

解答用紙 A (マークシート) の記入に関する注意事項

[1] から [33] までの解答は、解答用紙 A (マークシート) の解答欄にマークしなさい。

[例] (12) と表示のある問いに対して、「3」と解答する場合は、次の例のように解答欄 (12) の ③ にマークしなさい。

(12)
①
②
●
④
⑤
⑥
⑦
⑧
⑨
⑩

なお、解答欄にある ⑩ はマイナス符号 - を意味します。

I. 次の文章に関して、空欄補充問題と読解問題があります。答えとして、最も適切な選択肢を 1～3 あるいは 1～4 の中から選び、その番号をマークシートの解答欄にマークしなさい。尚、内容に関する [4], [7], [20], [23], [25], [26] の設問の選択肢は、本文の後に与えられています。

Competition spurs many parents to rush their children. We all want our offspring to succeed in life. In a busy world, that means putting them on the fast track in everything—school, sports, art, and music. It is no longer enough to [1] (1. catch 2. keep 3. put) up with the Joneses' children; now, our own little darlings have to outpace them in every discipline.

The fear that one's kids may fall behind is not new. Back in the eighteenth century, Samuel Johnson warned parents not to hesitate: "Whilst you stand deliberating which book your son shall read first, another boy has read both." In the 24-hour global economy, however, the pressure to stay ahead is more [2] (1. beneficial 2. harmful 3. ferocious) than ever, leading to what experts call "hyper-parenting," the compulsive drive to perfect one's children. To give

their offspring a head start, ambitious parents play Mozart to them in the womb, teach them sign language before they are six months old and use Baby Webster flash cards to teach them vocabulary from their first birthday. Computer camps and motivational seminars now even accept kids [3] (1. more young than 2. as young as 3. younger as) four. Golf lessons start at two. [4] [X] the pressure to join the race is [5] (1. immense 2. encouraging 3. meaningless). The other day I [6] (1. came over 2. came across 3. came into) an advertisement for a BBC foreign language course for children. "Speak French at 3! Spanish at 7!" screamed the headline. "If you wait, it will be too late!" My first instinct was to rush to the phone to place an order. [7] My second instinct was to feel guilty for not having acted on the first.

In a highly competitive world, school is a battleground where the only thing that [8] (1. arises 2. matters 3. is threatening) is finishing top of the class. Nowhere is that more true than in East Asia, where education systems are built on the principle of "exam hell." Just to stay competitive, millions of kids across the region spend evenings and weekends at institutions called "cram schools." Devoting eighty hours a week to academic work is not uncommon.

In the headlong dash for higher international test scores, schools in the English-speaking world have been especially keen to [9] (1. imitate 2. examine 3. criticize) the East Asian model. Over the last two decades, governments have embraced the doctrine of "intensification," which means piling on the pressure with more homework, more exams and a rigid curriculum. Hard work often starts before formal education. At his nursery school in London, my son started learning—not very successfully—how to hold a pen and write at the age of three. Private tutoring is also [10] (1. rewarding 2. surviving 3. booming) in the West, for children of younger and younger ages. American parents hoping to win a place in the right kindergarten send their four-year-olds to be coached on interview techniques. Some London tutors take three-year-olds on without hesitation.

Intensification is not [11] (1. appealing 2. confined 3. significant) to schooling, either. After school, many children dash from one extracurricular activity to the next, leaving them no time to relax, play on their own or let their imaginations wander. No time to be slow.

Children increasingly pay a price [12] (1. of 2. at 3. for 4. on) leading rushed lives. Cases of five-year-olds suffering from upset stomachs, headaches,

insomnia, depression and eating disorders brought on by stress are now not uncommon. Like everyone else in our always-on society, many children get too little sleep nowadays. This can make them jumpy and impatient. Sleep-deprived kids have more trouble making friends. [13] (1. Moreover 2. For example 3. However), they stand a greater chance of being underweight, since deep sleep causes the release of human growth hormone.

