

科目：社會政策與社會工作

編號：001

考生注意：

1. 依次序作答！只要標明題號！不必抄題！
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題

共 頁

第 頁

- 一、社會工作教科書上經常強調，社會工作是一種科學，也是一種藝術。請問您是否贊成上述的宣稱？如是，則專業者應如何於實務中體現上述的特性或本質？如果您不認同這種宣稱，則請論述您對社會工作的特質或本質抱持何種觀點。(25 分)
- 二、從社會個案工作到個案管理，從案主到服務消費者，請運用社會工作理論的發展脈絡，分析這些名詞有何差異？為何有如此的演變？其如何改變了社會工作實務者的角色與任務？(25 分)
- 三、何謂性別主流化？其六大政策工具為何？請依據行政院公佈的性別平等政策綱領，論述您對台灣當前性別平等議題設定的理解，分析其推進歷程，並從階級差異、城鄉差距、族群差異等多元角度提出評析或批判。(25 分)
- 四、請簡要摘述下文的討論議題，並延伸分析全球化對台灣的福利體制、社會工作的價值與社會工作實務產生哪些影響？(25 分)

* 命題注意事項摘要：(請詳閱命題注意事項)

1. 每科以一百分為滿分，各題均以整數配分。
2. 考試時間為 100 分鐘。
3. 請用打字(印表)機打印或以深黑色筆正楷書寫。
4. 試題必須直接打印或緊密黏貼於本試題紙上。

命題委員(簽章)：

許那惠

The generally high quality of life and the relative equality enjoyed in Scandinavian countries might in the future be jeopardized by the following dominant trends: a move towards more market-oriented views; criticism of taxation and welfare statism; the influence of international neo-liberal discourses; the emergence of new managerialism with a focus on competitiveness and effectiveness; criticism of welfare bureaucracy; the argument that the welfare state creates disincentives to work and entrepreneurship; accusation of misuse of benefits (Kosonen, 2001); and the ultimate argument that the welfare state, which is dependent on sustained economic growth, is unsustainable (Ife, 2002).

Scholars describe the changes in the Nordic welfare states as '... a process of de-differentiation' characterized by the following features: modernization and downsizing of the public sector, deregulation, decentralization, privatization, deinstitutionalization and de-professionalization (Hansen et al., 1996: 41), all features of late

capitalism and of new managerialism (Ferguson and Lavalette, 2006; Lavalette and Ferguson, 2007; Sewpaul and Hölscher, 2004). According to Kildal (2001), this shift in policy has contributed to emphases on: sanctions rather than incentives, duties rather than rights, a public-contract approach rather than a rights-based approach, and selectivity rather than universality. Changes in the National Insurance Scheme and the Social Service Act implemented by local authorities, for example, placed greater emphasis on the duty to work; on workfare, instead of income maintenance, which until recently underscored the National Insurance Scheme.

In spite of these changes, Kautto et al. (1999: 267) claim that 'all the known Nordic hallmarks were still present: universalism, high quality, tax funding and public provision – the Nordic countries seemed to be very resistant to dramatic changes'. Kosonen (2001: 171) agrees, arguing that even though the Nordic countries are affected by globalization, 'most of the characteristics of the Nordic welfare states have been maintained'. Thus, the impact of globalization on the Nordic states is currently contested. Some scholars use expressions like 'retrenchment', 'dismantling' or 'curtailment' to characterize the changes in the welfare state in Norway, as in much of the rest of the western world. Others talk about restructuring, reorienting and adjustment of services and cash benefits to characterize the changes in the welfare state. Whatever expression one prefers to use, what is obvious is that the welfare state is under scrutiny and social work educators must interrogate both national and global factors that affect the welfare state.

The impact of globalization on welfare policies

Globalization is characterized by a growing interconnectedness between political, social, cultural and economic systems beyond national borders. Held et al. (1999: 16) offers a comprehensive definition of globalization as 'A process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and exercise of power.' These authors argue that 'the *extensity*, *intensity* and *velocity* of global interactions may be associated with a deepening enmeshment of the local and the global such that the *impact* of distant events is magnified while even the most local developments may come to have enormous global consequences' (Held et al.,

1999: 15). Reflecting on contemporary patterns of globalization, Midgley (2004: 18) argues that 'recent economic, political and social events have fostered contradictory trends. Globalization is not a neat, unilinear process but involves complex and volatile forces that produce divergent and paradoxical results'.

Globalization reflects the greater international movement of commodities, money, information and people. The development of technology, organizations, legal systems and infrastructure make it possible to operate and interact without any interference from national governments. This is especially the case with respect to economic globalization which includes both the globalization of production and the globalization of finance. According to Keller (2005), globalization, in addition to reducing the influence of national governments, also increases the profit of international companies, which remain unconcerned about the social well-being of people. Keller (2005: 37) expresses concern about the future of the Scandinavian welfare states in the face of globalization. He asserts:

States that finance their social expenses primarily from taxes (for example the Scandinavian states) have an unfair position in globalisation, because firms and investors are constantly pushing for tax reduction. They threaten to leave for countries with a lower burden of taxation if their taxes aren't reduced. With no regard to the seriousness of these threats, the pressure on governments to reduce the extent of certain types of taxes forces them to try to finance the rest of their social expenses primarily through an obligatory employee insurance premium (as well as through an increase in indirect taxes, etc.).

Keller (2005: 44), as seen in the following quotation, has a rather pessimistic view of the future of the welfare state, and cogently discusses the implications of neo-liberal politics for social work:

The social state can do nothing more than limit itself to trying to reduce the more extreme social impacts of neo-liberal politics, with its robust business ideology pushed universally even beyond the sector of entrepreneurship. Social work, whose task is the integration of marginal people and groups into society, thus confronts an almost impossible task. It has to ensure dignified living conditions to those who don't have work and this inside a society where the dignity of living standards is conditioned by the approach towards adequate work.

These excerpts serve as an example of the work of many theorists who emphasize the negative impact of globalization on welfare services and spending (Bond, 2005; Dominelli, 1996; Saul, 2006; Sewpaul, 2006; Sewpaul and Hölscher, 2004; Yeates, 2001), within critiques of the neoliberal policies of international organizations

like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, that favour downsizing the public sector by reducing levels of taxation and public spending.

Some theorists, however, doubt the omnipotence of market economy and globalization processes on national governments and their public spending programs. Esping-Andersen (1996) argues that national political decisions, institutional mechanisms of interest representation and political consensus-building are very important for understanding the level and structure of welfare policies. Different national systems can and do respond to globalization in different ways. Pierson (1991) argues that domestic factors like demography, post-Fordist developments, technology and the maturation of the welfare state are more important factors than globalization in explaining changes in the welfare state. Sykes et al. (2001) have analysed development in many European states and they conclude that 'there is no evidence in the material presented here of a direct and essentially similar impact by globalization on European welfare states'. Changes are due to national government policies and institutions, 'though the rhetoric of globalization was often used by national governments to legitimate the introduction of sometimes harsh social policies' (Sykes et al., 2001: 197). Their main conclusions seem to be that even though significant welfare changes have occurred in the wake of globalization, welfare responses to globalization differ due to the impact of national policy.