

2023年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期2年の課程入学試験

(春期・一般選抜) 問題

外国語 英語

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

成
績

2023年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期2年の課程入学試験

(春期・一般選抜) 問題

外国語(英語)

問題Ⅰと問題Ⅱについて日本語で解答しなさい。ただし、外国人受験者にかぎり問題Ⅱの代わりに問題Ⅲを選択できます。

Ⅰ 以下の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

(1)English is at the core of virtually all major social trends and technological and business developments, from the rise of the urban middle classes and associated cultures of leisure activities and consumption, the growing use of the internet and other forms of communication systems, to the internationalisation of business and financial institutions. Education policies in all European countries have responded to this demand, often urged on by parental pressure, by giving English prominence over all other foreign languages on the school curriculum: English is most frequently the first foreign language children learn at school, increasingly it is introduced at primary level and it is very often studied throughout secondary education. In a number of EU countries, bilingual programmes with English as a medium of instruction are offered at school level. Similarly, a growing number of universities use English on all manner of postgraduate programmes and also on certain undergraduate courses of study, for instance in business and communication studies, and in medicine and the natural sciences.

English is acquired in a variety of settings and from many different sources that may use native or non-native-speaker models. Apart from regular schooling and courses for adult learners offered by mainstream and private institutions, many learners take the opportunity of visiting an English-speaking country, often for study purposes, and make use of language resources easily accessible in the media. (2)In many of the smaller European countries which do not dub foreign films and entertainment programmes, English is prominent on national television channels as well as through cable television, it figures in popular culture and sport and it is highly visible in public spaces in the form of publicity and advertising. Thus, learners of English benefit from non-formal, extra-curricular contact with the language they are acquiring, and their learning is enhanced by the association of English with high status, instrumental reward and usefulness as a means of international communication. As

regards language teaching, it is clear that English enjoys advantages that no other foreign language can compete with and, for many learners, acquiring English goes far beyond what was traditionally seen as foreign language learning. (3)Naturally, the learning outcomes vary considerably, and only those who continue to use the language on a regular basis beyond school can be classed as multilinguals.

The European Union as an institution has an explicit language policy that specifies the status and use of the languages of its member states. French and English are the two main working languages and thus a prerequisite for EU employees; permanent staff at the Commission tend to use French, while English is used by delegates from member states attending meetings. (4)It has gained considerable ground as a result of several rounds of expansion of the Union, not so much because of political decisions but simply because members prefer to use English.

The EU and the Council of Europe are committed to multilingualism and language diversity, goals that are to be achieved through the promotion of teaching more than one language in schools and continued support for minority languages. Thus, the study of more than one foreign language is pursued by two-thirds of EU upper secondary education students: in some of these countries, such as the Baltic States, Finland and the Scandinavian countries, Slovakia and Slovenia, the figure is much higher. In contrast, the equivalent figures for the UK show that over half of upper secondary school students were not studying any foreign language at all.

It should be mentioned that in many European countries there exists a long tradition of learning languages for their instrumental as well as their intrinsic cultural value. This is borne out by (5)the results of a Eurostat survey published in 2010, in which almost a third of adult EU citizens declared that they spoke at least two foreign languages. On the other hand, the same survey also showed that a third of those questioned did not speak any other language. This suggests that multilingualism in Europe has a close link with levels of education, degree of social mobility and cultural openness; it is not a general feature of society or of whole communities.

—from Anat Stavans and Charlotte Hoffmann, *Multilingualism*.

設問1 下線部(1)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問2 下線部(2)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問3 下線部(3)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問4 下線部(4)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問5 下線部(5)の具体的な内容について、本文の記述に沿って、日本語で説明しなさい。

II 以下の英文を読んで設問に日本語で答えなさい。

As early as the 1970s, a relationship was proposed between the humanlikeness of robots and feelings of comfort with them.

(1)A positive relationship was proposed, but it had a steep dip in comfort when robots looked almost but not perfectly human (Mori 1970, Mori et al. 2012). This dip is called the uncanny valley and explains feelings of discomfort and unease toward close-to-human robots. These feelings can occur when there is something fundamentally inhuman about a robot despite an otherwise close resemblance. For example, a robot may look humanlike but move in an odd manner or have a hand that is cold and lacks a bonelike structure within (Cabibihan et al. 2015). Mori's original theory likens the feeling of the uncanny valley to the way people feel about interacting with a dead body.

