【2 月 10 日実施】薬学部一般選抜「英語」における出題について

詳細はこちらから
https://www.keio.ac.jp/ja/admissions/docs/20250214_pha_eng_info.pdf
（慶應義塾大学　公式ページへ）

2026年度　薬学部　一般選抜　問題訂正

科・科目	ページ	設問	誤	→	正
外国語 （英語）	p.17	Ⅲ Q26	1行目 authors	→	author's
外国語 （英語）	p.17	Ⅲ Q27	1行目 authors	→	author's

〔 I 〕

Read the following article carefully and answer the questions. For each question, choose ONE BEST answer. On your answer sheet, find the number of the question and fill in the space that corresponds to the number of the answer you have chosen. For Writing Answer Question [A], write your answers [WAQ A1, WAQ A2, WAQ A3] in the corresponding spaces provided on the Writing Answer Sheet.

(Based on Science Fictions: How Fraud, Bias, Negligence, and Hype Undermine the Search for Truth. Stuart Ritchie.)

① In 1942, Merton set out four scientific values, now known as the 'Mertonian Norms'. **[Q1a]** of them have snappy names, but **[Q1b]** of them are good aspirations for scientists. First, *universalism*: scientific knowledge is scientific knowledge, no matter who comes up with it—so long as their methods for finding that knowledge are sound. The race, sex, age, gender, sexuality, income, social background, nationality, popularity, or any other status of a scientist should have no bearing on how their factual claims are assessed. You also can't judge someone's research based on what a pleasant or unpleasant person they are—which should come as a relief for some of my more disagreeable colleagues. Second, and relatedly, **[Q2]**: scientists aren't in it for the money, for political or ideological reasons, or to enhance their own ego or reputation (or the reputation of their university, country, or anything else). They're in it to advance our understanding of the universe by discovering things and making things—full stop. As Charles Darwin once wrote, a scientist 'ought to have no wishes, no affections, —a mere heart of stone.'

② The next two norms remind us of the **[Q3]** nature of science. The third is *communality*: scientists should share knowledge with each other. This principle underlies the whole idea of publishing your results in a journal for others to see—we're all in this together; we have to know the details of other scientists' work so that we can assess and build on it. Lastly, there's *organised scepticism*[*1]: nothing is sacred, and a scientific claim should never be accepted at face value. We should suspend judgement on any given finding until we've properly checked all the data and methodology. The most obvious embodiment of the norm of organised scepticism is peer review itself. It looks good in theory: by following the four Mertonian Norms, we should end up with a scientific literature we can trust—the shoulders of giants, as in Newton's famous phrase, on which we stand to see farther. Of course, those giants often had it wrong: just to take the two examples mentioned by John Stuart Mill, we used to believe that the Sun orbited the Earth, and that flammable objects were full of a special element called phlogiston that was released when they burned. But we eventually consigned these theories to the scrapheap as better data came in. Indeed, it's a virtue for a scientist to change their mind. The biologist Richard Dawkins recounts his experience of 'a respected elder statesman of the Zoology Department at Oxford' who for years had:

passionately believed, and taught, that the Golgi Apparatus (a microscopic feature of the interior of cells) was not real: an artefact, an illusion. Every Monday afternoon it was the custom for the whole department to listen to a research talk by a visiting lecturer. One Monday, the visitor was an American cell biologist who presented completely convincing evidence that the Golgi Apparatus was real. At the end of the lecture, the old man strode to the front of the hall, shook the American by the hand and said—with passion—"My dear fellow, I wish to thank you. I have been wrong these fifteen years." We clapped our hands red ... In practice, not all scientists would [say that]. But all scientists pay lip service to it as an ideal—unlike, say, politicians who would probably condemn it as flip-flopping. The memory of the incident I have described still brings a lump to my throat.

③ This is what people mean when they talk about science being 'self-correcting'. Eventually, even if it takes many years or decades, older, incorrect ideas are overturned by data (or sometimes, as was rather morbidly noted by the physicist Max Planck, by all their stubborn proponents dying and leaving science to the next generation). Again, that's the theory. In practice, though, the publication system sits awkwardly with the Mertonian Norms, in many ways obstructing the process of self-correction. Examples of this contraindication can be seen in the competition for grants and clamour for prestigious publications on one hand, and the open, dispassionate, sceptical appraisal of science on the other.

