” in New York, before languages blend together and disappear. It is a small nonprofit in an old commercial building above 18th Street, consisting of three desktop computers, some [16](1. counterproductive 2. underprivileged 3. overworked) recording equipment, a website, a digital archive, and a scattered group of linguists who make ends meet elsewhere.

10 Of the world's more or less 7,000 languages, up to 800 may now be spoken in the New York metropolitan area, more than in any other city—only London and Paris [17](1. go 2. come 3. run) close. Of the estimated 176 languages indigenous to and still spoken in the United States, at least fifty are nearly extinct, with fewer than ten speakers. Nearly everywhere, centuries of imperialism, capitalism, urbanization, environmental destruction, and nation-building are now having their full linguistic effect. It's another extinction event, parallel to the massive, ongoing loss of plant and animal species. At least half of the world's languages are [18](1. scheduled 2. likely 3. eager) to disappear within the next century or two: those that are unwritten, least documented, and in some cases completely unknown outside their speech communities are in greatest danger.

11 There are powerful arguments for the value of linguistic diversity. Education research shows that children learn best in their mother tongue. Being raised multilingual—the norm outside the English-speaking world—can improve cognitive development, and possibly have an effect on one's capacity for empathy. The active [19](1. succession 2. promotion 3. suppression), stamping out, and shaming into silence of languages should also be understood as a question of justice and human rights—it's the powerful, over and over again, who impose their words on the powerless. Evidence seems to indicate that indigenous peoples with resilient languages and cultures are better able to [20](1. withstand 2. withhold 3. withdraw) social breakdown. And consider the massive loss of knowledge and wisdom and art that comes with the loss of any language, which no amount of last-minute translation can stop. Each language's vanishing, as the linguist Ken Hale writes, would feel “like dropping a bomb on the Louvre.”

Note:

* Cortés: Hernándo Cortés (1485-1547), a Spanish explorer and conqueror who arrived in Mexico in 1518.

—Based on Perlin, R. (2014, Spring). “Endangered speakers—Catching disappearing languages.”
n+1.

[21] What can be inferred about the Munsee language?

1. It was the most spoken language in 17th century New York.
2. There is very limited time left to preserve it.
3. There are currently only about 70 speakers alive.
4. The fact that it is spoken in New York makes it a popular language.

[22] Which of the following would qualify as one of “the big ones” as mentioned in the 2nd paragraph?

1. West Africa.
2. England.
3. Cortés.
4. French.

[23] According to the article, which of the following is true about New York?

1. It was founded by German speakers.
2. There were a large number of languages from the very beginning.
3. There were more endangered languages in the 19th century than there are today.
4. The most dominant groups today are the Scandinavians and Irish.

[24] What was an effect of the Immigration Act of 1924 as mentioned in the 5th paragraph?

1. Limiting diversity in the city.
2. Expanding multiculturalism in the city.
3. Making immigration illegal.
4. Capping the number of Northern and Western Europeans.

[25] In the 8th paragraph, what is meant by “a Babel in reverse”?

1. Cultural uniqueness is being lost as groups adopt the dominant language and practices.
2. Linguistic diversity can only be maintained by bringing in a greater range of foreigners.
3. The more different language groups reside in New York, the healthier the society will be.
4. New York has more flourishing languages and cultures than any other city.

[26] What is implied by the fact that linguists must “make ends meet elsewhere”, as mentioned in the 9th paragraph?

1. There aren't enough endangered languages requiring recording in New York.
2. Linguists earn a good living researching endangered languages at the Alliance.
3. Computer and recording equipment for the Alliance is borrowed from other organizations.
4. Linguists cannot earn sufficient money working for the Endangered Language Alliance.

[27] Empathy is mentioned in the 11th paragraph because

1. protecting endangered languages is generally seen as a sign of empathy.
2. New Yorkers are not empathetic towards speakers of endangered languages.
3. empathy is one of the possible benefits of being raised in a multilingual environment.
4. speakers of endangered languages are more empathic than speakers of flourishing languages.

[28] According to the article, which is true of the Endangered Language Alliance?

1. It teaches rare and historical languages.
2. It is well staffed, equipped, and funded.
3. It records languages before they disappear.
4. It advocates for immigrants, exiles, and refugees.

[29] Which of the following is **NOT** mentioned as a positive outcome of protecting disappearing languages?

1. Educational effectiveness.
2. Cultural preservation.
3. Increased immigration.
4. Protecting human rights.

[30] What is the likely reason that the author quotes Ken Hale’s metaphorical statement “like dropping a bomb on the Louvre”?

1. Imposing a dominant language on the powerless inhibits creativity.
2. The loss of linguistic diversity is an irretrievable loss.
3. The Louvre is a symbol of multiculturalism and multilingualism.
4. Social breakdown often occurs in cultures without strong artistic traditions.

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(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。

1 On November 2, 2010, Facebook's American users were subject to an ambitious experiment in civic-engineering: Could a social network get people to vote in that day's elections?