There are mixed findings concerning both the existence of the uncanny valley and its explanations (MacDorman & Chattopadhyay 2016). Some of the variability between studies may be due to differences in the terms used to measure these feelings – including familiarity, comfort, threat, likability, similarity, unease, uncanniness, and eeriness. This is partly because the original paper was in Japanese and there is no direct translation into English. (2)The variation in the types of robot used has also created differences between studies. Robots can vary in many aspects of appearance; furthermore, sometimes only the face is used, whereas other times the whole body is shown.

Some evidence supports the existence of the uncanny valley, with a demonstrated drop in familiarity and a rise in eeriness in the middle of a series of images morphed from a robot face to a human (MacDorman & Ishiguro 2006). However, other work has found people like realistic humanlike robots and found no evidence for a dip in feelings of comfort in the middle of a continuum of faces morphed from cartoonlike to realistic (Hanson et al. 2005). Similarly, there was no evidence for a dip in familiarity or rise in eeriness when a range of robots that varied in humanlikeness were shown in videos (MacDorman 2006).

Factors other than humanlikeness may contribute to robots falling into the uncanny valley. (3)Robots rated equal on humanlikeness were rated differently in strangeness or familiarity, suggesting other variables contribute to these perceptions (MacDorman 2006). Other work supports this conclusion, with a range of design features such as height, bulk, and bipedal form adding to or subtracting from humanlikeness and contributing to the perceived threat or likability of robots (Rosenthal-von der Pütten & Krämer 2014). A study of what makes people appear creepy also found that multiple factors of appearance and behavior contributed to feelings of threat, including unkempt hair, odd dress, and unpredictable behavior (McAndrew & Koehnke 2016). Certain occupations were rated as creepier than others, including clowns, who have distorted human appearance, and taxidermists and funeral directors, who are associated with death.

(4)In terms of theory, ratings of unease toward not-quite-humanlike robots may be explained by evolutionary theory because it could be beneficial to feel revulsion as a defense mechanism to protect against infection from diseased or deceased bodies.

Unease toward robots could alternatively be caused by category uncertainty (i.e., wondering whether it is human or not). A similar theory, realism inconsistency, claims that human and nonhuman features are combined in a robot, creating an uncanny effect. Supporting this theory, one study found that a mixture of real and artificial features (e.g., eyes, eyelashes, mouth) in the same face created eeriness to a greater extent than a slow morphing from real to computer animated across all facial features together (MacDorman & Chattopadhyay 2016). Furthermore, a humanlike face with silver skin and empty-looking eyes was rated more eerie than the same face with humanlike skin and eyes (Broadbent et al. 2013). The eyes appear to be particularly important when judging whether a face is alive or not (Looser & Wheatley 2010). Together, this work suggests that conflicting cues are an important component in uncanniness as they may violate our expectations of humans.

The violation of perceptual expectations may occur when a robot looks like but does not act like a human. Video clips of an android (human appearance and mechanical action), a human (human appearance and human action), and a more mechanical robot (mechanical appearance and mechanical action) performing actions were shown to 20 people in a fMRI machine (Saygin et al. 2012). The results suggested greater brain activity in the bilateral anterior intraparietal sulcus (an important part of the action perception system) when viewing the android than when viewing the human and the mechanical robot. (5)This provides support for the predictive coding framework of neural processing, in which brain activity is higher when observed behavior is mismatched with expectations. That is, people expect a human to walk in a humanlike way, so if the android that looks humanlike walks in a mechanical way it violates our expectations, resulting in large feedback error signals in the brain (MacDorman & Chattopadhyay 2016). The study by Saygin and colleagues (2012) also illustrates that robots can be used to study human perceptions of movement.

—from Elizabeth Broadbent, “Interactions With Robots: The Truths We Reveal About Ourselves.”

設問1 下線部 (1) では何と何との関係 (relationship) を論じているのか解説を加えたうえで、日本語に訳しなさい。

設問2 下線部(2)で述べられていることを、日本語で具体的に説明しなさい。

設問3 下線部(3)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問4 下線部(4)を日本語に訳しなさい。

設問5 下線部(5)を日本語に訳しなさい。

