

平成 22 年度入学者選抜個別(第 2 次)学力検査問題

外 国 語

注 意 事 項

1. 監督者の指示があるまで、この冊子を開いてはいけません。
2. 問題冊子は、全部で 8 ページあり、第 1～3 ページは下書用紙です。下書用紙は切り離してはいけません。
3. 問題は、第 4 ページと第 5 ページの間に、はさみこんであります。
4. 解答用紙は、問題冊子と別に印刷されているので、誤らないように注意しなさい。
5. 解答は、必ず解答用紙の指定された欄内に横書きで記入しなさい。
6. 各解答用紙には、受験番号欄が 2 または 4 か所あります。それぞれ記入を忘れないこと。
7. 解答用紙は、記入の有無にかかわらず、机上に置き、持ち帰ってはいけません。問題冊子は持ち帰りなさい。
8. 落丁または印刷の不鮮明な箇所があれば申し出なさい。

学科によって解答すべき問題が異なります。
説明に従って解答しなさい。

外 国 語

次の英文は *Science* 誌(2008年12月12日)に掲載された“The Spreading of Disorder”(Kees Keizer, Siegwart Lindenberg, Linda Steg の共著)の記事を一部改変したものです。この文章をよく読んで、問題 **1** から **6** のうち、医学科と歯学科の受験者は問題 **3**, **4**, **5**, **6** に答えなさい。保健衛生学科(看護・検査)と口腔保健学科の受験者は問題 **1**, **2**, **3**, **5**, **6** に答えなさい。解答は解答用紙の指定された欄に記入すること。

*印のついている語句の注は本文のあとに示されています。

In the mid-1990s, the mayor of New York and his police commissioner focused on fighting signs of disorder and petty crime*. Graffiti* was removed, streets were cleaned, and signs of vandalism* were cleared. This **campaign** was based on the broken windows theory (BWT). The BWT suggests that signs of disorder like broken windows, **litter**, and graffiti cause other types of disorder and petty crime. It was thought that removing signs of disorder would take away an important **trigger** of disorderly and petty criminal behavior. After the introduction of the campaign, petty crime rates in New York dropped. Since then, approaches based on the BWT have become popular worldwide (e.g., in various cities in the United States, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Indonesia, and South Africa).

The BWT is popular, but it lacks scientific support. Studies designed to test **it**⁽¹⁾ have provided mixed results. There is also little evidence that broken window policing **contributed** to the sharp decrease in petty crime in New York. The BWT suggests that a **setting** with disorder triggers disorderly and petty criminal behavior, but it might be the other way around or both may be caused by a third variable.

Social norms* (i.e., rules or conventions) refer either to the perception of common approval or disapproval of a particular kind of behavior (injunctive norm)

or to a particular behavior common in a setting (descriptive norm). Injunctive norms affect behavior because they provide information about which behavior is most appropriate. For example, the anti-litter norm is a widely held injunctive norm. The extent to which an injunctive norm affects behavior depends on how much the norm is on people's minds. An anti-litter norm will be more on people's minds when they see someone picking up a piece of litter or see the norm stated on a sign. Descriptive norms affect behavior because they provide information about which behavior is most common in a given situation. A littered setting shows that it is common to litter and will therefore *enhance* littering. Injunctive and descriptive norms can be in conflict, for example in a setting where it is common to litter even though littering is disapproved of. Thus, settings described in the BWT as disorderly (e.g., a littered setting) can be thought of as settings where descriptive and injunctive norms are in conflict. The next question then is how behavior is influenced by it.

Injunctive norm information is more effective when accompanied by descriptive norm information that is consistent with that message. For example, a sign drawing attention to the anti-litter norm is more influential when placed in a non-littered setting. Thus, a setting with graffiti can trigger the creation of more graffiti because it *inhibits* the injunctive, anti-graffiti norm. The important question for the BWT is whether or not it also causes disorderly or petty criminal behavior in general. The question we will address is: Do more people litter in a setting where the anti-graffiti norm (injunctive norm) is in conflict with the descriptive norm (a setting where it is common to spray graffiti)?

Much *conformity* to injunctive norms is the result of people pursuing the goal of acting appropriately. However, people can also pursue a selfish goal directed at feeling better or at improving one's resources. All three goals can be in conflict, and the weakening of one is likely to allow another to have more influence. In a given situation, the goal to act appropriately is weakened when people observe that others did not pursue the goal to act appropriately. In turn, a weakening of this

goal strengthens conflicting selfish goals. For example, we predict that when people observe that others have painted graffiti, their concern for appropriateness will be weakened and selfish goals will be strengthened. Thus people don't necessarily copy the inappropriate behavior but may let concerns other than appropriateness take priority. ⁽¹⁾ In this way, one norm violation *fosters* violations of other norms, and disorder spreads from one kind of inappropriate behavior to other kinds.