When it comes to learning, putting children on the fast track often does more harm than good. The American Academy of Pediatrics warns that specializing in a sport at too young an age can cause physical and psychological damage. The same [14] (1. goes 2. comes 3. makes 4. does) for education. A growing body of evidence suggests that children learn better when they learn at a slower pace. Kathy Hirsh-Pasek, professor of child psychology at Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, recently tested 120 American preschool kids. Half went to nursery schools that stressed social interaction and a playful approach to learning; the rest attended nursery schools that rushed them towards academic achievement, using what experts call the “drill and kill” style of teaching. Hirsh-Pasek found that children from the more relaxed, slower environment [15] (1. turned out 2. made for 3. came to) less anxious, more eager to learn and better able to think independently.

In 2003, Hirsh-Pasek co-authored *Einstein Never Used Flash Cards: How Our Children REALLY Learn and Why They Need to Play More and Memorize Less*. The [16] (1. field 2. debate 3. volume) is packed with research uncovering the myth that “early learning” and “academic acceleration” can build better brains. “When it comes to raising and teaching children, the modern belief that faster is better and that we must make every moment count is simply wrong,” says Hirsh-Pasek. “When you look at the scientific evidence, it is clear that children learn better and develop more [17] (1. specific 2. rounded 3. unbalanced) personalities when they learn in a more relaxed, less hurried way.”

In East Asia, the punishing work ethic that once made the region’s schools the envy of the world is clearly backfiring. Pupils are losing their edge in international test scores, and failing to develop the creative skills needed in the information economy. Increasingly, East Asian students are rebelling against the study-till-you-drop mentality. Crime and suicide rates are rising, and truancy, [18] (1. prior seen as 2. as once like 3. well-known like 4. once seen as) a Western problem, has reached epidemic proportions. Over a hundred thousand

Japanese primary and junior high students play hooky for more than a month each year. Many others refuse to go to school at all.

Not long ago, the *New Yorker* magazine published a cartoon that summed up the growing fear that modern youngsters are being [19] (1. stripped 2. denied 3. ignored) a real childhood. Two elementary school boys are walking down a street, books under their arms, baseball caps on their heads. With a world-weariness beyond his years, one says, [20] "So many toys—so little unstructured time."

We have been here before. Like much of the Slow movement, the battle to give children back their childhood has roots in the Industrial Revolution. Indeed, the modern notion of childhood as a time of innocence and imagination [21] (1. led up to 2. grew out of 3. made up for) the Romantic movement, which first swept across Europe in the late eighteenth century. Until then, children were considered mini-adults who needed to be made employable as soon as possible. In education, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the French philosopher, rang in the changes by attacking the tradition of teaching the young as though they were grown-ups. In *Emile*, his landmark treatise on schooling children in accordance with nature, he wrote: "Childhood has its own way of seeing, thinking, and feeling, and nothing is more foolish than to try to substitute ours for theirs." In the nineteenth century, reformers turned their sights on the evils of child labor in the factories and mines that powered the new industrial economy. In 1819, Coleridge [22] (1. may 2. could 3. should) describe the children working in English cotton factories as slaves. By the late 1800s, Britain was starting to move children out of the workplace and into the classroom, to give them a [23] "proper childhood."

Today, educators and parents around the world are once again [24] (1. keeping 2. giving 3. taking) steps to allow young people the freedom to slow down, to be children. In my search for interviewees, I post messages on a few parenting websites. Within days, my inbox is crammed with emails from three continents. Some are from teenagers lamenting their haste-ridden lives. An Australian girl named Jess described herself as a "rushed teen" and tells me, "I have no time for anything!" But most of the emails come from parents thrilled about finding new and various ways in which their kids can decelerate.

Questions

[4] Which phrase might most suitably fill in the gap at [X]?

1. With everyone fast-tracking their kids,
2. Since everyone wants to fast-track other kids,
3. Though others fast-track themselves,
4. So that everyone could fast-track their kids,

[7] What does the underlined sentence mean?

