＊著作権の都合により、実際の入試問題から出典表記を一部改めています

2026年度大学院入試後期日程問題

中京大学大学院

心理学研究科

博士前期（修士）課程

一般選抜

【英語】

試験時間120分 （10：00～12：00）

《受験上の注意事項》

一般注意

① 受験票は、机の通路側に置いてください。
② 指示があるまで問題を開かないでください。
③ すべての試験問題と解答用紙に、受験番号を正しく記入してください。
④ 下書き用紙は各自自由に使用してください。
⑤ 解答は、必ず解答用紙表面に記入してください（解答用紙裏面、試験問題、下書き用紙に記入しても採点されません）。
⑥ 試験中は監督者の指示に従ってください。
⑦ 試験中、質問等がある場合は、手を挙げて監督者に申し出てください。
⑧ 試験終了の指示があったら、ただちに解答用紙への記入をやめてください。
⑨ 配付した試験問題、解答用紙、下書き用紙は、すべて回収します。
⑩ 試験問題は本紙を含め全5枚、解答用紙は全2枚あります。開始の合図があったら、まずすべての枚数がそろっているかを確認し、乱丁・落丁がある場合は、手を挙げて監督者に申し出てください。

机上に置いて良いもの

- 受験票
- 筆記用具
- 時計（時間を計る以外の機能が付いたものは不可）
- 英和辞典（電子辞書又はこれに類する機器は不可）

※これらのもの以外はカバンの中に入れ、床に置いてください。眼鏡、薬、ハンカチ等を机上に置くことを希望する場合は、監督者に申し出て下さい。

（2026年度）　大学院心理学研究科入学試験（後期日程）

博士前期課程（修士課程）　一般選抜

「英語」試験問題(1/4頁)

問題 I

次の英文を読んで、後の問いに答えなさい。(50点)

Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science

INTRODUCTION

Reproducibility is a defining feature of science, but the extent to which it characterizes current research is unknown. Scientific claims should not gain credence because of the status or authority of their originator but by the replicability of their supporting evidence. Even research of exemplary quality may have irreproducible empirical findings because of random or systematic error.

RATIONALE

There is concern about the rate and predictors of reproducibility, but limited evidence. Potentially problematic practices include selective reporting, selective analysis, and insufficient specification of the conditions necessary or sufficient to obtain the results. Direct replication is the attempt to recreate the conditions believed sufficient for obtaining a previously observed finding and is the means of establishing reproducibility of a finding with new data. We conducted a large-scale, collaborative effort to obtain an initial estimate of the reproducibility of psychological science.

RESULTS

We conducted replications of 100 experimental and correlational studies published in three psychology journals using high-powered designs and original materials when available. There is no single standard for evaluating replication success. Here, we evaluated reproducibility using significance and *P* values, effect sizes, subjective assessments of replication teams, and meta-analysis of effect sizes. The mean effect size (r) of the replication effects (M_r = 0.197, SD = 0.257) was half the magnitude of the mean effect size of the original effects (M_r = 0.403, SD = 0.188), representing a substantial decline. Ninety-seven percent of original studies had significant results ($P < .05$). Thirty-six percent of replications had significant results; 47% of original effect sizes were in the 95% confidence interval of the replication effect size; 39% of effects were subjectively rated to have replicated the original result; and if no bias in original results is assumed, combining original and replication results left 68% with statistically significant effects. Correlational tests suggest that replication success was better predicted by the strength of original evidence than by characteristics of the original and replication teams.

CONCLUSION

No single indicator sufficiently describes replication success, and the five indicators examined here are not the only ways to evaluate reproducibility. Nonetheless, collectively these results offer a clear conclusion: A large portion of replications produced weaker evidence for the original findings despite using materials provided by the original authors, review in advance for methodological fidelity, and high statistical power to detect the original effect sizes. Moreover, correlational evidence is

(次のページに続く)

受験番号	

consistent with the conclusion that variation in the strength of initial evidence (such as original *P* value) was more predictive of replication success than variation in the characteristics of the teams conducting the research (such as experience and expertise). The latter factors certainly can influence replication success, but they did not appear to do so here.

