

2026 年度

大阪樟蔭女子大学大学院
人間科学研究科修士課程

英語 / 小論文

英 語 ／ 小 論 文

※英語または小論文から1科目を選択して○をつけてください。

専攻	臨床心理学 専攻							
受験番号								
氏名								

注意：受験番号、氏名を記入すること。

【Ⅱ期：2026年2月21日実施】

英語／小論文の問題は次のページから始まります。

- I. 以下に示したのは、ある調査研究の方法部分（一部改訂）である。これを読み、以下の4つの問いに答えなさい。

2 Method

2.1 Date and Participants:

The survey was conducted from April to May 2014. 100 Japanese and 100 UK respondents were recruited by a survey company at which about one million thousand Japanese and one million thousand UK persons have registered. Respondents in each nation were limited to people who were born and had been living only in the corresponding nation. The respondents consisted of fifty persons in their 20s (male: 25, female: 25) and fifty persons in their 50s (male: 25, female: 25) in each of the nations.

The homepage of the online survey had been open for these participants during the above period. The questionnaire of the online survey was conducted with the native language for the respondents in each of the nations.

2.2 Survey Design:

The questionnaire did not give the explicit definition of robots, or include any photo and image of robots, except for the instruction on humanoid robots just before conducting the Frankenstein Syndrome Questionnaire (FSQ). The scale on attitudes toward robots in general was firstly conducted, and then the Frankenstein Syndrome Questionnaire was conducted since the reverse order had a possibility that envisions of humanoids evoked by the conduction of the FSQ affected the measurement of attitudes toward robots in general. The concrete items and scales in the survey were as follows:

Negative Attitudes toward Robots Scale (NARS):

To measure participants' attitudes toward robots in general, the NARS was adopted in the survey. The scale consists of 14 items classified into three subscales. The first subscale (S1, six items) measures negative attitude toward interaction with robots (e.g., "I would feel paranoid talking with a robot."). The second subscale (S2, 5 items) measures negative attitude toward the social influence of robots (e.g., "Something bad might happen if robots developed into living beings."). The third subscale (S3, 3 items) measures negative attitude toward emotional interaction with robots (e.g., "I feel comforted being with robots that have emotions.").

Each item is scored on a five-point scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) undecided; 4) agree; 5) strongly agree, and an individual's score on each subscale is calculated by adding the scores of all items included in the subscale, with some items reverse coded.

Frankenstein Syndrome Questionnaire (FSQ):

The questionnaire was developed to measure acceptance of humanoid robots including expectations and anxieties toward this technology in the general public (Nomura et al., 2012, Syrdal, et al., 2013). It consists of 30 items shown in Table 1. Each questionnaire item was assigned with a seven-choice answer (1: "Strongly disagree", 2: "Disagree", 3: "Disagree a little", 4: "Not decidable", 5: "Agree a little", 6: "Agree", 7: "Strongly agree").

Just before conducting the FSQ, the definition of "humanoids robots" was instructed only with texts as follows:

"Humanoid robots are robots that roughly look like humans, that have two arms, legs, a head, etc. These robots may be very human-like in appearance (including details such as hair, artificial skin etc.), but can also have machine-like features (such as wheels, a metal skin etc)."

(1) 本研究は、どのような方法で、どのような参加者を対象に実施されましたか。

(2) 本研究ではどのような尺度が使われましたか。使用されたすべての尺度を、項目例および調査対象者の回答方法と併せて記述しなさい。

(3) 上記の尺度はどのような順序で調査対象者に提示されましたか。またそれはなぜですか。

(4) 本研究における Humanoid robots の定義を日本語で記述しなさい。

英語問題 2

I. 以下の英文を読んで問いに答えなさい。

An easy way to get started with the philosophical discussion is by focusing on what sets trust apart from ordinary reliance. ^(a) I rely on my alarm clock to wake me up, but that is not trust; I rely on my partner's routine of showing up for appointments a quarter-hour early, but I don't trust him to do so (if it doesn't happen, no problem on my part). Reliance is based on competence and predictability, but trust is not just about competence and predictability, and there are different philosophical accounts about ^(b) the missing ingredient that trust only possesses. Proposals for the missing ingredient include trustee's characteristics, such as goodwill (Baier, Citation1986; Cogley, Citation2012), moral obligations (Nickel, Citation2007), or self-interest to maintain the relationship with the trustor (Hardin, Citation2002). But also, emotions, expectations and beliefs of the trustor are natural candidates. One early suggestion in this latter camp, from Richard Holton, was that when we trust, we hold a "participant stance" toward the object of trust, which is absent when we just rely on something, as in the alarm clock example (Holton, Citation1994). Moreover, as many agree on, trust makes us vulnerable; betrayed trust breeds resentment (Jones, Citation1996). A key theme linked to the latter claim is that trust, unlike reliance, is a so-called thick concept in that it is positively evaluable and ethically charged. Some philosophers also persuasively argued that distrust is not a mere absence of trust, rather, it is a negatively connoted evaluative attitude toward someone. Indeed, we can distrust a bad prime minister, but not the morning alarm clock if it does not ring at the time we expect (Hardin, Citation2004; Hawley, Citation2014).

出典: Lalumera, E. (2024). An overview on trust and trustworthiness: individual and institutional dimensions. *Philosophical Psychology*, 37, 1–17.

(1) 下線部分 (a) の部分を日本語に訳しなさい。

(2) 本文の中から下線部分 (b) の“the missing ingredient that trust only possesses”に該当するものを日本語で4つ挙げなさい。

1	
2	
3	
4	

小論文

著名なアスリートが、競技に対する姿勢として、「他者が関わること（例えば、他の選手と順位を競って上位になること、自分が不振の時にメディアや他者が自分を批判すること、等）は自分にはコントロールできない、だから自分ができるところにベストを尽くす」というあり方を述べているのを目にすることがある。

悩みや問題を抱えている他者に関わる、という対人支援の場において、このようなあり方をどのように考えればよいか、1,000 字から 1,200 字で論じなさい。

*単にそのあり方の是非、賛同や反論を主観的に述べるだけでなく、支援する側、される側など様々な視点・立場から、論理的に考えを述べること。

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]