④ Notice what it was that changed the mind of Dawkins's elder statesman: 'completely convincing evidence'. There's little point in trying to correct and update our scientific theories with data if the data themselves aren't convincing—or worse, aren't even accurate. This brings us back to the idea we discussed in the Preface: for results to warrant our trust, they need to be replicable. As the philosopher of science Sir Karl Popper puts it: Only when certain events recur in accordance with rules or regularities, as is the case with repeatable experiments, can our observations be tested—in principle—by anyone. We do not take even our own observations quite seriously, or accept them as scientific observations, until we have repeated and tested them. Only by such repetitions can we convince ourselves that we are not dealing with a mere isolated 'coincidence'.

⑤ It's not as if this is a revolutionary idea—or one that was new to Popper, writing in the 1950s. If we return to the early days of Philosophical Transactions in the seventeenth century, we find the co-founder of the Royal Society, the chemist Robert Boyle, going to extraordinary lengths to ensure the replicability of his findings. He would repeatedly demonstrate his experiments, which used his famous air pump to show various properties of air and the vacuum to groups of observers, before having them sign sworn testimony that they'd witnessed the phenomena in question. He would ensure that his writings were detailed enough 'that the person I addressed them to might, without mistake, and with as little trouble as possible, be able to repeat such unusual experiments.' And despite the great difficulty of building the complex apparatus, he encouraged and assisted other natural philosophers to replicate his air-pump experiments in different parts of Britain and Europe.

⑥ Replication, then, has long been a key part of how science is supposed to work—and incidentally, it's another of its **[Q3]** aspects, with results only being taken seriously after they've been corroborated by multiple observers. But somewhere along the way, between Boyle and modern academia, a great many scientists forgot about the importance of replication. In the collision of our Mertonian ideals with the realities of the scientific

publication system—not to mention the realities of human nature—the ideals have proven the more fragile, leaving us with a scientific literature full of untrustworthy, unreliable, unreplicable studies that often do more to **[Q7a]** than **[Q7b]**.

*1 organised scepticism (British spelling) = organized skepticism (American spelling)

Q1. In paragraph ① (line 2), which of the following could be best added in [Q1a] and [Q1b]?

	Q1a	Q1b
1.	All	none
2.	None	all
3.	One	another
4.	One	the others
5.	Some	the others

Q2. Which of the following words could best be added to [Q2] in paragraph ① (line 9)?

1. *cynicism*
2. *disinterestedness*
3. *empiricism*
4. *innovation*
5. *meritocracy*

Q3. Which of the following words could best be added to [Q3] in paragraphs ② and ⑥ (lines 1 and 2, respectively)?

1. contraindicated
2. empathic
3. objective
4. social
5. vindictive

Q4. Which of the following statements best reflects the meaning of the underlined phrase "the shoulders of giants" in paragraph ② (lines 9 and 10)?

1. Science advances by adding together the knowledge and efforts of previous thinkers over time.
2. To convince great scientists, it is essential to understand and view things only from their point of view.
3. True innovation requires questioning and stepping completely away from existing knowledge and methods.
4. The most important breakthroughs rarely come from the outstanding ideas of a small group of top thinkers.
5. All great thinkers in the past could see clearly and far into the future, as if they were looking out from a high place.

Writing Answer Question A, for article〔I〕

Choose the best underlined expression (made by Richard Dawkins, found in the last two sentences of his quoted words) in paragraph ② that best describes each scenario [WAQ A1], [WAQ A2], and [WAQ A3]. Write your answers on the writing answer sheet in the corresponding section for each scenario. Spelling must be correct.

[WAQ A1] In clinical trials, consistent ethical practice is strictly required to ensure compliance with regulations and protect the safety of participants. However, in actual reality, the policy on permission from the patient shifted repeatedly back and forth between strict and relaxed standards.

[WAQ A2] After years of careful experiments, a scientist finally obtained clear results that confirmed a long held idea. When it became clear that the data could help improve patient care, a strong wave of emotion was felt by the scientist. It represented not only a genuine scientific achievement, but also a very personal triumphant moment.