1. Immediately thereafter, I worried that I had made a mistake.
2. On reflection, I decided to follow my first instinct.
3. All of a sudden, I felt bad that I had made the call.
4. I should not have made the call to prevent my feelings of guilt.

[20] Which of the following sentences could be used to sum up the ideas in the underlined phrase?

1. Our toys all take such a long time to play with!
2. They might be numerous, but none of our toys are structured!
3. We might have a lot of toys, but we have no time to play with them!
4. We have so many toys that we have no free time left!

[23] Why does the author use the punctuation marks (“ ”) around the underlined words at [23]?

1. Nineteenth-century authors always used such marks around these words.
2. The author wants to explain the idea behind the words.
3. The author doubts that the phrase is appropriate.
4. The author wants to stress that childhood is respectable.

[25] According to the last paragraph, most parents send responses to the author because

1. they are disappointed to know there are no efficient ways to alter their children's stress.
2. they are lamenting their teenagers' rushed lives.
3. they agree with the author about their advice on slowing their children's lives.
4. they appreciate how the author's advice has slowed their children's lives.

[26] Which of the following would make the most appropriate title for this essay?

1. The Most Efficient Way of Raising Children
2. Raising Children in an Unhurried Manner
3. Freedom in Child Education
4. Progress in Raising Children

Ⅱ. 次の三つの文章は、健康問題に関するフォーラムにおける、三人の発表者の意見の一部を抜粋したものです。それぞれの文章を読んで、以下の質問に答えなさい。[27] から [33] の設問に対する答えとして、最も適切な選択肢を選び、その番号をマークシートの解答欄 (27) から (33) にマークしなさい。次に、[34] から [46] の設問に対する答えとして、最も適切な選択肢を選び、その番号を解答用紙Bに記入しなさい。

Speaker A

Obesity among the young is a serious and growing problem. Most nutritionists and doctors recognize that some measures are needed to prevent, to slow and to reverse this dangerous trend. Some governments, such as those of the states of New Jersey, California and Oregon, alarmed by the rise in student obesity rates, are putting school cafeterias on a diet, by banning the sale of high-sugar, fried, or fatty foods and drinks at schools. Some are disappointed at these government proposals. The California plan, for example, will provide no nutrition education to students, while [27] (1. retailing 2. expanding 3. banning 4. restricting) the authority of local school districts to decide what foods and beverages should be available to their students. Despite arguments to the contrary, it is clear that most of these plans will do little, if anything, to address the serious issue of obesity among children and young adults.

Policymakers must look for broader solutions to obesity that will educate students about the importance of balancing nutrition and physical activity. [28] (1. In contrast 2. Moreover 3. However 4. Accordingly), the governments are now going to punish those businesses by banning their products from schools, even though many food companies are already working with local school districts to provide a wide variety of food and beverage choices to students. This is [29] (1. neither unfair nor 2. both unfair and 3. simply unfair, not) unwise. Furthermore, such reforms will surely hurt poor students who cannot afford the expensive, “healthy” foods. Cheap, so-called “junk food” can be nutritious, and no government official should be allowed to take that choice away.

The food and beverage industry has shown its commitment to helping prevent and reduce obesity in America, especially among children. For example, companies have introduced more than 4,500 products with improved nutritional profiles. The industry has also contributed tens of millions of dollars to nutrition education and physical activity programs. Schools should encourage providers to give students a variety of food choices, and especially a wide range of healthier food and beverage products.

In addition, as educational institutions, schools must take responsibility for educating children in the principles of sound nutrition. The fact that so many children are choosing high-sugar, high-fat foods at school suggests their failure in this area so far. Schools also need to take note of the correlation between a lack of proper exercise and obesity that has been confirmed in many recent studies. At present, they are clearly failing in their duty to provide Physical Education classes to teach young people the importance of exercise to health. Students are obese because they sit around listening to music, watching TV, and playing at their computers, not only because of what they eat in school lunchrooms. And they are falling into inactivity in part because schools are not teaching them anything different.

