

※注意：Part I 題目請於試卷內之「選擇題作答區」依序作答，Part II 請作答於試卷內之「非選擇題作答區」。

Part I (40%): Reading Comprehension (閱讀並回答下列問題於試卷內之「選擇題作答區」):

Article 1: Excerpts of "Taipei woman demands NT\$18,000 in DNA testing to catch NT\$59 yogurt bottle thief", by Keoni Everington, Taiwan News, December 3rd, 2018.

A female undergraduate student (...) in Taipei recently discovered that one of her bottles of yogurt had been pilfered from the communal refrigerator and been consumed by one of her five roommates without her permission, (...) When she confronted all five roommates about the incident, none admitted to committing the devious deed, so she went straight to the police station to press charges for theft and asked that police start an investigation.

Police accepted the case and an investigation team began trying to collect fingerprints on the bottle, however, because the container had been wet when it was handled, fingerprints could not be successfully collected. The student then asked police to carry out a DNA forensics investigation to catch the thief.

According to the Statute for DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid) Sampling, the police had to notify all five of her roommates to come to the police station to collect their DNA. Including the woman and her five roommates, a total of six DNA samples were taken.

Police said that each DNA test costs NT\$3,000, and since six were carried out, the total cost of the DNA testing alone came to NT\$18,000. As the police department had to cover the cost for the tests instead of the college student, it is ultimately the taxpayers who had to foot the bill.

In the end, police were able to identify the roommate who had stolen the bottle of yogurt and charged her with theft. However, news that such a large amount of money and effort had been spent on such a minor case quickly spread and drew criticism from officials and the public.

The Taipei Police Department's 2019 budget for forensic investigations has climbed to NT\$22 million, an increase of nearly NT\$2.5 million over the previous year, including the collection of fingerprints and shoe imprints, biological evidence gathering, drug testing, urinalysis, and other criminal identification methods. The Taipei City Police Department said that the cost of DNA acquisition and testing is the most expensive form of evidence collection at NT\$3,000 per sample, followed by drug testing, which ranges between NT\$900 to NT\$2,200.

Former Central Police University professor, Yeh Yu-lan, told Apple Daily "It is difficult to follow the principle of proportionality, but when it involves the rights and obligations of the people, the police still have to do it." Yeh described this case as an "unheard of waste of police and investigative resources!"

Article 2: Excerpts of "The Other Side of 'Broken Windows", by Eric Klinenberg, New Yorker, August 23rd 2018.

(...) Consider the "broken windows" theory, which the Harvard political scientist James Q. Wilson and the Rutgers criminologist George Kelling introduced, in a piece in The Atlantic, in 1982. According to Wilson and Kelling, criminals perceive broken windows and other forms of disorder as signs of weak social control; in turn, they assume that crimes committed there are unlikely to be checked. "Though it is not inevitable," Wilson and Kelling argue, "it is more likely that here, rather than in places where people are confident they can regulate public behavior by informal controls, drugs will change hands,

見背面

prostitutes will solicit, and cars will be stripped.”

“Broken Windows” is one of the most cited articles in the history of criminology; it’s sometimes called the Bible of policing. Since the nineteen-eighties, cities throughout the world have used Wilson and Kelling’s ideas as motivation for “zero tolerance” policing, wherein officers monitor petty crimes, such as graffiti, loitering, public intoxication, and even panhandling, and courts severely punish those convicted of committing them. “If you take care of the little things, then you can prevent a lot of the big things,” the former Los Angeles and New York City police chief William J. Bratton has said. (...)

In 2005, the sociologist Lance Hannon showed that, in New York City’s high-poverty areas, the number of abandoned houses in a given census tract correlated with homicide levels. But Branas and MacDonald wanted to draw from an even deeper study, which required collecting an enormous amount of data (...)

One of the team’s first research projects involved two natural experiments in Philadelphia. In one, they examined violent crime around 2,356 abandoned buildings that had been in violation of Philadelphia’s anti-bligh ordinance. A set of six hundred and seventy-six buildings had been remediated by the owners, which meant they had been “treated” with replacement doors and windows; the rest had not. Every month, for a three-year period between 2010 and 2013, the researchers compared violent-crime levels around the treated buildings with violent-crime levels around a randomly selected, geographically matched group of buildings that remained in disrepair.

The second experiment compared violent crime around vacant lots. According to the team’s research, there were 49,690 such lots in Philadelphia. P.H.S. had remediated at least 4,436 of them, which meant it had cleared trash and debris, graded the land, planted grass and trees to create a parklike setting, and installed low fences with walk-in openings to facilitate recreational use and deter illegal dumping. Again, Branas and his colleagues compared the treated sites with a set of randomly selected, geographically matched properties. In this study, they measured crime annually, over a full decade, from 1999 to 2008.

(...)

