

第一大題：社會政策

說明: Here are three parts of readings with regards to concepts and its application of the **Capacity Approach (CA)** of social policy analysis. **The first and second parts** illustrate the basic concepts of CA and **the third part** is presented by three CA policy analysis examples. Please read all the information provided as follows and answer the questions.

Part one: The Capability Approach in social policy analysis

The Capability Approach (CA) is a set of ideas, concepts and methodological instructions which was developed mainly by Amartya Sen (e.g. Sen 1992; Sen 1999; Sen 2002), and subsequently other authors like Martha Nussbaum (e.g. Nussbaum & Glover 1995; Nussbaum & Sen 1993; Nussbaum 2003).

Part two: The building blocks of the CA (Summary)

The CA is made up of five conceptual building blocks: Commodities, Conversion Factors, Capabilities, Choices, and Functionings.

1. Commodities

Commodities are the resources the individuals can dispose of. Examples are money, or other material goods – a bicycle, a television, etc. Less material goods such as skills or habitual behavior could also be conceived of as commodities. Measuring possession and non-possession of commodities is the standard procedure for producing measurements of monetary poverty or of multiple deprivations (e.g. Townsend 1993; Pantazis et al. 2006). The CA criticizes the assessment of individual level outcomes based on commodities as “resourcist” and argues for measuring functionings instead of commodities.

2. Functionings

Functionings are what people really “do and are” and are considered a concept superior to commodities. This perspective is based on the view that individuals are fundamentally diverse, and that there are personal, environmental and social conditions which are the reasons for this fundamental diversity. In other words: because humans are not all the same, they require different (in terms of quantity as well as quality) commodities to achieve the same functionings. Measuring whether an individual is below 60% of median income, or whether an individual possesses a specific number of material items, does not necessarily allow one to reach conclusions about the individual’s well-being state.

3. Capability set

A capability set contains an individual's capabilities. Where functionings refer to what people really “do and are”, capabilities denote what people really “can do and can be”. Functionings, then, are a subset of the capability set. They are the materialized options or life chances of an individual. This conceptual distinction is based on the assumption that certain functionings are mutually exclusive, and that individuals (have to) exert choice.

The potential transformation of commodities into functionings is mediated by the social structures in place. Within the CA, these structures are dealt with under the heading of conversion factors, and, occasionally, in discussions of choice / agency.

4. Conversion factors

Conversion factors form the personal, environmental and social conditions of each individual existence. In the original approach as developed by Sen (Sen 1993; Robeyns 2005b), conversion factors are basically social structures in the widest possible sense. Sen's standard example is the bicycle (a commodity) which is useful only if accompanied by the respective infrastructure, e.g. a bikeway (a conversion factor). Closer to the field of social policy, one could interpret certain acquired skills as a commodity, which are useful only if accompanied by respective labour market structures which help turn these skills into outcomes. Being qualified as a typesetter was useful in 1960, but not any more in 2010 when computers have replaced the traditional way of typesetting. A nursing degree acquired in India may have been recognized by British authorities between 2001 and 2003, but not in 2009. How other personal characteristics such as intelligence or disability can be converted into functionings is also dependent on a set of institutional arrangements. Conversion factors are the place within the capability-approach to take into account all these structural effects which determine what and how commodities can be turned into functionings².

5. Agency / Choice

Whereas the analysis of conversion factors usually refers either to external structures of the social world in general, or, sometimes, to the relevant policies that shape the conditions under which individuals can (not) capitalize on their commodities, the question of choice refers more to internal limitations and the question of agency. Sen himself notes that capabilities are both “the person's ability to do the things in question taking everything into account (including external constraints as well as internal limitations)” (Sen 2002, p.586). Where agency has been conceptualized within the framework of the CA, this has often led to (and ended with) rather abstract discussions of internal constraints – such as the lack of desire to attain certain functionings³. This problem is referred to as “adaptive preference formation” (Nussbaum 2001; Teschl & Comim 2005) and basically means that individuals living in situations of deprivation or oppression often adjust their expectations and aspirations downwards.⁴

Part three: Examples of social policy analyses which make use of CA

A. Public employment services (PES): 公共就業服務政策

The role of public employment services (PES) for the unemployed is the subject matter of the contributions by Bonvin and Farvaque (2006), Bonvin (2008) and the contributions of a special issue on activation policies and the capability approach (for an overview, see Bonvin & Orton 2009). The normative foundation of their analyses focuses on three functionings: *Voice*, i.e. the notion that benefit claimants are able to co-determine which services and benefits they can access; *Capacities*, i.e. the resources at hand for the employment service

providers and which are crucial to enhancing the claimants' well-being states; *Choice*, i.e. that unemployed benefit claimants have as much choice as possible with regards to the various options they are offered by the employment service providers. Bonvin's normative starting point is his notion of “responsibility”. Only if claimants are equipped with sufficient resources (if employment service providers have sufficient capacities) and if they have a real choice between various options, they can reach “responsible” decisions.

B. Labor market policy (勞動市場政策)

Salais (2003, p.327 ff), in his account of the CA, looks at the role of the state in labor market processes, and especially at the role of social assistance and unemployment benefits. He emphasizes the capability for work and the development of a respective ideal-typical “capability world”. In this hypothetical ideal-type, work would be considered a collective agency (not an individual disutility), and the rationale for assistance would be to equip people with adequate means to achieve “freedoms” (not only to compensate for a loss).

C. Work-family Balance Policy (平衡工作與家庭政策)

The contributions by Lewis (2004) and Hobson et al. (2008) analyze well-being in relation to the field of work-family-balance. They propose that caring is an as equally valuable functioning as labor-market participation, and therefore conclude that care and the opportunity to freely choose between care and labor market participation are to be taken as a normative reference point.

