

次の英文を読み、下記の設問に答えよ。

*Fred stops by his colleague Alice's office to make a request.*

**Alice:** Hi, Fred. What's up?

**Fred:** Hi, Alice. I'm hoping you can help me out with something. I inadvertently scheduled meetings with two companies at the same time.

**Alice:** ( 1 ) How did that happen?

**Fred:** Well, from my point of view, it's not completely my fault. QRS Company emailed me several weeks ago, asking for some potential dates we could meet this month. I contacted them immediately with some possibilities but then 5分前まで何も聞いていませんでした。<sup>(A)</sup>

**Alice:** Let me guess. The minute you made the other appointment, they contacted you asking for the exact same time slot, right?

**Fred:** ( 2 ) I just set up a meeting with RightSmart, and I'd feel like an idiot immediately asking them to reschedule it.

**Alice:** ( 3 ) But can't you just tell QRS that [ X ]?

**Fred:** Well, I could, but the meeting would be really beneficial for our side, and I'm afraid if I back out, they may simply give up on the idea of meeting.

**Alice:** That's a valid concern. But do you really think it is a good business relationship to be at their beck and call?<sup>(1)</sup>

**Fred:** ( 4 ) I shouldn't have asked you. I'll figure it out on my own.

**Alice:** Hang on. I'll help you, of course, provided I'm free. I wasn't trying to give you a hard time. I just wanted to encourage you not to bend over backwards<sup>(2)</sup> for this opportunity. Tell me what I can do.

**Fred:** Well, the date in question is March 8, at 10:00 a.m. I'd like to take the meeting with QRS, so I was wondering if you could step in for<sup>(3)</sup> me in the meeting with RightSmart. I know you've had some dealings with them before.

**Alice:** Hold on. Let me check my schedule. Yeah, it should be fine. I have another commitment from 11:30 but it'll be over by then, right?

**Fred:** Oh, sure. The RightSmart meeting should take 45 minutes tops. Basically, it's a courtesy call. They've got a couple of new employees they'd like to introduce to us.

**Alice:** OK, then. Why don't you email them to let them know I'll be handling the meeting and cc me on it?

**Fred:** ( 5 ) Thanks, Alice. You've saved me from some embarrassment.

(Original text)

設問 1. 空所(1)~(5)を埋めるのにもっとも適当なものを(a)~(j)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。ただし、各選択肢は一度しか使えない。

- (a) Count me in.
- (b) Did you really?
- (c) Don't mention it.
- (d) Exactly.
- (e) I can't say for sure.
- (f) I get that.
- (g) I made it up.
- (h) Never mind.
- (i) Sure thing.
- (j) Who else?

設問 2. 下線部(イ)～(ハ)の意味にもっとも近いものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |     |                         |                               |
|-----|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| (イ) | (a) be always at fault  | (b) be always in a rush       |
|     | (c) be always on hand   | (d) be always out on a limb   |
| (ロ) | (a) go to great lengths | (b) let your guard down       |
|     | (c) move out of the way | (d) switch to a new direction |
| (ハ) | (a) call in for         | (b) stand up for              |
|     | (c) take over for       | (d) watch out for             |

設問 3. 空所【X】を埋めるために、〔 〕内の語を適切に並べ替えて、記述解答用紙の所定欄に書け。ただし、〔 〕の中には足りない語が 1 語あるので、それを補って解答すること。

[ are / at / available / no / that / time / you ]

設問 4. 下線部(A)の日本語の英訳を完成させるために、適語を記述解答用紙の所定欄に書け。ただし、hear を適切な形で用いて全体を 7 語で完成させること。そのうち最初の 1 語は与えられている。

|| 次の英文を読み、下記の設問に答えよ。

Twenty-five years ago, on Dec. 3, 1997, the inventor of the World Wide Web, Tim Berners-Lee, gave a talk at the W3C meeting in London. His speech was notable for its review of the early web, its initial development, and his thoughts about the future of the web.