Compelling theories, as critics of broken-windows policing know all too well, are often betrayed by evidence. That’s why Branas was so surprised by the findings from their first study, published in the American Journal of Public Health, which showed a thirty-nine-per-cent reduction in gun violence in and around remediated abandoned buildings and a smaller—but still meaningful—five-per-cent reduction in gun violence in and around remediated lots. These are extraordinary numbers, at a level of impact one rarely sees in a social-science experiment.

Equally powerful, Branas said, was that there was no evidence that the violence had simply shifted to nearby places. The declines were real. And they lasted from one to nearly four years, making the benefit far more sustainable than those of other crime-reduction programs. “Honestly, it was a bigger effect than we’d expected to find,” he said.

Answer the following questions. For Questions 1-4, select one answer choice:

1. (5%) According to Article 1, the police:
 - a. Were able to collect fingerprints and identified the thief in part thanks to the fingerprints.
 - b. Were unable to collect fingerprints because water had prevented an imprint of the finger prints.
 - c. Were unable to compare fingerprints because the accused did not have finger prints in the system.
 - d. Were able to collect fingerprints but decided they wanted to test the new DNA equipment instead.

2. (5%) According to Article 1, which one of the following statements is true:
- As a result of this investigation, the 2019 budget for forensic investigations increased by nearly NT\$2.5 million over 2018's budget.
 - The range of cost for the DNA procedure varies from NT\$900 to NT\$2,200.
 - Yeh Yu-lan felt that the investigation, as conducted, was an unacceptable use of police resources.
 - In addition to DNA testing, the police also attempted shoe imprints, drug analysis, and urinalysis in this case.
3. (5%) True or False: According to Article 1, the budget for forensic investigations was lower in 2018 than in 2019.
- True
 - False
 - Not specified in Article 1.
4. (5%) According to Article 2, which one of the following statements is true:
- Experiments were performed in nature.
 - Experiments were performed by Sociologist Lance Hannon.
 - The reduction in crime persisted for a longer time than experts anticipated.

For the following questions, consider each of the choices separately and select all that apply.

5. (10%) According to Article 2, "Broken Windows" is a theory that: (choose all)
- Suggests we stop criminals to prevent windows from breaking.
 - Has motivated policies involved with reducing smaller crimes.
 - Has been betrayed by the evidence.
 - Relies on the assumption that criminals expect a lower degree of law enforcement if businesses don't accept checks.
 - Has evidence that the reduction of crime in one neighborhood causes an increase in crime for other neighborhoods.
6. (10%) According to Article 2, some of the remediated houses:
- Were torn down.
 - Had their doors replaced.
 - Were left untreated.
 - Caused new homes to be built in the neighborhood as a result of the crime change.
 - Had fences installed to prevent criminals from accessing the property.

Part II (60%): Analytical Writing (分析寫作；作答於試卷內之「非選擇題作答區」)

Read the following article, then plan and compose a response to the particular issue below. Responding to any other issue will receive a score of zero. Be sure to respond according to the specific instructions and support your position on the issue with reasons and examples drawn from such areas as your reading, experience, observations, and/or academic studies.

Article 3: Excerpts of "2017 Crime Situations and Analyses", by Yeong-Dar Wu and I-Chia Tsai, Crime Trend Reports 2017, 9 January 2019.

The number of larceny decreased in the last ten years. Among the types of larceny, the sharpest fall occurred in motor vehicle theft. In 2017 the highest share of suspects in larceny cases to total offenders was pickpocketing, which grew each year over the last ten years. (...)

見背面

In 2017 non-prosecution decisions represented the largest share of outcomes made after investigation, followed by motion filed for summary judgments, and prosecutions under general procedures. (...)

In the last five years, the monthly number of cases handled by each prosecutor gradually increased.

The NT\$18,000 used to test DNA for the theft of a NT\$59 yogurt bottle was a waste of police resources and will not help prevent larger crimes.

Write a response in which you discuss the extent to which you agree or disagree with this claim **AND** the reasons on which that claim is based. When possible, please provide an economic justification for your arguments.

You should write no less than 300 words, but no more than 1000 words. Your response will be evaluated for its overall quality based on how well you:

- Respond to the specific task instructions
- Consider the complexities of the issue
- Organize, develop, and express your ideas
- Support your ideas with relevant reasons and/or examples
- Control the elements of standard written English

Note: An essay not directly addressing the topic is considered off-topic and receives no points.

Before beginning writing, you may want to think for a few minutes and then plan your response. **Use the bottom of this page to plan your response, and then write your response in the answer sheets (試卷內之「非選擇題作答區」)**. Be sure to develop your positions completely and organize it coherently, but spare some time to proof-read what you have written to make any revisions you deem necessary.

Plan Your Response Here – Write Your Essay in the Answer Sheets (試卷內之「非選擇題作答區」)

試題隨卷繳回