2 The answer was yes.

3 The way to [31](1. nudge 2. shake 3. stroke) bystanders to the voting booths was simple. It consisted of a graphic containing a link for looking up voting places, a button to click to announce that you had voted, and the profile photos of up to six Facebook friends who had indicated they'd already done the same. [32](1. Against 2. With 3. Beyond) Facebook's cooperation, the political scientists who conducted the study planted that graphic in the newsfeeds of tens of millions of users. Other groups of Facebook users were shown a [33](1. generic 2. generous 3. genetic) get-out-the-vote message or received no voting reminder at all. Then the researchers compared their subjects' names with the day's actual voting records to measure how much their voting prompt increased participation.

4 Overall, users who were notified of their friends' voting were 0.39 percent more likely to vote than those in the other group, and any resulting decisions to vote also appeared to spread to the behavior of close Facebook friends, even if those people hadn't received the original message. That small increase in voting rates [34](1. amounted to 2. contrasted with 3. passed up) a lot of new votes. The researchers concluded that their Facebook graphic directly mobilized 60,000 voters, and, thanks to the ripple effect, ultimately caused an additional 340,000 votes to be cast that day.

5 Now consider a hypothetical, [35](1. coolly 2. hotly 3. warmly) contested future election. Suppose that the CEO of Facebook personally favors whichever candidate you don't like. He arranges for a voting prompt to appear within the newsfeeds of tens of millions of active Facebook users—but unlike in the 2010 experiment, the group that will not receive the message is not chosen at random. Rather, he makes use of the fact that Facebook “likes” can predict political views and political party affiliation, even [36](1. before 2. beneath 3. beyond) the many users who include that information in their profiles already. With that knowledge, he could choose not to change the feeds of users who don't agree with his views. This could then [37](1. flap 2. flip 3. flop) the outcome of the election. Should the law constrain this kind of behavior?

6 The scenario imagined above is an example of digital gerrymandering. All sorts of factors [38](1. contend with 2. contrast with 3. contribute to) what Facebook or Twitter present in a feed, or what Google or Bing show us in search results. Our expectation is that those companies will provide open access to others' content and that the variables in their processes just help [39](1. field 2. wield 3. yield) the information we find most relevant. Digital gerrymandering occurs when a site instead distributes information in a manner that serves its own political agenda. This is possible on any service that personalizes what users see or the order in which they see it, and it's increasingly easy to do.

7 There are plenty of reasons to regard digital gerrymandering as so dangerous that no right-thinking company would attempt it. But none of these businesses actually promise [40](1. accuracy 2. neutrality 3. partiality). And they have already shown themselves willing to leverage their awesome platforms to attempt to influence policy. In January 2012, for example, Google blacked out its home page “doodle” (the logo graphic at the top of the page) as a protest [41](1. against 2. by 3. for) the pending Stop Online Piracy Act (SOPA) in the US, which they thought would cause censorship. The altered logo linked to an official blog [42](1. entrance 2. entrée 3. entry) asking Google users to contact Congress to complain; SOPA was ultimately abandoned, just as Google and many others had

wanted. A social-media or search company looking to take the [43](1. first 2. last 3. next) step and attempt to create a favorable outcome in an election would certainly have the means.

8 So what’s stopping that from happening? The most important fail-safe is the threat that a significant number of users, outraged by a betrayal of trust, would start using different services, hurting the company’s income and reputation. [44](1. However 2. Meanwhile 3. Moreover), although a Google doodle lies in plain view, newsfeeds and search results have no standard form. They can be subtly [45](1. teased 2. tickled 3. tweaked) without anyone knowing. Indeed, in our get-out-the-vote hypothetical situation above, the people with the most reason to complain would be those who weren’t given the prompt and may never know it existed. Not only that, but the policies of social networks and search engines already state that the companies can change their newsfeeds and search results however they like. An effort to change voter participation could be covered by the existing user agreements and require no special notice to users.

9 [46](1. At the same time 2. By the way 3. More to the point), passing new laws to prevent digital gerrymandering would be a bad idea. People may be due the benefits of a democratic electoral process, but in the United States, both people and corporations also have a First Amendment right to free speech—and to present their content as they [47](1. know 2. see 3. wish) fit. Meddling with how a company gives information to its users, especially when the information is not false, is asking for trouble.

10 There’s a better solution available: requiring web companies entrusted with personal data and preferences to act as “information fiduciaries*.” Just as a doctor or lawyer is not allowed to use information about his or her [48](1. patents 2. patience 3. patients) or clients for outside purposes, web companies should also be prohibited from doing this.

11 As things stand, web companies are simply bound to follow their own privacy policies. Information fiduciaries would have to do more. For example, they might be required to keep information about when the personal data of their users is shared with another company, or is used in a new way. They would provide a way for users to switch to unadulterated search results or newsfeeds to see how that content would appear if it were not personalized. And, most important, information fiduciaries would promise not to use any formulas of personalization based on their own political goals.