[WAQ A3] Many research institutions have official rules that support the use of open data. However, there is very little oversight to make sure such rules are actually followed. Even though the stated policy is to be open and transparent, researchers often do not share their data. This makes it hard to replicate studies and even slows down the pace of progress.

Q 5 . Based on paragraphs ①–③, which of the following statements is true ?

1 . A scientist should persist in their research unwaveringly, much like a stone, until their hypothesis is inevitably proven.
2 . As a discipline grounded in natural order, science should remain free from the influence of individual ideologies or personal convictions.
3 . Historical instances of erroneous scientific claims, such as the phlogiston theory, can be attributed in part to an insufficient application of organized skepticism within the scientific community.
4 . The pursuit of scientific knowledge contributes not only to the advancement of the academic community but also serves as a means to enhance the reputation of the individual researcher and their affiliated institution.
5 . Scientific knowledge should belong solely to its discoverer, particularly in the case of significant findings or theories. It is entirely appropriate for a researcher to retain exclusive rights and be the only person allowed to pursue further development ahead of all others.

Q 6 . Based on paragraphs ④–⑥, which of the following statements is true ?

1 . If different scientific observations are obtained in several trials of repeated experiments, we can be confident that the observation represents a reliable discovery.
2 . To demonstrate the significance of his discoveries, Boyle conducted air pump experiments across various locations, offering his autograph to observers.
3 . A discovery should only be accepted as a scientific finding by the public once the observations have been independently confirmed to be reproducible by peers.
4 . In the contemporary scientific world, replicability by anyone has, unfortunately, withstood the test of time perfectly and remains a minor criterion for a theory to be regarded as reliable.
5 . Because Mertonian Norms were merely idealistic and failed to account for human nature, scientific research now conducted under such norms can be considered trustworthy and has ended up genuinely and accurately instructing people rather than bewildering them.

Q 7 . In paragraph ⑥ (line 8), which of the following could be best added in [Q7a] and [Q7b] ?

	Q7a	Q7b
1 .	ascertain	bewilder
2 .	confuse	enlighten
3 .	elevate	organize
4 .	strengthen	deceive
5 .	treat	fracture

Q 8 . Which of the following statements best reflects the author's main claim in this article ?

1 . The pressure to compete for grants prevents all scientists today from giving enough attention to the reproducibility of their findings.
2 . Reproducible research is crucial for driving scientific progress, yet an increasing number of recent studies fail to meet this standard.
3 . Scientific findings from earlier periods lack reproducibility and—as always—continue to cause confusion within the modern scientific community.
4 . To have the reproducibility of their discoveries confirmed by others, researchers should not actively share their results through scientific publications.
5 . In contrast to many modern scientific findings, the theories proposed by great scientists of the past have not been thoroughly tested for reproducibility.

〔Ⅱ〕

Read the following article carefully and answer the questions. For each question, choose ONE BEST answer. On your answer sheet, find the number of the question and fill in the space that corresponds to the number of the answer you have chosen. For Writing Answer Questions [B1], [B2], and [B3], write your answers in the corresponding spaces provided on the Writing Answer Sheet.

(Based on Trailblazers in Science and Technology Rosalind Franklin Photographing Biomolecules. Lisa Yount.)

① Rosalind Franklin (1920–58), a British scientist, became an expert in the scientific art of using X-ray crystallography to reveal the structure of complex biomolecules (molecules found in living things). In her all-too-brief career, cut short by cancer, she interpreted three very different types of substances. She first investigated coal and other forms of carbon, the remains of plants and animals that lived in the prehistoric past. She then turned her attention to DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid), the compound that scientists were just beginning to recognize as the **[Q9]** of inherited, or genetic, information. Finally, she helped to work out the structure of viruses, complex molecules that can reproduce and cause disease in living organisms.

② Valuable as they are, these contributions in themselves are only one of the reasons why Rosalind Franklin deserves to be remembered. Although Franklin's studies of DNA represent only a small part of her scientific work, they played a key role in what Aaron Klug (1926–), Franklin's collaborator in the later part of her career, called (in an article on the discovery of DNA in Torsten Krude's *DNA: Changing Science and Society*) "one of the greatest discoveries in biology in the twentieth century": the discovery of the structure of the DNA molecule, which showed how that molecule could encode genetic information and reproduce itself. James Watson (1928–) and Francis Crick (1916–2004), the two men who worked out DNA's structure, gained clues from Franklin's work so valuable that they might not have been able to find the structure without them.