Before the state and national governments force school districts to reduce food choices in the cafeteria, those legislators should first consider [30] (1. to make 2. making 3. about making) sure that schools fulfill their obligations to educate youth in nutrition and exercise. Ultimately, the long-term problem of obesity in society will be solved by giving people, including students, the information and resources they need to set and achieve their health and nutrition goals, not by merely banning foods of which administrators and legislators disapprove. Students should be protected from the 'food police.'

Questions

Does Speaker A mention that the following factors are contributing to obesity? Answer by filling in (1) for YES, or (2) for NO in the corresponding slots under (31) – (33) on your answer sheet.

[31] School Food

[32] Junk Food Eaten Outside School

[33] Insufficient Physical Activity

注意：[34] から [46] の設問に対する答えは、解答用紙Bに記入しなさい。

Speaker B

It is natural that schools should play an active role in encouraging young people to eat well, as an important component of a reasonable anti-obesity campaign. Food habits, after all, are learned, not inherited. Admittedly, babies instinctively reject bitter and sour foods in favor of sweet ones; such aversions are probably adaptive, since many naturally occurring poisons have a bitter taste. But if we humans are innately attracted to sweet foods and automatically avoid bitter ones, why does over half of the world's population adore chilies? [34] (1. Everything 2. Nothing 3. Anything 4. What) could be more unnatural than eating chili peppers. Biting into a tabasco pepper brings about an initially mild reaction, but then the burn starts to grow and spreads quickly. Shortly thereafter, the chili eater breaks out in a sweat, eyes streaming, nose running, stomach warming, heart accelerating, and lungs breathing faster. This is normal—and it is precisely the effect that most chili lovers seek when they bite into the peppers.

After salt, chili is the most popular seasoning in the world. Normally used to make otherwise bland staples more appetizing, it is an integral part of people's diet throughout Central and South America, West and East Africa, India, and Southeast Asia, [35] (1. like over 2. as far as 3. as well as 4. excluding) parts of China, Indonesia and Korea. In rural Mexico, almost all villagers over the age of six eat hot peppers at all three meals. Mothers gently introduce their one- or two-year-old children to the taste by giving them chilies in stews, so that, by the age of five, most Mexican village children have not only suppressed the innate rejection, but they have acquired a liking for hot pepper and usually add it to food themselves. Chilies, cheap and nutritious, are as addictive as junk food, yet much healthier by far. There is no reason why our schools cannot afford to integrate chilies into our children's diet.

Eating habits and tastes are learned, not instinctive. Parents usually understand that they have primary responsibility for fostering their children's appreciation for food. However, no one [36] (1. can 2. need 3. has to 4. must) deny that schools also bear some responsibility for preparing and serving good food. Schools should neither be serving nor selling bad food; our children have been allowed to fill up on sweets for too long, and the results are plain to see. Schools not only have every right to control what is sold and eaten within their walls, it is their civic duty to do so.

Question

[37] Which of the following most accurately summarizes the first paragraph of Speaker B's remarks? Write the correct answer in the box marked (37) on Answer Sheet B.

1. Taste is instinctive, but our biological reactions to food intake are no guide as to what might be widely popular or appealing.
2. The chili eater's reactions to chili peppers are learned: he has adapted to the bitter taste, and is better than a baby at controlling his instinctive desire for chilies.
3. Schools should focus on encouraging natural food instincts, such as the taste for chilies, in their campaigns against obesity.
4. Babies reject bitter foods because the heart acceleration and running nose gained by biting into chilis is a sure way to become obese.

Speaker C

Despite celebrity appearances, TV chef Jamie Oliver does not take himself too seriously. Moreover, he has won praise for his social conscience with schemes like the Fifteen Foundation—a program to train young disadvantaged people in the restaurant business. Now he has taken that commitment one step further by turning his attention to school lunches.