One idea Berners-Lee posited in his talk—an idea he had been thinking about for more than a year—was undeniably brilliant. He suggested that every browser be equipped with what he called the “Oh, Yeah?” button. The idea was that we all would start building trust through signed metadata as we moved around the web. In a sense, our normal web browsing would create a gigantic accumulation of crowd-sourced credibility. “When we have this, we will be able to ask the computer not just for information, but why we should believe it,” he said.

Imagine an “Oh, yeah?” button on your browser. There you are looking at a fantastic deal that can be yours just for the entry of a credit card number and the click of a button. *Oh, yeah?*, you think. You press the “Oh, yeah?” button. You are asking your browser why you should believe it. It, in turn, can challenge the server to provide some credentials: perhaps, a signature for the document or a list of documents. Those documents will be signed. Your browser rummages through with the server, looking for a way to convince you that the page is trustworthy for a purchase. Maybe it will come up with an endorsement from a magazine, which in turn has been endorsed by a friend. Maybe it will come up with an endorsement by the seller’s bank, which has in turn an endorsement from your bank. Maybe it won’t find any reason for you to actually believe what you are reading at all.

The “Oh, Yeah?” button, it should be noted, was not truly about verifying information or locating “truth.” Berners-Lee wasn’t suggesting that ontological certitude would arise from the web mob’s ranking of websites that distributed the most accurate information. Rather, the “Oh, Yeah?” button would suggest a more paradigmatic truth—that is, 【 あ 】 on the web was considered generally in the realm of credible by most people.

The “Oh, Yeah?” button represented an early warning that we’d all need to be more skeptical in cyberspace in the future. It was also an admission that the web, in the future, would likely be employed to fool us with some regularity. Politicians, salespeople, criminals, miscreants, and liars would abound, and we’d need an easy way to counter them in our daily perusal of information.

Had it come to pass, so many ills that plague the web and social media today—think: “fake news” accusations, disinformation campaigns, and catfishing—could have been addressed from the start.

Yet, ultimately, the “Oh, Yeah?” button never got installed on our browsers. Too many factors conspired against it. In Berners-Lee’s original example, he noted its direct challenge to advertising. As <sup>(4)</sup>the web grew more and more commercial, the idea that a simple click of a button might reveal paradigmatic truth about any product’s advertised claims represented an almost existential threat to its usefulness as a selling vehicle. The “Oh, Yeah?” button might also have resulted in increased tension and argumentation as the web evolved toward social media. Imagine the anger that would be ignited if you let your crazy uncle know what your browser’s “Oh, Yeah?” button informed you about his latest Facebook conspiracy.

The “Oh, Yeah?” button, for all its admirable skepticism, also contained an important flaw that would only be revealed in the algorithmic age. Because each of our browsers would independently accumulate the signed metadata based on our distinct web usage, each of our “Oh, Yeah?” buttons would present us with distinct, unique paradigmatic truths. Just as no two social media feeds are completely identical, it’s likely no two “Oh, Yeah?” buttons would return identical findings. Berners-Lee, back in 1997, was too optimistic about the possibility of accumulating and distributing a shared reality in the future. We know now that we prefer social media algorithms channeling us into worlds where our biases and beliefs require no skepticism. Why would anybody want to click an “Oh, Yeah?” button to check the hilarious political meme reconfirming exactly what they already know to be true? Why spoil the fun?

In hindsight, we ultimately traded away the “Oh, Yeah?” button for the “Like” button. And that was a huge mistake.

(Adapted from slate.com, December 3, 2022)

設問 1. 下線部(1)～(5)の意味にもっとも近いものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |     |                        |                |                 |                  |
|-----|------------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| (1) | (a) assumption         | (b) collection | (c) rejection   | (d) verification |
| (2) | (a) an acknowledgement |                | (b) a discovery |                  |
|     | (c) a lament           |                | (d) an irony    |                  |
| (3) | (a) kill               | (b) permeate   | (c) surround    | (d) trouble      |
| (4) | (a) competed           | (b) planned    | (c) plotted     | (d) worked       |
| (5) | (a) directing          | (b) forcing    | (c) locking     | (d) turning      |

