

英语二阅读真题同源过关练习连载三

文章来源：经济学家 段落：六段 字数：450 内容：心理学

要求：A. 做题 B. 找到出题处 C. 挑五个句子翻译 D. 将文中单词认真背完

“IS SIN original?” That is the question addressed by Shaul Shalvi, a psychologist at the University of Amsterdam, in a paper just published in Psychological Science. Dr Shalvi and his colleagues, Ori Eldar and Yoella Bereby-Meyer of Ben-Gurion University in Israel, wanted to know if the impulse to cheat is something that grows or diminishes when the potential cheater has time for reflection on his actions. Is cheating, in other words, instinctive or calculating?

Appropriately, the researchers' apparatus for their experiment was that icon of sinful activity, the gambling die. They wanted to find out whether people were more likely to lie about the result of a die roll when asked that result immediately, or when given time to think.

To carry out their experiment, Dr Shalvi, Dr Eldar and Dr Bereby-Meyer gave each of 76 volunteers a six-sided die and a cup. Participants were told that a number of them, chosen at random, would earn ten shekels (about \$2.50) for each pip of the numeral they rolled on the die. They were then instructed to shake their cups, check the outcome of the rolled die and remember this roll. Next, they were asked to roll the die two more times, to satisfy themselves that it was not loaded, and, that done, to enter the result of the first roll on a computer terminal. Half of the participants were told to complete this procedure within 20 seconds while the others were given no time limit.

The researchers had no way of knowing what numbers participants actually rolled, of course. But they knew, statistically, that the average roll, if people reported honestly, should have been 3.5. This gave them a baseline from which to calculate participants' honesty. Those forced to enter their results within 20 seconds, the researchers found, reported a mean roll of 4.6. Those who were not under any time pressure reported a mean roll of 3.9. Both groups lied, then. But those who had had more time for reflection lied less.

A second experiment confirmed this result. A different bunch of volunteers were asked to roll the die just once. Again, half were put under time pressure and, since there were no additional rolls to make, the restriction was changed from 20 seconds to eight. The others were allowed to consider the matter for as long as they wished.

The conclusion, therefore, at least in the matter of cheating at dice, is that sin is indeed original. Without time for reflection, people will default to the mode labeled “cheat”. Given such time, however, they will often do the right thing. If you want someone to be honest, then, do not press him too hard for an immediate decision.

1 the word ‘original’ in paragraph 1 probably means

A. inborn B. preliminary C. habitual D. innocent

2 the purpose of the die experiment is to

- A. testify the human nature of gamblers in gambling
- B. respond to the query of the public with curiosity
- C. answer a headedly-discussed question
- D. ascertain the interrelationship between time and cheating

3 the testing result in paragraph 4 showed that

- A. the former lied as frequently as the latter
- B. people given more time lied more
- C. people given less time tended to tell the truth
- D. people given less time lied more

4 we can infer from the last paragraph that

- A. an honest person can achieve success more easily than others
- B. truthfulness has something to do with careful thinking
- C. hasty decisions usually lead to disastrous impacts

D. the correlation between honesty and haste seems to be less clear

5 the best title of this passage may be

A. time and tide wait for no man

B. Lies can never change fact

C. more speed, less truth

D. lies have short legs

答案: ADDBC

“IS SIN original?” That is the question addressed by Shaul Shalvi, a psychologist at the University of Amsterdam, in a paper just published in Psychological Science. Dr Shalvi and his colleagues, Ori Eldar and Yoella Bereby-Meyer of Ben-Gurion University in Israel, wanted to know if the impulse to cheat is something that grows or diminishes when the potential cheater has time for reflection on his actions. Is cheating, in other words, instinctive or calculating? 第一题答案出处

Appropriately, the researchers' apparatus for their experiment was that icon of sinful activity, the gambling die. They wanted to find out whether people were more likely to lie about the result of a die roll when asked that result immediately, or when given time to think. 第二题答案出处

To carry out their experiment, Dr Shalvi, Dr Eldar and Dr Bereby-Meyer gave each of 76 volunteers a six-sided die and a cup. Participants were told that a number of them, chosen at random, would earn ten shekels (about \$2.50) for each pip of the numeral they rolled on the die. They were then instructed to shake their cups, check the outcome of the rolled die and remember this roll. Next, they were asked to roll the die two more times, to satisfy themselves that it was not loaded, and, that done, to enter the result of the first roll on a computer terminal. Half of the participants were told to complete this procedure within 20 seconds while the others were given no time limit.