He has not taken the easy route. Though he started by [38] (1. stressing 2. emphasizing 3. concentrating 4. targeting) on one school, Kidbrooke, Oliver has been active across Greenwich, in an effort not just to alter the diets of nearly 30,000 schoolchildren, but to show that providing decent school food on a tiny budget is not impossible. He started with the idea that school food is awful. In 2003 he visited a township* outside Johannesburg, South Africa, where the kids and the schools have almost nothing compared with their English counterparts. Yet he found that the [39] of school food there was better than in 95% of schools in England. So he wanted to do something about it. The problem was that he had no clear [40]. Now he does.

The first time Oliver's efforts appeared on the menu, they remained almost entirely untouched. As he said, "Most of the kids were already let down by their parents. What I mean is, they had never seen real vegetables—leeks or cabbages for example—let alone eaten any. So you had to get real clever about the way

you served them. You'd hide them in the pizza topping, or pulp them into a vegetable stock so that the kids got the goodness without realizing it."

There were times when Oliver felt like giving up. "When we first abandoned the processed food, most of the kids abandoned us. The dining-room was almost empty for days," says Oliver. But surprisingly the [41] improved. It was only during a spell of really nasty weather, when the kids could not be bothered to go elsewhere, that they came to take a second look at the new food. Most were disappointed that there were no fried potatoes, but hunger prevailed. Much to Oliver's delight, the stuffed chilies disappeared within twenty minutes. Processed food became history. Oliver's success proves that students' poor eating habits can be changed. As he remarked, "Let's face it: you'll never get them to eat a single decent meal if fried potatoes are an option."

School food is not an issue that is going to go away and Oliver will stick with it. It has become a campaign, rather than a TV series. His view is simple: "We've got to make a difference. Just because US and German kids eat junk food in school doesn't mean ours have to." Oliver is right. Budget limits are no excuse for poor food. I myself met a homeless man in Chelsea recently who saves his money to buy the best bread he can. So [42] if he can eat well, anyone can. The government's position seems to be that while they know there is a problem, they do not quite know what to do about it. But the answer is quite simple: ban junk food in schools.

* 南アフリカにおける黒人居住区

Questions

[39] – [41] Which words would most suitably fill the blank spaces labelled [39], [40], and [41]? Choose from among the four words listed below. Use a single word only once. Write the correct answers in the boxes marked (39), (40), and (41) on the answer sheet.

1. standard 2. nutrition 3. situation 4. proposal

[42] Which one word in the underlined sentence [42] would be spoken with the most stress? Write the correct answer in the box marked (42) on the answer sheet.

1. if 2. he 3. can 4. eat 5. well

[43] Which of the following most accurately explains why Jamie Oliver originally became involved with school lunches? Write the correct answer in the box marked (43) on the answer sheet.

1. He thought that it was impossible to supply healthy and appetizing school lunches on a tiny budget.
2. He could not accept that poor kids in Johannesburg might be better fed than those back home.
3. He wanted to take a campaign from a single school and show that it could work across an entire district of London.
4. He wanted to show the parents of English children how to use fried potatoes to win over their kids.

Questions on Speakers A, B, and C

Given the viewpoints expressed in the passages, which (if any) of the speakers would agree with statements [44] and [45]? Write the correct answers in the boxes marked (44) and (45) on the answer sheet.

Speaker A only: →	1
Speaker B only: →	2
Speaker C only: →	3
Speakers A & B: →	4
Speakers A & C: →	5
Speakers B & C: →	6
Speakers A, B & C: →	7
None of the speakers: →	8

[44] Adults should respect children's own common sense and natural instincts with regard to the food choices they make for themselves.

[45] Cheap food is not necessarily bad food.

[46] Which of the following five summaries reflects the passages most accurately? Write the correct answer in the box marked (46) on the answer sheet.

