

# 令和6年度入学試験問題

## 外国語

### 英語

150点満点

《配点は、一般選抜学生募集要項に記載のとおり。》

#### (注意)

1. 問題冊子および解答冊子は監督者の指示があるまで開かないこと。
2. 問題冊子は表紙のほかに6ページある。
3. 問題は全部で3題ある(1～6ページ)。
4. 試験開始後、解答冊子の表紙所定欄に学部名・受験番号・氏名をはっきり記入すること。表紙には、これら以外のことを書いてはならない。
5. 解答は、すべて解答冊子の指定された箇所に入力し、解答欄におさめること。
6. 解答に関係のないことを書いた答案は無効にすることがある。
7. 解答冊子は、どのページも切り離してはならない。
8. 問題冊子は持ち帰ってもよいが、解答冊子は持ち帰ってはならない。





I 次の文章を読み、設問(1)~(3)に答えなさい。

(50点)

The creativity literature tells us that, even though we're just now beginning to appreciate the importance of creativity in everyday life, it is a topic pondered by poets and philosophers since time immemorial. In fact, "creativity" has only been a regular part of our vocabulary since the middle of the twentieth century. Its first known written occurrence was in 1875, making it an infant as far as words go. <sup>(a)</sup> "Creativeness" goes back a bit further, and was more common than creativity until about 1940, but both were used rarely and in an inconsistent kind of way. Strikingly, before about 1950 there were approximately zero articles, books, essays, classes, encyclopedia entries, or anything of the sort dealing explicitly with the subject of "creativity." (The earliest dictionary entry I found was from 1966.) It is not, it turns out, in Plato or Aristotle (even in translation). It's not in Kant (ditto). It's not in Wordsworth or Shelley, or in the Americans Emerson, William James, or John Dewey. As the intellectual historian Paul Oskar Kristeller finds, creativity, though we tend to assume it is a timeless concept, is a term with "poor philosophical and historical credentials." Yet, just around the end of World War II, the use of creativity shot upward — the Big Bang of creativity.

When I tell people the term "creativity" is new, I invariably get the question, "what did we call it before?" And my response, annoying but sincere, is always "what do you mean by 'it'?" There are two assumptions behind the first question, both correct. The first is that words and concepts are not the same thing; the arrival or popularization of a new word does not necessarily mean the arrival of a totally new concept. The senior citizen and the old person, for example, are two different eras' ways for describing the same person — one who is advanced in age. The second assumption is that people have always been talking about the kind of stuff we talk about when we talk about creativity — in the way that people have always talked about old

age. It's not totally wrong to say that creativity is, or at least can be in certain instances, a new term for old concepts, such as imagination, inspiration, fantasy, genius, originality, and even phrases like creative imagination and creative power, which long predated creativity itself.

Yet the modern concept of creativity does not perfectly trace back to any one of these older words. Ingenuity or ( 才 ) is too utilitarian; it lacks the artsy vibe. Creativity may invoke monumental achievements in art and science, but as a synonym the term ( 才 ) somehow feels too exclusive and grandiose, while ( 才 ) is a little too pedestrian, something you might attribute to a pig that finds its way out of its pen. Originality hits closer to the mark, but it's somehow not as soulful — nobody ever says originality is the key to a fulfilling life. ( 才 ), perhaps the term most often used interchangeably with creativity, lacks a sense of productivity. Like fantasy, it doesn't have to leave your head, and it can be utterly preposterous. The prevailing idea among creativity experts is that creativity is the “ability to produce something new and useful.” (That phrasing is taken — not coincidentally — from US patent law.) The term “creativity,” in other words, allows us to think and say things previous terms don't. It is not a new word for old ideas but a way of expressing thoughts that were previously inexpressible. When people in the postwar era increasingly chose the word “creativity,” then, they were subtly distinguishing their meaning from those other, almost universally older concepts. The term may not be precise, but it is vague in precise and meaningful ways. Just as light can be both particle and wave, creativity somehow manages to exist as simultaneously mental and material, playful and practical, artsy and technological, exceptional and pedestrian. This contradictory constellation of meanings and connotations, more than any one definition or theory, is what explains its appeal in postwar America, in which the balance between those very things seemed gravely at stake. The slipperiness was a feature, not a bug.