12 Four decades ago, another emerging technology had Americans worried about how it might be manipulating them. In 1974, there was a panic over the possibility of subliminal messages in TV advertisements. As a result, the Federal Communications Commission prohibited that kind of communication. There was a [49](1. floor 2. foundation 3. foot) for that rule; historically, broadcasters have accepted a responsibility to be fair in exchange for licenses to use the public airwaves. The same duty of audience protection ought to be brought to today's dominant medium. As more and more of what shapes our views and behaviors comes from invisible, artificial-intelligence-driven processes, the worst-case [50](1. scenarios 2. scenes 3. situations) should be placed off limits in ways that don't become restrictions on free speech. Our information intermediaries can keep their sauces secret, inevitably advantaging some sources of content and disadvantaging others, while still agreeing that some ingredients are poison—and must be off the table.

Note:

* fiduciary: 信託者

—Based on Zittrain, J. (2014, June 1). “Facebook could decide an election without anyone ever finding out.” *The New Republic*.

[51] A “ripple effect” as used in the 4th paragraph is best described by the way in which

1. the differences between things can gradually become blurred.
2. a message becomes distorted by being passed through many people.
3. a small change in one area can result in a big change elsewhere.
4. the effects of an action can continue and spread long after the event.

[52] Which of the following would be an example of “digital gerrymandering” as described in the 6th paragraph?

1. A well-known businessperson sends an email to all of his or her company’s customers in a certain region endorsing a particular local political candidate.
2. A social network hides posts about a certain state representative from the newsfeeds of network users who live outside of the politician’s home state.
3. A search engine lists positive articles about a law the search company supports higher on the page for users in areas where the law is less popular.
4. A company posts an essay on its home page urging people to vote against a new law that would force the company out of business.

[53] The story about Google and SOPA in the 7th paragraph is used as an example of an Internet company doing which of the following?

1. Protecting the free speech rights of its users.
2. Removing content that contradicts the company’s philosophy.
3. Violating users’ privacy for the purpose of political change.
4. Using its influence to make a political statement.

[54] Which of the following is an implication of the last two sentences of the 8th paragraph?

1. Users have no legal grounds for complaining if an Internet company secretly manipulates them for political purposes.
2. Internet companies routinely cite their user agreements as justification for altering their content for political purposes.
3. Users should have a right to vote on the policies of the Internet services they use, but they are prevented from doing so by the terms of use.
4. Internet companies have secretly added policies allowing them to manipulate voter participation into their sites’ terms of use.

[55] Which of the following best describes what the author means when he writes that changing how a service provides information is “asking for trouble” in the 9th paragraph?

1. Making new laws to prevent digital gerrymandering would be difficult.
2. Limiting companies’ right to free speech could have negative effects.
3. Doing so would violate the users’ First Amendment right to free speech.
4. Any such law would also apply to users’ political content.

[56] Which of the following activities would be allowed for an information fiduciary, as described in this article?

1. Using a user’s personal information to deliver custom advertising content directly from the company.
2. Requiring a user to completely log out of the service in order to see a generic search result or newsfeed.
3. Selling user browsing data to a business partner for the purpose of creating a list of potential customers.
4. Collecting user location data from a mobile application to predict income level and voting behavior.

[57] The example about subliminal messages in the 12th paragraph is included to show which of the following?

1. Public worries about new technology’s impact on corporate speech are usually baseless.
2. There is legal precedent for prohibiting certain kinds of corporate speech for the public good.
3. Corporate interests will always use new technology to mislead the public for their own purposes.
4. Historically corporations have negotiated with the public on how they can apply new technologies to speech.

[58] What does the author mean when he states in the 12th paragraph, “The same duty of audience protection ought to be brought to today’s dominant medium”?

1. Internet services should safeguard the public from secret manipulation.
2. Advertisements on Internet services should conform to television standards.
3. The Federal Communications Commission should not regulate Internet services.
4. Internet companies must be prohibited from hosting political content.

[59] Which of the following could replace the word “sauces” in the last sentence of the 12th paragraph?

1. Politics.
2. Agreements.
3. Methods.
4. Values.

[60] Which of the following best summarizes the author’s position on the problem of digital gerrymandering?

1. Although there is a high potential for abuse, users have no choice but to trust Internet companies with their information.
2. The free market will encourage Internet companies to remain trustworthy with regards to delivering information.
3. A new legal category of business should be established for Internet companies to protect users from unethical practices.
4. Any attempt to limit the activities of Internet companies will be ultimately ineffective due to the speed of technological advancement.

2015(平成27)年度 環境情報学部 一般入学試験問題 訂正

教科・科目	ページ	設問	誤	→	正
英語	12	Ⅱ	Note: *fiduciary: 信託者	→	Note: *fiduciary: 受託者
小論文	8		【D】10行目 …のおとぎ語の…	→	【D】10行目 …のおとぎ話の…