設問 2. 次の1.～3.について、本文の内容に合うものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

1. Which of the following describes the main function of Berners-Lee’s “Oh, Yeah?” button?
  - (a) an endorsement of a bank document
  - (b) a request for proof of a page’s trustworthiness
  - (c) a summary of a product’s features
  - (d) a warning to be skeptical of a seller
2. Which of the following best describes the endorsement system?
  - (a) confidential
  - (b) credible
  - (c) layered
  - (d) timely
3. Which of the following is NOT mentioned as a reason the “Oh, Yeah?” button did not become a reality?
  - (a) Algorithms lead to a reduced desire to authenticate.
  - (b) Authentication results could lead to friction among social media users.
  - (c) Checking credibility interferes with commercial aims.
  - (d) Users prefer to take a humorous attitude toward claims they find unlikely.

設問3. 空所【あ】を埋めるために、〔 〕内のすべての語を適切に並べ替えて、記述解答用紙の所定欄に書け。ただし、三番目の語は与えられている。

[ a / of / read / reasonable / something / whether / you ]

設問4. 本文のタイトルとしてもっとも適当なものを(a)~(d)から一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- (a) “Oh, Yeah?” Could Solve the Internet’s Problems
- (b) The Button That Could Have Changed the Internet
- (c) There’s an Easy Way to Check a Source
- (d) Why People Have Stopped Being Skeptical

||| 次の英文を読み、下記の設問に答えよ。

Owning or operating a superyacht is probably the most harmful thing an individual can do to the climate. If we’re serious about avoiding climate chaos, we need to tax, or at the very least shame, these resource-hoarding behemoths out of existence. In fact, taking on the carbon aristocracy, and their most emissions-intensive modes of travel and leisure, may be the best chance we have to boost our collective “climate morale” and increase our appetite for personal sacrifice—from individual behavior changes to sweeping policy mandates.

On an individual basis, the superrich pollute far more than the rest of us, and travel is one of the biggest parts of that ( i ). Take, for instance, Rising Sun, the 454-foot, 82-room megaship owned by the DreamWorks co-founder David Geffen. According to a 2021 analysis in the journal *Sustainability*, the diesel fuel powering Mr. Geffen’s boating habit spews<sup>(1)</sup> an estimated 16,320 tons of carbon-dioxide-equivalent gases into the atmosphere annually, almost 800 times what the average American generates in a year.

And that’s just a single ship. Worldwide, more than 5,500 private vessels clock in<sup>(2)</sup> about 100 feet or longer, the size at which a yacht becomes a superyacht. This fleet pollutes as much as entire nations: The 300 biggest boats alone emit 315,000 tons of carbon dioxide each year, based on their likely ( ii )—about as much as Burundi’s more than 10 million inhabitants.

Then there are the private jets, which make up a much higher overall contribution to climate change. Private aviation added 37 million tons of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere in 2016, which rivals the annual emissions of Hong Kong or Ireland. (Private plane use has ( iii ) since then, so today’s number is likely higher.)

You’re probably thinking: But isn’t that a drop in the bucket compared to the thousands of coal plants around the world spewing carbon? It’s a common sentiment; last year, Christophe Béchu, France’s minister of the environment, dismissed calls to regulate yachts and chartered flights as “le buzz”—flashy, populist solutions that get people amped up but ultimately only fiddle<sup>(3)</sup> at the margins of climate change.

But this misses a much more important point. Research<sup>(3)</sup> in economics and psychology suggests humans are willing to behave altruistically—but only when they believe everyone is being asked to contribute. People “stop cooperating when they see that some are not doing their part,” as the cognitive scientists Nicolas Baumard and Coralie Chevallier wrote last year in *Le Monde*.

In that sense, superpolluting yachts and jets don’t just worsen climate change; they lessen the chance that we will work together to fix it. Why bother, when the luxury goods mogul Bernard Arnault is cruising around on the Symphony, a \$150 million, 333-foot superyacht?

