

이름: _____

수험번호: _____

※ 다음 글을 읽고 물음에 답하십시오.

Say you are getting ready for a blind date or a job interview. What should you do? Besides shower and shave, of course, it turns out you should read—but not just anything. Something by Chekhov or Alice Munro will help you navigate new social territory better than a potboiler* by Danielle Steel.

That is the conclusion of a study published in the journal *Science* Tuesday. It found that after reading literary fiction, as opposed to popular fiction or serious nonfiction, people performed better on tests measuring empathy,* social perception and emotional intelligence—skills that come in especially handy when you are trying to read someone’s body language or gauge* what they might be thinking. The researchers say the reason is that literary fiction often leaves more to the imagination, encouraging readers to make inferences about characters and be sensitive to emotional nuance and complexity. “This is why I love science,” Louise Erdrich, whose novel “The Round House” was used in one of the experiments, wrote in an e-mail. The researchers, she said, “found a way to prove true the intangible* benefits of literary fiction.”

The researchers, social psychologists at the New School for Social Research in New York City, recruited their subjects through that über-purveyor* of reading material, Amazon.com. To find a broader pool of participants than the usual college students, they used Amazon’s Mechanical Turk service, where people sign up to earn money for completing small jobs. People ranging in age from 18 to 75 were recruited for each of five experiments. They were paid \$2 or \$3 each to read for a few minutes. Some were given excerpts* from award-winning literary fiction. Others were given best sellers like Gillian Flynn’s “Gone Girl,” a Rosamunde Pilcher romance or a Robert Heinlein science fiction tale. In one experiment, some participants were given nonfiction excerpts. To maximize the contrast, the researchers—looking for nonfiction that was well-written, but not literary or about people—turned to *Smithsonian Magazine*. “How the Potato Changed the World” was one selection. “Bamboo Steps Up” was another.

After reading—or in some cases reading nothing—the participants took computerized tests that measure people’s ability to decode emotions or predict a person’s expectations or beliefs in a particular scenario.

*potboiler: 통속소설 *empathy: 공감, 감정이입 *gauge: 측정하다, 평가하다

*intangible: 무형의 *über-purveyor: 초거대규모의 공급자 *excerpt: 발췌문

<문제 1> 이 글의 저자가 소개팅이나 취업면접을 위해서 추천하는 것이 무엇인지 구체적으로 말하고 그에 대한 근거가 무엇인지 말해보시오.

<문제 2> 이 글에서 The Round House와 Bamboo Steps Up을 예로 제시한 이유가 무엇인지 말해보시오.

이름: _____

수험번호: _____

※ 다음 글을 읽고 물음에 답하십시오.

Many readers of the *New York Times* were startled recently to learn that one of their most cherished assumptions about clothing and gender was, apparently, without ground. Baby clothes, which since at least the 1940s have been routinely divided along gender and color lines, pink for girls, blue for boys, were, said the *New York Times*, once just the other way around. In the early years of the twentieth century, before World War I, boys wore pink (“a stronger, more decided color,” according to the promotional literature of the time) while girls wore blue (understood to be “delicate” and “graceful”). Only after World War II, the *New York Times* reported, did the present alignment of the two genders with pink and blue come into being.

Few articles in the *New York Times* occasioned as much casual astonishment, at least among people of my acquaintance. It was generally known that infants and small children had for hundreds of years been dressed alike, in frocks,* so that family portraits from previous centuries made it difficult to tell the young boys from the girls. “Breeching,”* as a rite of passage, was a definition of maleness. Gender differentiation grew increasingly desirable to parents as time went on. By the closing years of the twentieth century the sight of little boys in frilly* dresses has become unusual and somewhat funny; a childhood photograph of macho author Ernest Hemingway, aged almost two, in a white dress and large hat adorned with flowers, was itself the focus of much amused critical commentary when reproduced in a best-selling biography—especially when it was disclosed that Hemingway’s mother had labeled the photograph of her son “summer girl.”

Despite this general awareness of the changeability of infant style, the pink-blue reversal came as something of a shock. In a society in which even disposable diapers had now been gender-color-coded (pink for girls, blue for boys, with anatomically correct extra absorbency in the front or middle) the idea that pink was for boys was peculiarly disturbing. Notice that it is the connotations of the colors, and not the perception of the genders, that has changed. But what was so particularly fascinating about this detail from the recent history of taste? I think, perhaps, the fact that it disconcerted* feelings of tradition, continuity, and naturalness of association.

*frock: 원피스, 드레스

*breeching: 바지입기

*frilly: 주름 장식이 달린

*disconcert: 무너뜨리다, 뒤엎다

<문제 1> 필자가 Ernest Hemingway를 언급한 이유가 무엇인지 말해보시오.

<문제 2> 밑줄 친 부분이 의미하는 바가 무엇인지 풀어서 설명해 보시오.