國立臺灣大學社會工作學系 108 學年度博士班入學考試

筆試科目1:社會政策與社會工作

A. (配分 50%)

近年來我國社會福利體系有許多重大的發展與變革,包括長照 2.0、年金改革、社會安全網、兒 少發展帳戶等等。請從這四項重大政策當中選取兩項,說明政府推動該政策的背景與政策過程 (15%),並分別舉一個適合的社會福利理論,來解釋該政策的起源與發展 (35%)。

B. (配分 50%)

- 1. Please read case study below and answer the questions as follows. (50%)
- 1) Please apply feminist social work perspective to identify the problem assessment, treatment plan and evaluation.
- 2) In this case, have you seen the social worker's gender-blind in working with this family? Please give your explanation.
- 3) What are the preventive services can be taken based on Sue's case from a structural perspective rather personal perspective?

Case Study

Harold, a 34 year-old miner, was married to Sue, aged 30. They had 3 children—James aged 8, Alice aged 6, and Timothy aged 4. Harold and Sue had been childhood sweethearts and both had wanted Sue to stay home with the children.

Their relationship has flourished until two years ago when Harold was made redundant and became unable to find alternative employment. After the first year, Harold's meagre redundancy pay and unemployment insurance payments ran out and the family applied for income support. Harold became extremely depressed and began to have violent mood swings. Sue hated having him around the house. They began to have endless rows about the most trivial things.

Harold desperately wanted a job, but ads in the local paper and Job Centre were mainly for part-time work which did not interest him—clerical work, cleaning and so on. Sue, who read the adverts with him decided these were jobs she could do. Against Harold's wishes, she successfully applied for and obtained a full-time secretarial job in a local factory.

Harold was furious with this outcome and refused to help her manage what he considered her other more important responsibilities so that she could take up the offer. Undeterred, Sue asked her mother who lived nearby to help look after the children while she worked. As the 3 children attended either classes or nursery school during the day, Sue took them to school in the mornings; her mother picked them up and took them home at the end of the day. The children did not object to the arrangement as they enjoyed going to Grandma's and already saw it as their second home.

For things to run smoothly, Sue had to ensure that Harold's lunch was prepared before she went to work. When she returned in the evening, she had to make dinner for all of them, help James with his homework, and do some housekeeping including the laundry and ironing. Her weekends were full of

catching up on sundry domestic chores.

After six months, Sue was exhausted. She decided to talk to Harold with the aim of getting him to share the load. Harold reacted by shouting at her, overturned a table and slammed the door on his way out of the house. Sue who was shaken but determined, felt that although she would do what needed to be done with the children, she would leave Harold to fend for himself. No more lunches prepared for him, no more laundry, no more cleaning up after him. Harold responded by becoming verbally abusive.

A few weeks later, Sue started working overtime. The children stayed with her mother during her late shifts. On one of these occasions, when she got home, the house was a tip and there was nothing to eat in the fridge. Sue blew her top. In the argument that followed, Harold grabbed her by the hair and began to punch her. Sue was hospitalized for two weeks by this attack. Although she would not press charges against him, she demanded a divorce. Harold refused and begged her to take him back. Sue would not change her mind.

Meanwhile, James started acting out at school. He was caught fighting with a younger boy. Apparently, James had been bullying him for several months. As a result of these incidents, a social worker was assigned to work with the family.

The social worker, a white woman called Sal came to visit Sue. She told her about the ongoing divorce proceedings that she was reluctantly going through not because she no longer loved Harold, but because she was afraid that he would become more violent over time and would make life unbearable for her and the children. Sal listened to Sue's story and sympathized over the difficulties she was having.

Given the range of problems the family was experiencing, she regretted the she would have time only to work with James, hoping to teach him how to resolve conflict in a nonaggressive manner. However, she gave Sue a list of women's groups that she could join. 'They may be able to help', Sal added as she got up to go, satisfied that as Harold was no longer in the house, none of the 3 children were 'at risk' of being abused by him.

As soon as Sal left, Sue crumpled up the list and threw it in the bin. Tears began to stream down her face as her despair and frustration welled up through them.

(Reference: Dominelli L. (2002). Feminist Social Work: Theory and Practice.)

國立臺灣大學社會工作學系 108 學年度博士班入學考試

筆試科目 2: 社會研究方法(含統計)

- 一、請閱讀試題中之研究論文,並回答以下問題:
 - (1) 請解釋何謂研究方法的「三角化(triangulation)」(10%)?
 - (2) 承上題,請嘗試運用三角化的原則來重新設計該質性研究之研究方法(25%)。
 - (3) 闡述您重新設計的研究方法對該論文研究主題可能產生的貢獻(15%)?
- 二、依據衛生福利部統計資料,截至 2017 年底我國已完成立案的社區發展協會計有 6,839 個,若您想瞭解臺灣社區發展協會組織網絡夥伴關係對其服務績效的影響,請依序回答以下問題:
 - (1) 請規劃一量化研究設計,並簡要說明您將如何進行研究(5%)。
 - (2) 承上題,請討論可能樣本大小的決定因素有哪些?您如何決定此次抽樣的樣本數(10%)
 - (3) 承題(1),請依據抽樣理論,說明您如何設定此研究的顯著水準,原因為何(10%)?
- - (1) 表中分別呈現三個分析模型,請分別討論三個模型的分析結果(15%)。
 - (2) 您如何判斷表中三個模型的優劣?請說明原因(10%)。

Table 2. Three regressions of work engagement on age, gender, different types of job demands, psychological well-being, and interactions (job demand \times psychological well-being; N = 140).

	Predictors	Outcome Work engagement				
		В	95% CI	β	F	R ²
a	Age	.48	-3.95, 4.92	.02		
	Gender	-1.96	-6.60, 2.68	07		
	Psychological job demands	81	-1.64, .01	16*		
	Psychological well-being	.78	.44, 1.12	.35**		
	Psychological job demands × Psychological well-being	13	27,01	I6*	6.60 ^{lok}	.20
Ь	Age	1.14	-3.43, 5.70	04		
	Gender	-1.42	-6.23, 3.38	05		
	Physical job demands	51	-1.10, .08	14		
	Psychological well-being	.79	.43, 1.14	.37**		
	Physical job demands × Psychological well-being	02	19, .15	02	5.05**	.16
C	Age	1.14	-3.35, 5.63	.04		
	Gender	-1.47	-6.24, 3.30	05		
	Emotional demands	19	69, .31	06		
	Psychological well-being	.82	.47, 1.17	.37*ok		
	Emotional demands \times Psychological well-being	08	16,01	16*	5.41**	.17

Note: **p < .01. *p < .05; age coding (<30 = 1; from 31 to 55 = 2; >55 = 3).