1. Speaker A claims that governments should not control what is to be eaten by students at school, but instead, they should guarantee that schools provide suitable guidance about healthy foods and exercise. Speaker B claims that both schools and parents should get involved in controlling what is to be eaten by young people. Speaker C claims that parents themselves should take full responsibility for serving healthy food.
2. Speaker A claims that governments should control what is to be eaten by students at school, guaranteeing that schools provide suitable education about healthy foods and exercise. Speaker B claims that both schools and parents should get involved in choosing what is to be eaten by young people. Speaker C claims that schools cannot take full responsibility for serving healthy food.
3. Speaker A claims that governments should not get involved in providing food education, either at the state level or at the school level. Speaker B claims that neither parents nor schools should be involved in restricting food choices at schools. Speaker C argues that, on their limited budgets, schools simply cannot create healthy lunches for their students.
4. Speaker A claims that governments should not control what is to be eaten by students at school, but that they should instead guarantee that schools provide suitable guidance about healthy foods and exercise. Speaker B claims that both schools and parents should get involved in deciding what is eaten by young people. Speaker C claims that schools can and should be serving healthy food.
5. Speaker A claims that governments should not control what is to be eaten by students at school, but instead, they should guarantee that schools provide suitable education about healthy foods and exercise. Speaker B claims that either schools or parents should get involved in controlling what is to be eaten by young people. Speaker C claims that schools themselves should take full responsibility for serving healthy food.

Ⅲ. ガメラ (Gamela) は、サイアナム (Sianam) という架空のアジアの国にある港町です。サイアナムは、人口 800 万人の国ですが、とても貧しい国です。国の経済は、主に、観光業で成り立っています。ガメラは、サイアナムで最も有名な観光名所を持つ人口 25 万人の古い町です。ところが、二週間前に、その町を悲劇が襲ったのです。大洪水が起こり、その町の大部分が人の住めない状態になってしまい、貧困地区の全ての家が全壊してしまいました。更に、今、伝染病が流行しています。

現在、サイアナム政府では、災害対策案の選択肢として、次ページの三つの案 (A, B, C) を検討しています。どの案にもそれぞれ長所と短所があり、どの案も採用可能です。

問題：「あなたがどの案を支持するかを英文で論理的に述べなさい。」

注意事項：1. 長さは、100 語以上にしなさい。

2. あなたが支持する案に関して、必ず長所と短所に言及しなさい。更に、あなた自身が考えたその案に関する長所と短所を加えてもかまいません。
3. あなたが支持しない他の案との比較をする必要はありません。
4. 箇条書きではなく、接続詞や副詞を使って一貫性のある文章にまとめなさい。
5. 文法に注意して書きなさい。
6. 尚、それぞれの案に付してある日本語は、直訳ではなく、あくまでも参考のための意識です。

A. Sianam-led Reconstruction Program(独自の復興計画)

長所 : job creation (雇用創出)

vital infrastructure upgrade (重要なインフラの改善)

nationwide participation (全国規模の参加)

conversion of slum housing (貧困地区の再開発)

短所 : huge costs (莫大な経費)

property disputes (土地をめぐる争い)

long completion time (完了までに時間が掛かる)

ignores social welfare needs (福利厚生の為の援助が無い)

B. Humanitarian Aid Program (人道支援計画)

長所 : priority on people (人間を優先)

focus on medical treatment (医療の充実)

manageable costs (経費を調整できる)

immediate effects (即効性が高い)

短所 : temporary measure (暫定的な対応)

difficulty of fair distribution of aid (公平な援助の分配が困難)

ruined town remains dangerous (廃墟となった町が依然として危険な状態)

no economic stimulus (経済活性化の要因が無い)

C. International Appeal (国際援助の要請)

長所 : time to assess actual damage (被害の実態を調査する時間がある)

minimal cost to government (政府の支出が最小限に収まる)

worldwide publicity for Sianam's problems (国内情勢が国際的に報道される)

new and creative input from abroad (諸外国からの多様な参考意見)

短所 : abandonment of government responsibility (政府の責任放棄)

no guarantee of securing enough aid (援助が十分に得られる保証が無い)

social unrest among survivors (生存者間における社会不安)

large numbers of refugees (難民が大量に発生する)