We conducted experiments in common public spaces. There were no signs in any of the studies that the subjects were aware of being observed by the experimenter. We distinguished between a contextual norm (which the participant witnessed having been violated) and a target norm (a violation committed by the participant). We *manipulated* indications that the contextual norm was being violated. We predicted that disorder (violation of contextual norm) would spread (violation of target norm). For ease of description, let us call the situation in which the contextual norm is violated (i.e., inappropriate behavior by others is being displayed) the “disorder condition” and the one in which it ⁽³⁾ is not violated the “order condition”.

In study 1, the setting was an alley located in a shopping area and commonly used to park bicycles. In the order condition, the walls of the alley were clean, whereas in the disorder condition they ⁽⁴⁾ were covered with graffiti. A standard sign prohibiting graffiti was in the alley, and every subject entering the setting at least glanced at it. Participants were all people who came to collect their bicycles. In their absence, a flyer* had been attached to their bicycle. The flyer was white and very noticeable. The flyer had to be removed to easily use the handlebar. Because there were no trash cans in the alley, “not littering” meant taking it ⁽⁵⁾ with them. We counted throwing the flyer on the ground or hanging it on another bicycle as littering. The effect of violating the anti-graffiti norm on littering was quite substantial. Of the participants in the order condition (non-graffiti), 33% littered compared with 69% of the participants in the disorder condition (graffiti on the

walls).

For study 2, we used a police rule as a contextual norm and “no trespassing” (as ordered by the police) as the target norm in the setting of a car park. Thus, both contextual and target norms were not general social norms but rules set up by the local police. A temporary fence closed off the main entrance for people who came to pick up their car, but a gap of about 50 centimeters was left open in the fence. We attached two signs to the temporary fence directly next to the gap. One sign (our contextual norm) indicated that it was prohibited to lock bicycles to the fence. The other sign (our target norm) made clear that it was prohibited to use this entrance and that people had to use an alternative entrance to the car park, which required walking an extra 200 meters. In the order condition, four bicycles standing one meter in front of the fence were not locked to the fence. In the disorder condition, the four bicycles were locked to the fence. The outcome variable was whether pedestrians followed the “no trespassing” sign (the target norm) and walked the extra 200 meters. Again, there was a clear effect. Of the participants in the order condition, 27% stepped through the gap in the fence, compared with 82% of the participants in the disorder condition.

Would this also hold for a rule set by a private company that is not enforced with punishments? In study 3, a parking garage adjacent to a supermarket and health club was used in which the contextual norm established by the private company is to return shopping carts to the supermarket after loading groceries into one’s car. A very visible sticker with the text: “please return your shopping carts” at the entrance doors of the parking garage focused attention on this request. In the order condition, the garage was clear of shopping carts. In the disorder condition, there were four unreturned shopping carts standing around in disarray. The target norm was the anti-litter norm. The outcome variable was whether or not participants littered a flyer that was placed under the driver’s side windshield wiper of their parked car. Of the participants in the condition without shopping carts, 30% littered the flyer, compared with 58% of the participants where

unreturned shopping carts were visible.

Is disorder only linked to visual cues* of norm violation? Would the effect occur if the contextual norm was only audible? In our fourth study, we focused on a national law as a contextual norm. In the Netherlands it is prohibited by law to set off fireworks in the weeks before New Year's Eve. We wanted to find out, two weeks before New Year's Day, whether an offense against this national law would cause people to litter. The law about fireworks is well known, and its violation would immediately make the law salient in people's minds. The setting was a bicycle shed near a train station. In the order condition, there was no sound of fireworks. In the disorder condition, we set off firecrackers well within hearing distance of the participants but out of sight to prevent any visual cues. We observed whether participants littered a flyer attached to their bicycle. Of the subjects in the order condition, 52% littered the flyer compared with 80% of the subjects that heard fireworks being set off as they entered the bicycle shed.

Our conclusion is that, as certain norm-violating behaviors become more common, they will negatively influence conformity to other norms and rules.