③ Franklin has also become famous because her part in the DNA discovery and her relationship to several of the other scientists involved in it bring up serious issues of scientific ethics. One is the question of credit. Scientists normally build on the work of their predecessors and contemporaries, but they are expected to name those other researchers in their published papers. They are also expected to ask permission to use any experimental data from others that has not yet appeared in print. Critics have maintained that Watson and Crick violated both of these rules: They used some of Franklin's data without her knowledge, and they never fully gave credit to her in their writings.

④ Franklin's role in the discovery of DNA raises the issue of discrimination against women in science as well. Feminist writers such as Anne Sayre, a friend of Franklin's and author of the biography *Rosalind Franklin and DNA*, have claimed that Watson, Crick, and

Maurice Wilkins (1916–2004), the assistant director of the laboratory in which Franklin carried out her DNA studies, felt free to "borrow" Franklin's research findings because she was a woman and therefore was regarded as less important than a male scientist in her position would have been. Sayre also felt that the personality conflict that arose between Franklin and Wilkins contained elements of discrimination. However, some other commentators, such as science historian Horace Freeland Judson, who wrote a history of the early work on DNA called *The Eighth Day of Creation*, believe that discrimination against women scientists did not play a major part in the difficulties Franklin experienced. The question of how much effect discrimination had on Rosalind Franklin's career remains controversial today.

⑤ Rosalind Franklin, back at King's College, had no idea that she was participating in a contest. She was simply hurrying to complete and write up her DNA research before her eagerly awaited transfer to Birkbeck in March. (The date of Franklin's departure had been delayed from January because she had lost a month of work time from an attack of influenza.) She was working on three papers, all to be coauthored with Raymond Gosling.

⑥ While Franklin was writing her papers, another event took place that would have a major effect on the undeclared "race": Raymond Gosling gave Photo 51, Franklin's exceptionally clear X-ray image of the B form of DNA, to Maurice Wilkins around January 26. Gosling may not have asked Franklin's permission, but he said later that he saw no need to do so. After all, the photo represented his work as much as hers, and it was part of the research on DNA that would continue at the King's laboratory after she had gone.

⑦ Rosalind Franklin gave her last seminar at King's on the same day that Watson read Linus Pauling's paper. Her talk focused on the A form of DNA and the reasons why her X-ray photos and calculations led her to believe that this version of the molecule, at least, was not shaped like a helix. She did not mention the B form at all. When Wilkins asked her about it during the question period after her talk, she agreed that the B form was a helix. Wilkins wrote in his autobiography that this was the first time he remembered hearing her say that any form of DNA could have a helical shape.

⑧ Two days after Franklin's seminar, Watson visited King's with the Pauling paper in hand. He could not find Wilkins at first, so he strode into Franklin's laboratory and asked whether she wanted to see Pauling's paper. According to Watson's account in *The Double Helix*, she responded only with an irritated glare. He nonetheless launched into an explanation of Pauling's mistakes. Instead of being amused at the similarity between Pauling's model and Watson's own earlier ill-fated effort, Franklin "became increasingly annoyed with my recurring references to helical structures" and informed him that "not a shred of evidence permitted Linus, or anyone else, to postulate a helical structure for DNA." When Watson defended his helix proposal, "her voice rose as she told me that the stupidity of my remarks would be obvious if I would stop blubbering and look at her X-ray evidence."

⑨ Watson left Franklin's quarters rapidly. Shortly afterward, he countered Maurice Wilkins, and they had a long talk about their mutual dislike for Franklin and their relief that she was about to leave King's College. During this conversation, Wilkins showed Franklin's Photo 51 to Watson. Like Gosling before him, Wilkins did not ask Franklin's permission to share her work, but, also like Gosling, he did not feel that he needed to do so. Photo 51 had not seemed especially important to either Franklin or Wilkins, but its clear indication that the B form of DNA, at least, had to be a helix struck Watson like a thunderclap. "The instant I saw the picture my mouth fell open and my pulse began to race," he wrote in *The Double Helix*.