(1) 下線部(a)を和訳しなさい。ただし, **creativeness** と **creativity** は訳さずに英語のまま表記すること。

(2) 空欄(ア)～(エ)に入る最も適切な名詞を以下の中から選び, 解答欄に番号を記入しなさい。同じ語は一度しか使用してはならない。なお, 本文中では大文字で始まる語も, 選択肢では全て小文字になっている。

- ① **cleverness**                      ② **fantasy**                      ③ **genius**  
④ **imagination**                    ⑤ **inventiveness**

(3) 下線部(b)を和訳しなさい。ただし, **creativity** は訳さずに英語のまま表記すること。

**II**

次の文章を読み、設問(1)~(4)に答えなさい。

(75点)

You know what you believe. You know the set of ideologies and beliefs that you hold. Who else out there holds the same beliefs and shares the same ideological worldview? In marketing, we call this segmentation and targeting. Segmentation is the act of taking a heterogeneous group of people, where everyone is different, and putting them in homogeneous-like clusters, where everyone is more alike than they are different. When we segment a population of people, we divide them into groups based on different preferences and attributes so that we can serve them with the best products and marketing messages that will influence them to adopt certain behaviors. That is, after all, the core function of marketing: influencing behavioral adoption. Once the population has been divided into these segments, marketers then select the segments to which they will offer their products. This is the act of targeting. We target a segment (or a number of segments) to pursue that we believe will<sup>(a)</sup> most likely adopt a desired behavior — buy, vote, watch, subscribe, attend, etc. Although our product may potentially be useful to everyone, we focus our efforts on the people with the highest propensity to move. Considering the influence that culture has on our behavior, due to the social pressures of our tribes and our pursuit of identity congruence, tribes present themselves as the most compelling segment to target.

This perspective calls for a strong consideration if for no other reason than the fact that tribes are real. They're made up of real people, and people use them to communicate who they are and demarcate how they fit in the world. Segments, on the other hand, are not real. They are a construct that marketers<sup>(b)</sup> create where people are placed into homogeneous-like groups based on a rough substitute that helps us identify who they are and predict what they are likely to do. Segments are clean and neat. But real people are complex and

messy. As the astrophysicist Neil deGrasse Tyson once tweeted, “In science, when human behavior enters the equation, things go nonlinear. That’s why Physics is easy and Sociology is hard.” Real people don’t fit into neat little boxes, though we try our best to put them there. <sup>(c)</sup>

Marketers aren’t the only ones guilty of this; we all do it. We put people in boxes to simplify the complexity of the world so that it’s easier to make sense of it — not for accuracy but for efficiency. Here’s an example. Meet my friend Deborah. Deborah drives a minivan. Does Deborah have kids? Do her kids play a sport? What sport do they play? And where does Deborah live? As you read those questions, you likely draw your answers fairly quickly. You probably thought, Deborah drives a minivan, so she must have kids, who play soccer, and they all live in a cul-de-sac. Sounds about right, right? Well, here’s the thing. I gave you one data point about Deborah (she drives a minivan), and you mapped out her entire life. This is what we do — with great cognitive fluidity, I might add. We put people in boxes based on the shortcut characteristics that we assign to people’s identity. <sup>(d)</sup>

- (1) 下線部(a)を和訳しなさい。
- (2) 下線部(b)を和訳しなさい。
- (3) 下線部(c)の理由について、本文にはない具体例を挙げながら、80語以上100語以内の英語で説明しなさい。解答欄の各下線の上に単語1語を記入すること。カンマ(,)等の記号は、その直前の語と同じ下線に含めることとし、1語と数えない。短縮形(例: don’t)は1語と数える。
- (4) 下線部(d)を和訳しなさい。



Ⅲ 次の文章を英訳しなさい。

(25 点)

かつての自分の無知と愚かさを恥じることはよくあるが、それは同時に、未熟な自分に気づいた分だけ成長したことをも示しているのだろう。逆説的だが、自分の無知を悟ったときにこそ、今日の私は昨日の私よりも賢くなっていると言えるのだ。まだまだ知らない世界があることを知る、きっとこれが学ぶということであり、その営みには終わりが無いのだろう。

問題は、このページで終わりである。