The researchers had no way of knowing what numbers participants actually rolled, of course. But they knew, statistically, that the average roll, if people reported honestly, should have been 3.5. This gave them a baseline from which to calculate participants' honesty. Those forced to enter their results within 20 seconds, the researchers found, reported a mean roll of 4.6. Those who were not under any time pressure reported a mean roll of 3.9. Both groups lied, then. But those who had had more time for reflection lied less. 第三题答案出处

A second experiment confirmed this result. A different bunch of volunteers were asked to roll the die just once. Again, half were put under time pressure and, since there were no additional rolls to make, the restriction was changed from 20 seconds to eight. The others were allowed to consider the matter for as long as they wished.

The conclusion, therefore, at least in the matter of cheating at dice, is that sin is indeed original. Without time for reflection, people will default to the mode labeled “cheat”. Given such time, however, they will often do the right thing. If you want someone to be honest, then, do not press him too hard for an immediate decision. 第四题答案出处

全文翻译:

“人性本‘恶’？”这是由阿姆斯特丹大学的一位心理学家 Shaul Shalvi，在《心理科学》杂志上发表的一篇文章中所提出的问题。Shalvi 博士和他的两位同事——以色列 Ben-Gurion 大学的 Ori Eldar 和 Yoella Bereby-Meyer，希望知道如果那些潜在的骗子有时间对他们的行为做出充分考虑，他们撒谎的冲动会否因此增强或减弱呢？换句话说，撒谎究竟是人的一种本能行为，还是经过仔细分析后所做出的选择呢？

研究人员为他们的实验选择了一样合适的工具——骰子——罪恶活动的标志。他们想查明的是：人们是在摇骰后立即被询问其结果时容易撒谎呢，还是在他们获得一定的思考余地的时候呢？

实验前，Shalvi 博士，Eldar 博士和 Bereby-Meyer 博士给作为实验对象的 76 位志愿者每人发了一个摇盅和一粒骰子。参加者被告知他们中的一部分被随机抽选出来的，会依据其掷出的骰子点数而得到相应数目的奖励，每点 10 谢克尔（约合 2.5 美元）。接着他们便按照指示摇盅，开盅查看结果，记住点数。然后他们被要求多摇两次，以让自己确信骰子中没有被灌铅。最后，让他们自己在电脑终端里输入第一次所掷出的点数。有一半参加者被要求在 20 秒内完成整个实验流程，而另一半则没有时间限制。

研究人员当然无法知晓每个参加者实际掷出点数。但他们知道，依照统计学规律，如果所有人都能做到如实上报点数，那么这次实验的平均掷出点数应为 3.5。这就为研究人员提供了一个测量参加者诚实程度的依据。他们发现，那组被要求于 20 秒内输入结果的参加者所上报的掷出点数平均值为 4.6，而另外没有时间压力的参加者的为 3.9。显然这两组人都撒谎了，不过在那些有充分时间进行考虑的参加者中撒谎的较少。

第二次实验则验证了这一结果。这次是另一群不同的志愿者被要求掷骰子，不过只掷一次。同上次一样，他们中一半人被限制了时间，并且由于此次只需掷一次骰子，时间限制也从 20s 缩短为 8s，其余一般则想考虑多久都行。

因此，得出的结论——是至少在此次摇骰作弊的案例中如此——“人性本‘恶’”。在缺少时间进行考虑的情况下，人们会进入默认的“撒谎”模式。然而，如果他们获得了那样的考虑时间，一般会做出道德上正确的选择。所以，如果你希望某人对你诚实，那么千万别逼迫他立即做出决定啊。