入 学 試 験 問 題

前

英語

（学習用配点 200 点）

2027 年度 福島県立医科大学・非公式予想問題

演習時間 100 分（2026 年度参考）　前期日程対策　全　3　問

注 意 事 項

1 開始の合図があるまで、問題冊子を開かないこと。

2 問題冊子は 7 ページ、全 3 問である。印刷の欠落や不鮮明な箇所がないか確認すること。

3 解答には、黒鉛筆または黒色シャープペンシルを用いること。

4 解答用紙の指定欄に受験番号と氏名を記入すること。指定欄以外へ識別情報を書かないこと。

5 解答は、解答用紙の指定された欄に記すこと。設問ごとの字数や語数の条件を守ること。

6 解答欄には設問と関係のない文章・記号・符号を書かないこと。計算・論証の必要な設問は途中の過程も示すこと。

7 この問題冊子の余白は下書きに用いてよい。冊子のページを切り離さないこと。

8 問題冊子と解答用紙を照合し、解答すべき大問と小問の取り違えがないようにすること。

9 リスニングは含まない。時間は 2026 年度原本を参考とした演習設定であり、2027 年度の確定時間ではない。

10 本冊子は非公式の独自予想問題である。大学の公式試験問題ではなく、配点と採点基準は学習用の独自設計である。

第　1　問

（60 点）

次の本文は本教材用の書き下ろしである。本文を読み、問いに答えよ。

[1] A town council announced that it had improved a local bus service by making the buses faster. The average journey between the railway station and the hospital had fallen from twenty minutes to sixteen. The number was easy to understand, and the council printed it on a large poster. Yet some passengers said that their trips now took longer. The council first treated these complaints as a failure to appreciate an improvement. A student who used the service suggested a different explanation: the council and the passengers [be / different / journeys / measuring / might].

[2] For the council, a journey began when a bus left the station and ended when it arrived at the hospital. For many passengers, it began when they left home and ended when they reached the particular room they needed. These journeys included a walk to the stop, a wait, and sometimes a change of buses. A shorter ride could be valuable without making the whole trip shorter. In particular, a passenger who missed a connecting bus by one minute might have to wait another half hour. Saving four minutes on one section would not make up for that delay.

[3] The student invited a small group of volunteers to keep travel diaries for a week. This was a fictional classroom investigation, not a survey of every resident. Each volunteer recorded departure and arrival times, the purpose of the trip, and any connection. The diaries showed that the new timetable worked well for people who boarded at the station. It worked less well for people coming from a village on another route. Their first bus now arrived just after the hospital bus had left. The faster service had made the individual ride shorter while making the connection less convenient.

[4] The volunteers also noticed that a single average hid an important difference. One passenger made the same direct trip each day and could predict its length closely. Another needed two connections and occasionally arrived much later than expected. Although their average total travel times were similar, the second passenger had to leave extra time before an appointment. Reliability was therefore a benefit in its own right. The question was not simply how many minutes a typical trip took, but how much uncertainty a traveller had to manage.

[5] The council could not solve every problem by adding buses. Its budget and the number of drivers were limited. It did, however, have choices that the original measure had made difficult to see. It could adjust two departure times, provide a clearer notice about connections, or ask the hospital whether a small change in appointment times was possible. None of these options promised to remove all delays. Each addressed a different part of the complete journey, rather than treating the speed of a vehicle as the only useful measure of service.

[6] The lesson was not that averages are useless or that complaints are always correct. A carefully defined average can reveal real progress. The mistake was to let one convenient measure stand for every aspect of a service. Before arguing about whether a number has improved, people

need to ask whose experience the number describes and where the measurement begins and ends. The most useful result of the diaries was not a replacement score. It was a better shared question: which part of the journey can we change, for whom, and at what cost?

(1) 第 1 段落の下線部の語をすべて一度ずつ用い、意味の通る正しい語順に並べ替えよ。（8 点）

(2) 第 4 段落の下線部を日本語に訳せ。（14 点）

(3) 第 4 段落で平均値が隠すとされる違いは何か。日本語 60 字以内で説明せよ。（14 点）

(4) 本文の内容と一致するものを一つ選び、記号で答えよ。（10 点）

(a) The diaries represented a survey of every resident in the town.

(b) The council could consider connection times as well as the speed of buses.

(c) The two passengers had exactly the same experience because their averages were similar.

(d) The writer argues that an average can never reveal a real improvement.

(5) 第 5 段落で挙げられる、単にバスを増やす以外の三つの改善策を、それぞれ日本語で答えよ。（14 点）

第　2　問

（60 点）

次の本文は本教材用の書き下ろしである。本文を読み、問いに答えよ。

[1] Imagine a school that opens a small repair library. Students can borrow simple tools and learn how to repair everyday objects with help from volunteers. At first, the organisers judge success by counting how many objects are repaired. This seems reasonable. A chair that can be used again is a visible result, whereas a conversation about a broken chair is harder to count. After a month, however, the volunteers find that the number of successful repairs tells only part of the story.

[2] Some visitors bring objects that are cheap to replace but important to them. A student may value a bag because a family member made it. Another may want to repair an old radio in order to understand how it works. These visitors are not simply trying to save the price of a new product. If volunteers assume that financial value is the only reason for repair, they may dismiss a request before learning what matters to the owner. Asking a question can therefore be as important as offering a tool.