⑩ Watson already knew from William Astbury's photos of DNA that the bases in the DNA molecule were 3.4 Å apart, and he and Crick had determined several months before that the diameter of the molecule was 20 Å. Wilkins told him that there were 10 nucleotides in a single repeat, or complete turn of the helix, so he quickly calculated that the height of one repeat must be 34 Å. He [ ] [ ] he now [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] he [ ] [ ] [ ] building a new model.

⑪ Aaron Klug found a draft of this paper dated March 17, before Franklin had heard about the Watson-Crick model, among Franklin's scientific notes (which he inherited after her death). He published an article describing this previously unknown draft in the April 26, 1974, issue of *Nature*. According to Klug, the draft paper showed that at that time, Franklin—who had already moved to Birkbeck—was on the verge of working out the DNA molecule's structure for herself. She recognized that the molecule was a two-chain helix with the phosphate groups on the outside and the bases on the inside. She guessed that cytosine and thymine, the two pyrimidines, were interchangeable, and so were the two purines, adenine and guanine, whereas a purine and a pyrimidine were not. She had not reached the final insights about the one-up-one-down structure of the chains and the specific pairing of the bases, but in a few more months—even weeks or days, perhaps—she might have grasped those facts as well if she had continued to work on DNA. Klug, Raymond Gosling, and even James Watson have said or written that Franklin might have reached these key insights before Watson and Crick if she had been working with the right person—someone as compatible with her as Watson and Crick were with one another, or as Klug (whom she did not know at that time) eventually became with her. Klug, for instance, told Horace Freeland Judson, "She needed a collaborator, and she didn't have one. Somebody to break the pattern of her thinking, to show her what was right in front of her, to push her up and over."

Q 9. Which of the following words could best be added to [Q9] in paragraph ① (line 7)?

1. buffer
2. carrier
3. debris
4. excess
5. observer

Q10. Which of the following is true according to paragraph ② ?

1. Aaron Klug collaborated with Franklin throughout her entire scientific career.
2. Aaron Klug believed Franklin's work on DNA was not a very significant contribution overall.
3. The discovery of the DNA structure was attributed solely to Rosalind Franklin by her contemporaries.
4. Franklin's DNA studies, though a small part of her work, were crucial in the discovery of the structure of DNA.
5. Watson and Crick discovered the DNA structure entirely independent and uninfluenced by Franklin's findings.

Q11. According to paragraph ③, what ethical issue is raised regarding Watson and Crick's work ?

1. They published Franklin's data only after receiving her explicit permission.
2. They actively and fully collaborated with all other scientists on the structure of DNA.
3. Much to Franklin's professional detriment, they deliberately delayed the publication of their findings.
4. They openly and fully acknowledged Franklin's pivotal contribution in all their initial publications.
5. They may have utilized Franklin's unpublished data without her awareness and failed to credit her adequately.

Q12. What can be inferred from paragraph ④ about the controversy surrounding Rosalind Franklin ?

1. Maurice Wilkins actively campaigned against the discrimination faced by women scientists in his laboratory.
2. There is now a unanimous agreement among historians that Franklin faced no significant gender discrimination.
3. Anne Sayre and Horace Freeland Judson hold the exact same view on the role of discrimination in Franklin's career.
4. Feminist writers have conclusively proven that Franklin's personality was the sole cause of her professional difficulties.
5. The extent to which gender discrimination impacted Rosalind Franklin's career remains a subject of ongoing debate.

Writing Answer Question B, for article〔II〕

Write your answer on the writing answer sheet in section [WAQ B1].

Find the best word in paragraph ⑤ that means the same thing as "race" and write that word in the Writing Answer Section. Please write clearly. Spelling must also be correct.

Q13. In paragraph ⑥, the underlined phrase "another event" (line 1) refers to -

1. Gosling showed Photo 51 to Wilkins.
2. Franklin contracted an influenza infection.
3. Franklin delivered a seminar at King's College.
4. Linus Pauling published a paper about the structure of DNA.
5. Franklin obtained an exceptionally clear X-ray image of the A form of DNA.