Reproducibility is not well understood because the incentives for individual scientists prioritize novelty over replication. Innovation is the engine of discovery and is vital for a productive, effective scientific enterprise. However, innovative ideas become old news fast. Journal reviewers and editors may dismiss a new test of a published idea as unoriginal. The claim that "we already know this" belies the uncertainty of scientific evidence. Innovation points out paths that are possible; replication points out paths that are likely; progress relies on both. Replication can increase certainty when findings are reproduced and promote innovation when they are not. This project provides accumulating evidence for many findings in psychological research and suggests that there is still more work to do to verify whether we know what we think we know.

出典：Reproduced/modified from Open Science Collaboration ,Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. Science 349, aac4716(2015), AAAS.

1. 著者らは心理学研究の再現可能性をどのように調べたか，本文の内容に基づき，100 字以内の日本語で説明しなさい。(10 点)

2. 下線部の英文を 120 字以内の日本語に訳しなさい。(10 点)

3. 著者の結論（CONCLUSION のセクション）を 250 字以内に要約しなさい。(30 点)

（解答用紙１に記入すること）

受験番号	

問題 Ⅱ

下記の文章は、ある論文の Discussion を抜粋したものである。これを読んで、後の問いに答えなさい。

In our study, we observed heterogeneity in the degree to which individuals learned from their failures as a consequence of varying levels of individuals' perceived ability to learn. Specifically, surgeons with elite education, certified expertise, and specialization in patient care exhibited a longer persistence in learning from their own failures compared to their counterparts. Our theory posited that these individuals possess higher perceived ability to learn than their counterparts, resulting in stronger motivation to learn and, consequently, reduced vulnerability to negative emotions and attribution biases associated with repeated failures. Importantly, in other contexts, other individual characteristics may reflect an individual's perceived ability to learn from their own failures. Therefore, researchers examining other empirical settings should adapt their predictions and measures to account for any differences from our context.

A more nuanced implication of our study's results is that not all experiences necessarily lead to learning, and they can even be detrimental to learning. The experiential learning literature has often viewed experience as a beneficial source of learning. However, this may not hold for all types of experiences, especially ones that can elicit negative emotions or attribution biases such as failures. We believe it is crucial for researchers in this domain to consider not only the opportunities for learning that experiences bring, but also other consequences that they lead to, such as changes in the motivation to learn.

We believe our results also have important implications for learning at the organizational level. Organizations are aggregates of individuals; hence, learning by individuals will affect organizational learning. What may seem like a variance in learning rates across organizations could be driven by different learning rates of individuals. Thus, understanding how to improve individuals' learning would be useful for improving organizational performance. Our results suggest that individuals' motivation to learn is an important mechanism for learning from failures and that individuals who have qualifications or past experiences associated with higher perceived ability to learn will have higher motivation to learn, and thus persist longer in learning. While our study focused only on individual learning from their own failures to understand this baseline relationship more deeply, future studies could extend this study to examine how multiple individual-level learning processes aggregate to affect organizational outcomes.

(中略)

Our findings come with some caveats. First, failures occur in different forms across different contexts. In our context, failures are high stakes that involve patient deaths. Hence, the negative emotions triggered by these failures or the likelihood of attribution biases are likely to be larger than when the stakes are not as high. For example, some studies have examined near-misses or errors or less severe failures such as product recalls. Although we predict that the processes we theorized in our paper will occur similarly in most failure-related situations (albeit to different degrees), more research is needed to examine the learning outcomes of experiencing different types of failures. Second, our context involved situations where repeated failures were sometimes beyond the control of the individual. In such contexts, individuals may be more inclined to attribute their failures to external causes as more failures accumulate. Additionally, our setting allowed individuals with relatively high

(次のページに続く)

受験番号	

levels of accumulated failures to remain in the organization despite their failures. Thus, it would be valuable to see future studies examining the relationship in other contexts where termination from the organization is more likely.

出典：Giving up learning from failures? An examination of learning from one's own failures in the context of heart surgeons by Lee, Sunkee;Park, Jisoo, Strategic Management Journal, Volume 45, Issue 10, John Wiley & Sons.

1. 本文中で記述されている「個人の学習」と「組織レベルの学習」について、要約して説明しなさい。(20 点)

2. この研究について注意すべき点として記載されている内容を要約して説明しなさい。(30 点)

（解答用紙２に記入すること）

受験番号	