“If some people are allowed to emit 10 times as much carbon for their comfort,” Mr. Baumard and Ms. Chevallier asked, “then why restrict your meat consumption, turn down your thermostat or limit your purchases of new products?”

Whether we're talking about voluntary changes (insulating our attics and taking public transit) or mandated ones (tolerating a wind farm on the horizon or saying goodbye to a lush lawn), the climate fight hinges to some extent on our willingness to participate. When the ultrarich are given a free pass, we lose faith in the value of that sacrifice.

Taxes aimed at superyachts and private jets would take some of the sting out of these conversations, helping to improve everybody's "climate morale," a term coined by Georgetown Law professor Brian Galle. But [ A ] isn't likely to change the behavior of the billionaires who buy them. Instead, we can impose new *social* costs through good, old-fashioned shaming.

Last June, @CelebJets—a Twitter account that tracked the flights of well-known figures using public data, then calculated their carbon emissions for all to see—revealed that the influencer Kylie Jenner took a 17-minute flight between two regional airports in California. "kylie jenner is out here taking 3 minute flights with her private jet, but I'm the one who has to use paper straws," one Twitter user wrote.

There's a lesson here: Massively disproportionate per capita emissions get people angry. And they should. When billionaires squander our shared supply of resources on ridiculous boats or cushy chartered flights, it shortens the <sup>(4)</sup>span of time available for the rest of us before the effects of warming become truly devastating. In this ( iv ), superyachts and private planes start to look less like extravagance and more like theft.

Change can happen—and quickly. French officials are exploring curbing private plane travel. And just last week—after sustained pressure from activists—Schiphol Airport in Amsterdam announced it would ban private jets as a climate-saving measure.

Even in the United States, carbon shaming can have outsized impact. Richard Aboulafia, who's been an aviation industry consultant and analyst for 35 years, says that cleaner, greener aviation, from all-electric city hoppers to a new class of sustainable fuels, is already on the horizon for short flights. Private aviation's high-net-worth customers just need more incentive to adopt these new technologies. Ultimately, he says, it's only our vigilance and pressure that will speed these changes along.

There's a similar opportunity with superyachts. Just look at Koru, Jeff Bezos's newly built 416-foot megaship, a three-masted schooner that can reportedly cross the Atlantic on wind power alone. It's a start.

Even small victories challenge the standard narrative around climate change. We can say no to the idea of limitless plunder, of unjustifiable overconsumption. We can say no to the billionaires' toys.

(Adapted from nytimes.com, April 10, 2023)

設問 1. 下線部(1)～(4)の意味にもっとも近いものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |     |                       |                    |                           |                      |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|
| (1) | (a) absorbs           | (b) accounts for   | (c) corresponds to        | (d) emits            |
| (2) | (a) count             | (b) measure        | (c) regulate              | (d) surpass          |
| (3) | (a) aimlessly operate | (b) barely survive | (c) intentionally satisfy | (d) partially thrive |
| (4) | (a) ensure            | (b) maximize       | (c) require               | (d) waste            |

設問 2. 空所(i)～(iv)を埋めるのもっとも適当なものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |       |                  |                   |                 |            |
|-------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------|
| (i)   | (a) concept      | (b) footprint     | (c) transport   | (d) vessel |
| (ii)  | (a) budget       | (b) circumference | (c) competition | (d) usage  |
| (iii) | (a) bottomed out | (b) leveled off   | (c) plummeted   | (d) surged |
| (iv)  | (a) field        | (b) form          | (c) light       | (d) turn   |

設問3. 下線部(あ)の内容にもっとも近いものを(a)~(e)から一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- (a) daily efforts prioritizing interests beyond oneself
- (b) deliberate actions aimed at enhancing one's life circumstances
- (c) painstaking attempts to save one's assets
- (d) perpetual collective endeavors to protect ports
- (e) serious undertakings to improve one's capacity for resilience

設問4. 空所【A】を埋めるために、〔 〕内の語を適切に並べ替えて、記述解答用紙の所定欄に書け。ただし、〔 〕の中には不要な語が2語含まれている。

[ a / bit / by / costly / making / more / overgrown / sustainable / these / toys ]