Q14. Which of the following is true with regard to Raymond Gosling's actions surrounding the handling the data contained in Photo 51 (as described in paragraph ⑥) ?

1. Photo 51 was an old and unclear X-ray image of the DNA molecule.
2. Franklin had explicitly instructed Gosling to share the photo with Wilkins.
3. It was a photograph depicting the A form of DNA, which Franklin was primarily focused on.
4. Gosling believed he did not require Franklin's permission as the photo was part of ongoing lab research and also represented his own work.
5. When showing it to Wilkins, Wilkins immediately, at that moment, understood the full implications of Photo 51 for the DNA structure, unlike Franklin at that time.

Writing Answer Question B, for article〔Ⅱ〕

Write your answer on the writing answer sheet in section [WAQ B2].

On the Writing Answer Sheet, write in the corresponding spaces provided, the appropriate Japanese translation of the underlined phrase "ill-fated effort" in paragraph ⑧ (line 6).

Q15. In paragraph ⑨, the underlined phrase "struck Watson like a thunderclap" (lines 7 and 8) implies that Photo 51:

1. It was physically damaging and shocking for Watson to view the photo.
2. The photo confirmed Watson's pre-existing theories about the A form of DNA.
3. A very loud and startling noise was actually made when Photo 51 was revealed.
4. Seeing the photo was completely irrelevant, even confusing, to Watson's ongoing research.
5. The photo had a sudden, profound, and revelatory impact on Watson's understanding of the structure of DNA.

Writing Answer Question B, for article〔Ⅱ〕

Write your answer on the writing answer sheet in section [WAQ B3].

On the Writing Answer Sheet, put the following words into the proper order necessary to complete the sentence. Please put them in the order that makes the best sense within the context of paragraph ⑩.

[basic], [begin], [felt], [had], [information], [needed], [that], [the], [to]

He [ ] [ ] he now [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] he [ ] [ ] [ ] building a new model.

Q16. According to Aaron Klug's analysis of Franklin's draft paper, in paragraph ⑪, what was Franklin on the verge of discovering independently ?

1. She was close to yielding conclusive proof that DNA, in any form, was not helical in structure.
2. She had realized that Linus Pauling's model of DNA, which Watson had shown her, was essentially correct.
3. She realized that purines combined only with like purines, and pyrimidines only with like pyrimidines in their sequence as nucleotides.
4. She was close to discovering the entire three-dimensional structure of DNA, including the chain directions and the specific rules for base pairing.
5. She was close to discovering that the DNA molecule was a two-chain helix with phosphate groups on the outside and bases inside, and understanding the base-pairing principles.

Q17. In paragraph ⑪, what do Klug, Gosling, and even James Watson suggest might have occurred if Rosalind Franklin had worked with a more compatible collaborator ?

1. Her noted personality conflicts with colleagues would have likely worsened.
2. She would have likely abandoned her research on DNA structure much sooner.
3. She would have focused her efforts exclusively on the A form of DNA, ignoring the B form.
4. She would have immediately sought to join Watson and Crick's research team at Cambridge.
5. She might have independently elucidated the final structure of DNA before Watson and Crick did.

〔Ⅲ〕

Read the following article carefully and answer the questions. For each question, choose ONE BEST answer. On your answer sheet, find the number of the question and fill in the space that corresponds to the number of the answer you have chosen.

(Based on Lindsay Marszal, All Over Again, from the Journal of The American Medical Association 2025.2264)

① Would you go into healthcare services if you had to do it all over again? It's a question I've been asked more than once, usually by someone curious about a profession that is both deeply rewarding and endlessly demanding. When I hear it, my mind first flashes to the struggles—the quiet battles I've fought in fields often undervalued or misunderstood. I recall the hours spent on relentless paperwork, **[Q18a]** authorizations, and **[Q18b]** coordination that went unnoticed. I remember **[Q19]** seeing my work reduced to a line on a budget sheet, threatened by low reimbursement rates and revenue-driven metrics. These memories come quickly, sharp and familiar.

② One of the first times I sensed the **[Q20]** in medicine was during my training when an adult medicine physician commented on my plans to pursue pediatrics*1. He raised his brows and said warmly, "Are you sure? You could go into any field you want to." His words were meant as encouragement, but they lingered with me differently. The implication was clear: pediatrics wasn't seen as a field for those who are ambitious or full of potential. It was perceived as simple, soft—somehow lesser.