注

petty crime	軽犯罪
graffiti	graffito(らくがき)の複数形
vandalism	破壊[行為]
norms	規範
flyer	ちらし, ビラ
cues	きっかけ, 手がかり

問題

保健衛生学科および口腔保健学科

1 The following words appear in bold italics in the text. On the answer sheet, circle the letter indicating the best definition for each word (based on how the word is used in the text).

campaign

- a) law b) idea c) approach d) mistake e) election

litter

- a) cars b) stores c) pets d) signs e) trash

trigger

- a) gun b) cause c) part d) approval e) threat

contributed

- a) prevented b) blocked c) startled
d) added e) slowed

setting

- a) roadway b) location c) country d) building e) culture

enhance

- a) increase b) end c) decrease d) begin e) prevent

inhibits

- a) blocks b) causes c) inhabits
d) promotes e) interlinks

conformity

- a) creation b) concentration c) problems
d) adherence e) objections

fosters

- a) minimizes b) maximizes c) promotes
d) prohibits e) slows

manipulated

- a) found b) envisioned c) recorded
d) removed e) controlled

保健衛生学科および口腔保健学科

2 *What do the following words, which are underlined in the text, refer to? Answer using one, two, three, or four English words that can replace the underlined text.*

- 1) it 2) it 3) it 4) they 5) it

全学科

3 *According to the text, decide whether the following statements are true (T) or false (F). For each statement circle the correct answer on the answer sheet.*

- 1) The campaign in New York, in the mid-1990s, led to the creation of the broken windows theory (BWT).
- 2) Since the New York campaign, the BWT has been shown to be successful in many countries including the Netherlands, Great Britain, Indonesia, and even South Africa.
- 3) Research done to test the BWT sometimes provided support for the theory, but not always.
- 4) The authors believe the sharp decrease in petty crime in New York is clear evidence of the scientific basis of the BWT.
- 5) Whereas a descriptive norm refers to behavior common in a particular place, an injunctive norm refers to whether or not a behavior is approved of.
- 6) Both injunctive norms and descriptive norms always help to decrease disorder.
- 7) In an ordered condition, a descriptive norm is likely to be the result of people following one or more injunctive norms.
- 8) The power of injunctive norms is enhanced when paired with consistent descriptive norm information.

- 9) Seeing someone painting graffiti will never increase a viewer's likelihood of painting graffiti.
- 10) In a littered setting, the descriptive norm may be in conflict with the injunctive norm.
- 11) When people observe that others did not behave appropriately, it is likely that their concern for being appropriate will be weakened and as a result, their selfish goals may be strengthened.
- 12) People's selfish desires can threaten the effectiveness of injunctive norms because they tend to be in conflict with the idea of social conformity.
- 13) Some subjects were informed before the experiment that they would be observed by an experimenter.
- 14) In study 1, "not littering" was defined as throwing the flyer away into the nearby garbage can.
- 15) In study 1, when a standard sign prohibiting graffiti was placed in an alley, people collecting their bicycles were less likely to litter.
- 16) Study 1 found a 33% increase in littering in the disorder condition, as compared to the order condition.
- 17) In study 2, the percentage of those who trespassed (i.e., entered through the gap in the fence) was substantially lower in the order condition.
- 18) In study 3, the percentage of those who littered was higher in the disorder condition where shopping carts were left unreturned.
- 19) The findings of study 3 support the validity of the BWT in cases where private companies make rules.
- 20) Study 3 demonstrated that a clear, visible sticker with the text "please return your shopping carts" prevented littering even though four shopping carts were standing around in disarray.
- 21) Study 4 demonstrated that seeing people breaking a law (in this case, setting off firecrackers) has an influence on littering.
- 22) Based on the results of the four studies, it appears that disorderly or norm-violating behavior has a bad effect on the way people observe other social and injunctive norms (hence disorder will grow and expand).

- 23) In more than half of the settings created in the four experiments, descriptive norm information and injunctive norm information was in conflict.
- 24) The authors' observations strongly suggest that a situation with graffiti would generally reduce the injunctive power of signs such as "No Smoking".

医学科と歯学科のみ

4 *Briefly (in 15 to 25 words) answer the following questions in your own words, using complete English sentences.*

- 1) Summarize the findings related to the increased littering found in studies 1, 3, and 4 and present the average increase.
- 2) Contrast the design of studies 1 and 4, then briefly explain their common finding.
- 3) Imagine that there is one more sentence at the very end of the article which starts with the words "Thus there is a clear message for policymakers and police officers: ...". Complete this additional sentence by providing the authors' recommendation (s).

全学科

5 下線部(ア)と(イ)を日本語に訳しなさい。

全学科

6 本文中で紹介されている四つの研究は、基本的には同じような条件下に被験者を置くことで行われています。その条件はどのようなものですか。また、どのようなことが検証されていますか。文中の例を用いて300字以内で説明しなさい。なお、以下のキーワードを必ず用いること:規範("norms"),秩序("order condition"),無秩序("disorder condition")。