設問5. 次の1.~3.について、本文の内容に合うものを(a)~(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

1. The French minister of the environment claimed that controlling the use of private yachts and jets would be
  - (a) a controversial solution inviting vigorous opposition from people.
  - (b) an empty gesture as most of the rich wouldn't care.
  - (c) a small effort that could result in very serious consequences.
  - (d) a trivial and ineffective step in bringing about change.
2. By saying "I'm the one who has to use paper straws," the Twitter user implies that people on private jets
  - (a) are not doing their share to protect the environment.
  - (b) are reducing their carbon emissions in more trendy ways.
  - (c) can enjoy more sophisticated beverages while traveling.
  - (d) will never understand the lives of ordinary people.
3. Which of the following can be considered a central message of the article?
  - (a) A sense of unfairness discourages ordinary people from their active participation in activities to improve the environment.
  - (b) Climate change could occur in the near future as the concept of "carbon shaming" is increasingly gaining popularity.
  - (c) People's awareness of insufficient measures regarding climate change led to the introduction of taxes on luxurious boats and private jets.
  - (d) The super-wealthy would contribute significantly more to pollution compared to the average person.

#### IV 次の英文を読み、下記の設問に答えよ。

Artificial intelligence (AI) is nothing new. It's been around since the 1950s, but 2023 certainly feels like a tipping point. No longer is AI the sole provenance of academics and tech professionals. With the introduction of ChatGPT, Google Bard and the like, the technology is now easily accessible to all. And therein lies the challenge.

As AI becomes ever more consumable and its capabilities continue to evolve at breakneck speed, so too will the implications for society as a whole. In an ideal world, government, industry and civil society should work together to ensure that AI is developed and implemented ethically. But the genie is out of the bottle, so to speak, and despite growing concern from AI pioneers and thought leaders alike, there's likely no slowing it down.

[ あ ], there's plenty that we can do to set up some guardrails around sticky ethical

considerations. It begins with recognizing bias and minimizing manipulation by increasing transparency and opening a dialogue about the ethical challenges that AI presents.

One of the key concerns surrounding the ethics of AI is the potential for reinforcing existing biases. As discussed in a conversation with Michelle Yi, Senior Director of Applied Artificial Intelligence at RelationalAI, bias in AI systems can have far-reaching ( i ). When biased data is fed into AI models, it can perpetuate biases on an unprecedented scale.

It all begins with the concept of <sup>(A)</sup>“data in, data out.” If biased data is used to train AI models, the resulting outputs will inevitably reflect those biases. Machine learning algorithms have the power to amplify these biases, and unless we actively check for and address them, we risk perpetuating societal ( ii ) unintentionally.

This issue becomes especially significant when AI is employed in decision-making processes, such as hiring, lending or criminal justice. Addressing bias in AI is crucial to ensure fairness and equity in all of its applications.

Another area of concern is the use of AI to manipulate people’s behavior. We all know how annoying it is when Alexa or Siri picks up on our conversations and serves up targeted ads accordingly. [ い ], you talk about needing a new bathing suit for an upcoming vacation to Hawaii, and the next thing you know, you’re inundated with swimsuit ads. With the integration of AI, the potential for behavior manipulation grows <sup>(B)</sup>exponentially.

Imagine a future where AI can understand our sentiment or tone of voice even when we don’t explicitly, or directly, express our opinions. AI will be able to use these subtle intonations to make assumptions and predictions about our behaviors, opinions and ideas. This opens the door for potential manipulation that could be used in everything from targeted ads all the way to political persuasion.

So what’s an organization to do? [ う ], all AI systems should be designed so that they can be audited and reviewed. And organizations should check for biases within the data used to train AI models. A steering committee, or “model committee,” can be set up to look at models, scrutinize the rules that support them and analyze their behavior to identify and remove any built-in <sup>(C)</sup>biases. “It can go all the way from the top down to a process level improvement,” says Michelle Yi, “and there are a lot of ways that organizations can focus on helping to address this issue.”