③ Working in pediatrics has been a journey of constantly navigating and fighting for respect, not just for myself but for patients and their families. Pediatrics demands intellectual rigor along with emotional strength that few outside the field understand. My patients live with rare diagnoses and complex physiologies that challenge even the most **[Q23]** clinicians. The stakes feel higher, not only because of the clinical complexities but also because of the sheer preciousness of these young lives.

④ When I entered palliative*2 care, the respect gap only widened. Many don't realize that this work—helping families navigate their child's life and, sometimes, their death—requires as much medical expertise and decisiveness as any other field of medicine. It also demands emotional courage and the ability to see beyond a diagnosis, to hold space for the person behind the illness. Every day, I sit with families, helping them weigh the impossible, listening to their hopes, acknowledging their fears, and offering my hand in a journey where answers are few.

⑤ Caring for children who often have **[Q24a]** disabilities deepens my sense of purpose and magnifies the challenges. I've been in rooms where the worth of these children is questioned—not overtly, but in subtle, unsettling ways. I once participated in a discussion about a girl with **[Q24b]** disabilities, a patient I had come to know well. She had the brightest eyes and the most radiant smile—a smile that spoke volumes, conveying connection and emotion as powerful as any words. During an interdisciplinary meeting, a colleague casually asked, "Is this all really necessary?" as if the quality of her life, and thus the care she receives, was solely ours to decide. Advocating for health equity and against ableism*3 in medicine can sometimes feel like shouting into the wind.

⑥ Beyond these specialty-specific challenges, there exists another layer of complexity: the reality of being a woman in medicine. I think of the moments when my expertise was questioned, when my empathy was mislabeled as emotion, and when my advocacy for vulnerable patients was deemed overly aggressive. It's exhausting to balance warmth with authority and compassion with professionalism, knowing that every word and decision may be subtly filtered through biases I cannot fully control. There is a constant tension in trying to inhabit the narrow space allotted to "acceptable" female leadership.

⑦ Despite the challenges, I stay grounded and lean into the experiences that sustain me, experiencing humanity at its core. When I sit with a mother gently holding her child, watching every breath with reverent hope, I am reminded of the beauty and vulnerability of life. There is something sacred about being present in families' most vulnerable moments, something powerful about showing up not only with medical expertise but also with humility and presence. This work isn't about "fixing" or "curing" in the traditional sense. It's about holding space for the beauty and dignity of every life, of saying, "I see you, and I am here."

⑧ So although my mind may initially flash to the struggles and burdens, it is soon overtaken by a flood of beautiful faces and moments that remind me why I wouldn't hesitate to say, "Yes," all over again. I hope that answer never changes, even though I carry a small, persistent worry—the fear that the moral injury from the injustices facing my patients and the systemic devaluation of my chosen subspeciality could one day feel like too much. Yet, for now, the resilience of patients and their families and the purpose I find in this work keep me steadfast in my commitment.

*1 pediatrics: the branch of medicine that deals with children and their diseases.

*2 palliative: reducing pain, but without actually curing the cause(s) of the pain.

*3 ableism: a social prejudice against people who are physically and/or mentally disabled.

Q18. In paragraph ① line 5, which of the following contains a set of words that could best be added to [Q18a] and [Q18b], respectively ?

	Q18a	Q18b
1.	declining	discouraging
2.	easy	inappropriate
3.	pretending	easy
4.	prior	care
5.	unnecessary	sloppy

Q19. Which of the following phrases could best be added to [Q19] in paragraph ① line 6 ?

1. the pride of
2. the sting of
3. the satisfaction of
4. the contentment of
5. the appropriateness of

Q20. Which of the following phrases could best be added to [Q20] in paragraph ② line 1 ?

1. quiet biases
2. overt directives
3. uplifting consensus
4. proper perspectives
5. positive judgements

Q21. Which of the following is true of paragraph ② ?