[3] Other visitors arrive with nothing that needs immediate repair. They want to watch, practise, or learn enough to recognise when a job is beyond their ability. The organisers initially worry that these visitors take time away from the main task. Yet a person who learns to notice a loose connection may later prevent a more serious problem. A visitor who learns when to stop may also avoid a dangerous attempt. The value of the session does not depend entirely on whether an object leaves the room in working condition.

[4] There is a difficulty here. Once the organisers admit that learning and confidence matter, they may be tempted to describe every unsuccessful repair as a success of some kind. That would make the project almost impossible to evaluate. A broken object, wasted materials, or advice that a visitor does not understand should not disappear behind a pleasant story. The volunteers decide to record several outcomes separately: the condition of the object, the skills practised, the explanation given, and the owner's next step. This record allows a failure in one area to remain visible even when something useful happens in another.

[5] The project also changes the volunteers' idea of expertise. An experienced repairer may solve a problem quickly but leave the owner unable to repeat the process. A less experienced volunteer may work more slowly while helping the owner understand each decision. Neither speed nor talk alone guarantees good teaching. The volunteers begin to ask visitors to explain, in their own words, what they will check next time. The aim is not to test the visitor. It is to find out whether the explanation has made sense and whether another kind of help is needed.

[6] The repair library is not a promise that every object should be repaired forever. Some objects cannot be made safe, and some repairs require skills that the group does not have. The organisers make these limits clear. Within those limits, the library offers something that the original

count did not capture: an opportunity to make decisions with people rather than merely doing a job for them. Keeping several kinds of record does not make judgement automatic. It makes the reasons for a judgement easier to discuss, question, and improve.

(1) 第 2 段落の下線語 dismiss に最も近い意味の語を一つ選べ。(6 点)

(a) reject (b) repeat (c) measure (d) repair

(2) 第 4 段落の下線部を日本語に訳せ。(14 点)

(3) 修理が必要な物を持たずに来る人にも、参加する価値があるのはなぜか。第 3 段落に即して日本語 80 字以内で説明せよ。(16 点)

(4) 第 6 段落の these limits とはどのような限界か。二つを日本語で答えよ。(12 点)

(5) 本文の内容と一致しないものを一つ選べ。(12 点)

(a) An owner may value an object for reasons other than its replacement price.

(b) A record can show useful learning without hiding an unsuccessful repair.

(c) Asking visitors to explain a next step can help volunteers check an explanation.

(d) An experienced repairer always teaches better because a quick repair guarantees understanding.

第　3　問

（80 点）

次の本文は本教材用の書き下ろしである。本文を読み、問いに答えよ。

[1] A teacher proposes that every student project should be published on the school's website. The plan has an attractive purpose: students will write more carefully if they know that people beyond the classroom may read their work. Families will also be able to see what students have learned. But the proposal combines several decisions that need not have the same answer. Who should choose the audience? Should an early draft be treated like a finished piece? And can a student learn from an error without making that error permanently public?

[2] Supporters of public work point out that a real audience can change the quality of a project. A description of a local place may become clearer when its writer expects a visitor, rather than only a teacher, to use it. A report may also receive a question that nobody in the class thought to ask. These are useful possibilities. They do not, however, show that the widest possible audience is always the best audience. A small group with relevant experience may provide more useful comments than hundreds of readers who do not understand the purpose of the task.

[3] Publication can also change what students choose to try. If every attempt is displayed beside a name, students may avoid an uncertain idea and choose a safer one. A page that looks polished may therefore be a poor guide to how much thinking occurred. In a fictional class discussion, one student says, "If every draft has to look successful, we may stop writing the drafts that help us learn." Her point is not that quality does not matter. It is that the conditions for learning and the conditions for displaying a result are not always identical.

[4] A second concern is consent. A project can contain information about someone who did not choose to join the class: a relative in a family story, a neighbour in an interview, or a person visible in a photograph. A student's willingness to publish does not automatically give permission to share another person's information. Removing a name may not be enough if the details still identify the person. The teacher therefore needs a process for checking permission before deciding how impressive the finished website might look.

[5] A reasonable policy could distinguish three stages. Students might share an early draft with a partner, discuss a revised version with a relevant group, and decide separately whether the finished result should be public. A student who chooses a limited audience should still explain the work clearly and take criticism seriously. A student who chooses public release should check permission and provide a way to correct errors. (A) 公表する相手を選べるようにすることは、生徒が自分の作品に責任を持たなくてよいという意味ではない。 The responsibility becomes more specific: students must explain why this audience is appropriate and what they have done to protect the people represented in the project. In this approach, publication is a decision to justify, not simply a reward for finishing.

(1) Translate the underlined Japanese sentence (A) into English.（16 点）

(2) Choose the statement that best agrees with the passage.（12 点）

(a) The largest possible audience always gives the most useful comments.

(b) An audience with relevant experience may be more useful than a larger audience.

(c) Students should never publish a project containing an error, even after correcting it.

(d) Choosing a limited audience removes a student's responsibility for the work.

(3) Why might removing a person's name be insufficient before publication? Explain in Japanese within 60 characters.（12 点）

(4) Do you think every school project should be made public? Write at least 100 words in English and provide at least three specific examples to support your view.（40 点）