Organizations must also prioritize transparency and accountability by making their policies around AI clear to both employees and the public. It may help to create a vision statement about how the organization will leverage AI, including the company’s stance—and ethics—around it, and how AI maps back to the <sup>(D)</sup>company’s mission statement. Bottom line, the objectives and approach of how an organization uses AI must be clear to consumers, stakeholders and shareholders alike.

Industry leaders should also work with the government to establish clear rules and regulations that foster innovation while ensuring accountability and transparency. Cooperation between government, industry and civil society will be crucial in order to harness the power of AI for good and avoid the pitfalls of what could go wrong.

The ethics of AI will impact everyone—not just people in the business world. As human beings and consumers, technology’s influence is inescapable, like it or not. This is why it’s so important to have the conversation now, in the early phases of what AI is potentially going to grow into.

On an individual level, we must all become more discerning consumers and question the information that’s fed to us. Awareness is the first step toward mitigating the impact of manipulation. By being critical of sources and not taking information at face value, we can better protect ourselves.

Addressing the ethical challenges AI presents now is the best way to ensure that the technology reaches its potential to benefit society. Putting steps in place to remove bias and being ( iii ) manipulation is the first step. We must start the conversations now in order to build a framework that safeguards society’s values and fosters responsible and beneficial AI implementation.

(Adapted from forbes.com, June 23, 2023)

設問 1. 次の(1)~(5)について、本文の内容に合うものはマーク解答用紙のTの欄に、合わないものはFの欄にマークせよ。

- (1) AI has been posing many serious problems in society since its emergence a few years ago.
- (2) AI normally reduces bias found in society, but it cannot completely solve this problem.
- (3) Since there is always a possibility of biased information being input into the AI model, it is important to inspect the system regularly.
- (4) Siri's picking up our conversations to bombard us with relevant advertisements is an example of behavioral manipulation.
- (5) The problems that bias in AI poses for society could include issues such as employing new staff and assessing applications for loans.

設問 2. 下線部(1)~(3)の意味にもっとも近いものを(a)~(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- (1) (a) appears to be an impressive achievement  
(b) emerges as an inverted position  
(c) gives the impression of overcoming defeat  
(d) seems like a critical juncture
- (2) (a) A crucial issue is being reexamined.  
(b) An important secret has been disclosed prematurely.  
(c) An irreversible event has occurred.  
(d) An obvious problem is being avoided.
- (3) (a) accepting information as is without challenging it  
(b) agreeing to the information to save face  
(c) interpreting information in a way that is most beneficial  
(d) taking in only the information that is valuable and useful

設問 3. 下線部(A)~(D)の意味にもっとも近いものを(a)~(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- (A) (a) imperceptive (b) remarkable (c) rigorous (d) unforgiving
- (B) (a) coming up with (b) going along with  
(c) swamped with (d) taken with
- (C) (a) adopt (b) define (c) examine (d) generate
- (D) (a) grip (b) guide (c) influence (d) utilize

設問 4. 空所(i)~(iii)を埋めるのもっとも適当なものを(a)~(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- (i) (a) attainments (b) consequences (c) contributions (d) revelations
- (ii) (a) expectations (b) norms (c) prejudices (d) values
- (iii) (a) content with (b) involved in  
(c) suggestive of (d) vigilant about

設問 5. 空所[あ]~[う]を埋めるのもっとも適当なものを(a)~(g)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。ただし、各選択肢は一度しか使えない。

- (a) As a result
- (b) Even so
- (c) Far from that
- (d) For example
- (e) For starters
- (f) Rather
- (g) Subsequently



設問6. 次の1.~3.について、本文の内容に合うものを(a)~(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