Questions: (問題)

1. Please illustrate the core meaning of CA in social policy analysis presented in Part one and Part two above in Chinese. (25%)
2. After having read policy analysis examples examined from CA (Part three), please take **one** of Taiwan’s previous/current policies in terms of “public employment service policy”, “labor market policy”, or “work-family balance policy” as example to analyze and make comments based on CA. (You can write in English or Chinese) (25%)

第二大題: 社會工作

1. Reciprocity and trust are closely related conceptually. In collaboration, participating organizations generally exhibit an “I-will-if-you-will” mentality based on perceived degrees of the reciprocal obligations each will have toward the others. Partners may be willing to bear disproportional costs at first because they expect their partners will equalize the distribution of costs and benefits over time out of a sense of duty. Ring and Van de Ven (1994) call this “fair dealing.” This tit-for-tat reciprocity that is contingent and fragile may, however, change over time as perceptions of obligation evolve into less fragile social mores that form the basis of social interaction and reciprocal exchange in the collaboration (Axelrod 1984; Ostrom 1990; Powell 1990).

The problem is this: Developing trust takes time and time implies the need for repeated interaction among partners that builds the credible commitment so necessary for collective action to occur (Axelrod 1984, 1997; Ostrom 1990). For Ostrom (1998), collective action depends upon the three key core relationships: trust, reciprocity, and reputation. As collaborative partners interact and build reputations for trustworthy behavior over time, they may find themselves moving away from the more contingent I-will-if-you-will reciprocity to longer term commitments based on institutionalized “psychological contracts” (Ring and Van de Ven 1994) based on trust. When personal relationships increasingly supplement formal organizational role relationships, psychological contracts increasingly substitute for legal contracts, and when formal organizational agreements increasingly mirror informal understandings and commitments, interorganizational relationships may be sustained over time (Ring and Van de Ven 1994, 103).(Thomson, Perry, and Miller, 2007).

Please answer the following questions **in Chinese**.

- A. Please describe your understanding of the key concepts and important elements of the above excerpt. (10%)
 - B. Please give a social work practice example to illustrate “trust” issue in the inter-organizational collaboration. (10%)
 - C. What can social workers do at both strategic and operational levels to promote “trust”among collaborating organizations? (10%)
2. In the United States, cultural diversity in social work has primarily been associated with race and ethnicity, but diversity is taking on a broader meaning to include the sociocultural experiences of people of different genders, social classes, religious and spiritual beliefs, sexual orientations, ages, and physical and mental abilities. A brief review of the social work literature in the past few years points to the range of potential content areas that require culturally sensitive and culturally competent interventions.(NASW, 2007).

Please answer the following questions **in Chinese**.

- A. Please briefly describe the NASW standards for cultural competence in social work practice. (10%)
- B. What are the roles and functions of indigenous workers in promoting cultural competence of social agencies? (10%)

國立臺灣大學社會工作學系 102 學年度博士班入學考試
社會研究方法

一、社會工作者在進行民族誌研究(ethnographic research)時，要能區辨 emic 與 etic 兩個概念。請解釋這兩個概念的意義（5 分）。進一步，什麼是 emic perspective research? 什麼是 etic perspective research?（5 分）又在進行實地研究（field study）時，如何使研究者本是一位局外人（outsider），可以成為一位相對局內人（relative insider）（15 分）。

二、如果社會工作者被邀請參與公部門的社會服務方案評鑑(program evaluation)，例如：社區社會福利服務中心、長期照顧管理中心、幼兒園、身心障礙福利服務中心、外籍配偶家庭服務中心、單親家庭服務中心、社區老人關懷據點等，請你舉一個例子，回答以下問題：

1. 你的資料收集的群體（constituency groups）包括哪些？（5 分）
2. 如何區辨這些不同的資料來源在方案執行過程中所扮演的角色？其可能對研究的影響？（5 分）
3. 資料收集的方法如何？（5 分）
4. 資料分析時要注意哪些課題。（10 分）

三、請挑出下列關於一項研究結果陳述內容中所有的錯誤、進行修正，並說明修正的理由：(20 分)

某研究者想要了解性別以及工作壓力對生活滿意度的解釋。他以隨機抽樣的方式取得 500 份問卷資料，之後進行一些統計分析後發現：男性工作壓力平均得分為 30.25，女性為 29.76，進行卡方檢定後發現，其卡方值為 1.054， $p = 0.072$ 。根據此分析結果，可見男女性的工作壓力有所不同，且男性比女性所感受到的生活壓力略高。他又再進一步以 F 檢定檢測工作壓力和生活滿意度的關係後發現，工作壓力與生活滿意度也呈現正相關性，且工作壓力越大者，其生活滿意度越低。最後，他還將性別與生活滿意度當成自變項，以多元迴歸分析進行模式檢測，結果發現，迴歸模式的 t 值為 7.52， $p < 0.001$ ，表示性別和生活滿意度都可解釋生活壓力。根據以上分析結果，他建議大家應該要重視男性工作壓力較大的問題，並提供必要的紓壓管道來幫助他們，這樣他們的生活滿意度也可有所提升；另他也提醒大家，解釋男女生活滿意度的因素是不一樣的，所以要特別注意兩者差異，以更有效協助不同性別者提升生活滿意度。

四、下列各題的陳述內容與否正確進行評論，並舉例說明你評論的依據：

1. 統計分析結果的顯著性未必等於實務上的重要性。(10 分)
2. 一個測量工具若具有內部一致性信度的話，就應該具有建構效度。(10 分)
3. 為求研究的嚴謹度，一項好的研究應該要同時包含量化與質性的研究典範。(10 分)