1. Pediatrics is viewed by everyone as a field of medicine that is complex and challenging.
2. The medical care of children is full of easy demands that are constantly met by all people.
3. The medical field that takes care of children is somehow seen as straightforward and second-class.
4. Tending only to the well-being of children is not paramount, and it only requires the best in the field to enter into it.
5. Pediatrics is universally seen as an area of healthcare that is so important that only the top people, in terms of achievement, should ever choose the specialty.

Q22. Which of the following is true of paragraph ③ ?

1. Children's medicine requires both intelligence and sensitivity to care for its patients.
2. Heartfelt apprehension together with rigid interpretation are the simple requirements in the field of pediatrics.
3. Scholarliness is the exclusive overriding requirement for healthcare providers in children's medicine that needs to be met.
4. A high emotional quotient in the caregiver should be given complete precedence over the intelligence quotient in the field of children's medicine.
5. A strong passion in caring for children in healthcare will overcome all obstacles that may eventually arise, and the demanding details will naturally work their way out in the process.

Q23. Which of the following words could best be added to [Q23] in paragraph ③ line 5 ?

1. freshman
2. inexpert
3. novice
4. rookie
5. seasoned

Q24. In paragraph ⑤ lines 1 and 4, which of the following contains a set of words that could best be added to [Q24a] and [Q24b], respectively ?

	Q24a	Q24b
1.	encouraging	plain
2.	profound	complex
3.	shallow	uninvolved
4.	straightforward	uncomplicated
5.	unambiguous	transparent

Q25. Which of the following could best be deduced to be the definition of the underlined word "<u>interdisciplinary</u>" as used by the author in paragraph ⑤ line 6 ?

1. People from various areas of healthcare come together to consult on a course of action.
2. A single group of people enters the process of decision-making solely to dictate the course of treatment.
3. People from only a single field gather to share their narrow perspectives in order to direct the care of the patient.
4. A collection of individuals with the exact same professional expertise holds a meeting to decide the next step in the treatment protocol.
5. Everyone within a department gathers together in order to create a multiplex, divergent, discordant consensus for satisfying the patient.

Q26. Which of the following best represents the authors meaning in the last underlined sentence of paragraph ⑤ ?

1. The volume of one's voice is very important when trying to help others.
2. It can be an immense struggle, sometimes in vain, to try to change things that are deeply ingrained in a system.
3. Equal medical care for all is quite naturally obtained as a matter of course whenever people care enough to keep speaking up about it.
4. Significant improvements inevitably manifest when people tirelessly promote the equal rights, in terms of access to healthcare, of all human beings.
5. Changing the mindset of people outside the healthcare industry is a struggle that can readily be turned around as long as it is championed by courageous individuals.

Q27. Which of the following is true of the authors description in paragraph ⑥ ?

1. Females and males in healthcare are clearly held to the same standards.
2. The practice of pediatrics is a primary healthcare field that is only suited to one gender.
3. Women make better caregivers than men in both healthcare and family environments.
4. There are gender differences in terms of the perspectives in which healthcare providers are viewed.
5. Identification with the patient is a quality that male healthcare providers have much more experience with.

Q28. Which of the following best represents what the author is trying to say in the double underlined phrases "<u>to hold space</u>" and "<u>holding space</u>" in paragraphs ④ (line 4) and ⑦ (line 7) ?

1. Create a safe and supportive environment for the person being taken care of.
2. Respect the patient as a human being, but place clear limits on what is to be discussed.
3. It is imperative to be only partially present for somebody else when tending to sensitive matters.
4. Invalidating an individual's concerns is a realistic maneuver when navigating complex problems in healthcare.
5. Offering conditional support to a patient, especially children, is the most important aspect in administering treatment.

Q29. Which of the following is FALSE, in terms of what the author is trying to say in paragraph ⑧?

1. Integrity and compassionate care for children are things that will inevitably be achieved.
2. Inequality in the treatment of patients who are children could perhaps be a problem too big for one person to take on.
3. Virtue and fairness in creating equal healthcare for all types of children is a steep and difficult mountain to climb—one that may prove to be too much.
4. The prevalent putting down of people working in a particular field trying to help others could eventually become a situation that is perceived to be unable to be overcome.
5. Not doing what is right for the person being cared for, on top of an underappreciated area of healthcare, is a combination that may not lend itself to being a very hopeful situation easily prone to change.