1. Which of the following issues does the author NOT mention as an existing or potential problem with AI?
  - (a) manipulation of the public by political actors
  - (b) misinformation resulting in online fraud
  - (c) reproducing and exacerbating human bias
  - (d) unwanted and tiresome advertising
2. How can organizations be more transparent regarding their use of AI?
  - (a) by clarifying the ways in which AI will be employed
  - (b) by creating a mandatory mission statement
  - (c) by defining discrete policies to their customers and shareholders
  - (d) by training employees about implicit bias
3. Which of the following is advocated by the article?
  - (a) boosting collaboration between the private and public sectors
  - (b) finding ways to stop AI from reading our feelings
  - (c) promoting the use of AI in key decision-making processes
  - (d) restricting the data used to train AI models to those approved by the government

V 次の英文を読み、下記の設問に答えよ。

Our experience shows that leaders' success depends on their ability to MOVE—that is, to be *mindfully* alert to priorities, to generate *options* so that they always have several ways to win, to *validate* their own vantage point, and to *engage* with stakeholders to ensure that they are along for the ride. In this article, we examine the crucial second step of our model. Specifically, we look at four common leadership approaches and the scenarios in which each can be most helpful, and we introduce a process for navigating the options in real time.

Dozens of research studies spearheaded by American psychologists Charles “Rick” Snyder and Shane J. Lopez demonstrate how people’s capacity to reach their desired goals can be increased by conceiving multiple possible pathways. Most people assume that success ( i ) a task is a question of perseverance or willpower. But Snyder and Lopez show that willpower must ( A ) “way power” to drive successful outcomes. Their research suggests that ideally you will have four or more options or pathways for achieving your goals (external priorities). It also demonstrates the importance of determining who you want to be as a leader in terms of your character strengths and values (internal priorities) and how you can best relate to others (interpersonal priorities).

Building on this work, we have developed an approach, called the “four stances,” to help leaders generate options for interpersonal communication. Think how tennis players nearly instantly shift their stance to make an optimal response to a ball hurtling over the net. The core concept for our approach is rooted ( ii ) evolutionary psychology and how our basic reflexes (fight, flight, and so on) automatically deploy under dangerous or novel circumstances. In the more evolved world of leadership, the four stances help leaders identify and access more interpersonal options. The stances are:

→ **Lean In.** Take an active stance on resolving an issue. Actions in this stance include deciding, directing, guiding, challenging, and confronting.

→ **Lean Back.** Take an analytical stance to observe, collect, and understand data. Actions include analyzing, asking questions, and possibly delaying decisions.

→ **Lean With.** Take a collaborative stance, focusing on caring and connecting. Actions include empathizing, encouraging, and coaching.

→ **Don't Lean.** Whereas a *Lean Back* posture involves observing and analyzing, *Don't Lean* is about being still and disciplining yourself to create space for a new solution to bubble up from your subconscious. This stance also serves to calm you if your emotions have been triggered. Actions include contemplating, visualizing, and settling through diaphragmatic breathing.

To win in any leadership moment, great leaders need to develop and be able to access all four stances. To illustrate, let's consider one of our clients, Isobel, a newly appointed president of a major business line at a tech company.

Isobel was in trouble and called us in. She was at loggerheads with the firm's mercurial CEO, who had a tendency to be unreliable—contradicting himself, changing positions, and often making promises the company couldn't deliver ( iii ).

"I'm getting a bad reputation for being aggressive at board meetings," she told us at our first two-on-one coaching session. "I just tell the truth—someone needs to—but I'm the one getting dinged."

As we talked, we identified a clear gap between her own and others' perceptions. *Leaning In* — way <sup>(A)</sup> in — was her default stance. As a former lawyer, she was a world-class debater, and her impact was far more powerful than she realized. It was clear she needed to overcome her reflexive behavior and find other ( B ) ways to win. We described the four stances and asked her to consider alternatives to her default approach.

"But I need to be ( C )," she countered.

"Of course," we responded, "but you can use other stances while still being true to yourself."

We went through the stances one by one. In situations in which *Lean In* was the best choice, she saw that she could be more skillful by better calibrating <sup>(2)</sup> the intensity of her remarks. If she could learn to *Lean Back* and not rush into conflict, she could slow down her reactions and be more strategic about when she would engage. If she applied *Don't Lean*, she could take a moment to breathe, which could help her neutralize her activation by the CEO and keep a clear head. We were all surprised that asking about *Lean With* <sup>(B)</sup> was what pivoted <sup>(3)</sup> Isobel into a new way of operating. Drawing on Harvard Business School professor Amy Edmondson's groundbreaking work on psychological safety, we asked, "What if your job at the board meeting was to make the CEO and directors feel safe?"

Isobel immediately embraced that approach, which appealed to her protective side. She spontaneously started thinking through the implications <sup>(7)</sup>. Supporting the CEO would probably help him calm down and make the meetings less painful for everyone. In the *Lean With* stance, she could also tolerate his contradictions by understanding that his first reaction wasn't always his final ( D ). She decided that she would enthusiastically support his comments when they were in alignment with the executive committee's assessment and refrain from reflexively challenging him when he veered ( iv ) course, unless the board was close to a vote on that recommendation. After adopting this approach, her reputation with the board skyrocketed. She became known as a leader who made peace rather than war.

(Adapted from *Harvard Business Review*, January-February, 2023)

設問 1. 空所(A)～(D)を埋めるのにもっとも適当なものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |     |                       |                          |                |            |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------|
| (A) | (a) be coupled with   | (b) be incompatible with |                |            |
|     | (c) be indifferent to | (d) be susceptible to    |                |            |
| (B) | (a) administrative    | (b) aggressive           | (c) commercial | (d) viable |
| (C) | (a) authentic         | (b) impressive           | (c) persuasive | (d) prompt |
| (D) | (a) bet               | (b) challenge            | (c) turn       | (d) word   |

設問 2. 空所(i)～(iv)を埋めるのもっとも適当なものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |       |            |            |           |             |
|-------|------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| (i)   | (a) at     | (b) behind | (c) by    | (d) from    |
| (ii)  | (a) across | (b) behind | (c) below | (d) in      |
| (iii) | (a) along  | (b) on     | (c) over  | (d) through |
| (iv)  | (a) above  | (b) around | (c) in    | (d) off     |

設問 3. 下線部(1)～(4)の意味にもっとも近いものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

- |     |                         |                       |                                  |                                    |
|-----|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (1) | (a) cease               | (b) diminish          | (c) fluctuate                    | (d) manifest                       |
| (2) | (a) adjusting           | (b) enhancing         | (c) exercising                   | (d) minimizing                     |
| (3) | (a) backed              | (b) organized         | (c) scheduled                    | (d) shifted                        |
| (4) | (a) details of the plan | (b) possible outcomes | (c) similar previous experiences | (d) underlying causes of the issue |

設問 4. 下線部(ア)の内容を具体的に書いた箇所を本文中より抜き出し、2語で記述解答用紙の所定欄に書け。

設問 5. 次の1.～4.について、もっとも適当なものを(a)～(d)からそれぞれ一つ選び、マーク解答用紙の所定欄にマークせよ。

1. According to the article, which of the following is true of the four stances?
  - (a) They are essentially modern equivalents of “fight or flight.”
  - (b) They need to be used sparingly and with caution.
  - (c) They offer four approaches to interpersonal engagement.
  - (d) They often work in tandem with each other in real time.
2. Which of the following most accurately explains the underlined (A)?
  - (a) a deeply ingrained introverted tendency
  - (b) a highly emotional state of mind
  - (c) an exceedingly permissive behavior
  - (d) an overly assertive approach
3. Which of the following best paraphrases the underlined (B)?
  - (a) her desire to prevent the CEO from aggravating the situation
  - (b) her fear of confronting the CEO
  - (c) her impulsive behavior triggered by the CEO
  - (d) her misconceptions toward the CEO
4. Why did *Lean With* work best for Isobel?
  - (a) It was consistent with the caring aspect of her personality.
  - (b) *Lean With* was a forward approach similar to her default stance.
  - (c) Resolving the CEO’s contradictions impressed the board.
  - (d) The CEO was too aggressive to appreciate other approaches.

[以下余白]