

考試科目	社會學	系所別	社會系	考試時間	2 月 10 日(四) 第 2 節
------	-----	-----	-----	------	-------------------

一、請在閱讀以下短文後，以中文回答下列問題：(30 分)

### Five Myths About the Ivy League (excerpt)

Why are Ivy League applicants — even the overwhelming majority who apply legitimately — so desperate to get in, and why is this set of schools so renowned? A number of myths surround the group of eight schools originally grouped together as a sports conference.

#### Myth No. 1: In admissions, academic brilliance is paramount.

Because of the impressive SAT\* scores and high grades of students admitted to Ivy League institutions, many people incorrectly infer that superhuman academic performance is the key ingredient for admission. “Grades are still the most important factor in admissions,” the founder of one consulting firm told USA Today. “Course rigor is also extremely important.”

But Harvard and its sister Ivies do not see educating the next generation of rocket scientists, professors and assorted intellectuals as their primary task. Instead, they select students whose qualities seem most likely to make them future members of what the sociologist C. Wright Mills called the “power elite,” what Marxists dubbed the “ruling class” and what Ivy League presidents refer to simply as “leaders.”

In reality, academic strength is just one of several dimensions by which candidates are ranked, including extracurriculars, athletics and the enigmatic “personal” ranking. Harvard’s internal statistical analyses revealed that the personal ranking carried the most weight and the academic ranking the least. This skepticism toward applicants who are one-sidedly academic has deep roots: As far back as the 1950s, Harvard’s dean of admissions, Wilbur Bender, warned about the notion that “the only person who belongs at Harvard is the valedictorian, the obvious intellectual, the white-faced grind” and imposed an effective quota of 10% on “top brains.”

#### Myth No. 2: Athletic skill is just like the other attributes schools value.

Savvy parents and applicants are well aware that the Ivy League values athletic talent. But it is often listed as just one “hook” among many others, including legacy status, membership in a historically underrepresented minority group and socioeconomic disadvantage. Asked in 2012 about the magnitude of athletics, a former dean of admissions at Princeton said that “we do not emphasize one activity over the other; athletes as well as artistic endeavors are equally valued.” She went on to specifically mention “musicians, dancers or actors” as groups receiving recognition.

But athletes are a special case and are given vastly more preference than other recognized categories. Varsity coaches exert tremendous influence by giving the admissions office a list of recruited athletes — a list that is

考 試 科 目	社會學	系 所 別	社會系	考 試 時 間	2 月 10 日(四) 第 2 節
---------	-----	-------	-----	---------	-------------------

usually respected. Equally outstanding musicians, artists, actors and dancers do not receive the same treatment. This preference outweighs even the preference given to legacies\*\* or minorities. In a study of 30 selective institutions conducted by James Shulman and former Princeton president William G. Bowen, athletes were 48% more likely to be admitted than applicants without a hook, compared with 18% for racial minorities and 25% for legacies. But the best evidence on varsity athletes comes from data revealed during the recent Harvard lawsuit: Non-athletes with a mediocre academic rating of 4 (on a 1 to 6 scale) had an admit rate of 0.076, compared with about 70% for athletes — a probability nearly 1,000 times greater.

Myth No. 3: Ivy League colleges are the nation's most selective schools.

With pricey college admissions consultants from companies like Ivy Coach charging up to \$1.5 million for five-year packages to steer children toward Ivy League schools, it is natural to think these are the nation's most selective colleges. And it is true that it is very hard to get in; in 2017, more than 280,000 students applied to the eight Ivies, and less than 10% were admitted.

But over the past few years Stanford has become even more selective than Harvard. In 2018, just 4.3% of Stanford's applicants were admitted, compared with 4.6% at Harvard. Just four of the 10 most selective colleges in the country are Ivies — Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Columbia — with MIT, Caltech, Stanford and Julliard more selective than the other four members of the league.

Myth No. 4: Aid and need-blind admissions have democratized the Ivies.

Over the past half-century, Ivy institutions have adopted a policy of ignoring financial considerations in admissions decisions; applicants' inability to pay tuition won't stop a school from admitting them. Along with commitments to give special consideration to socioeconomically disadvantaged students, regardless of race, one would expect that the net effect of these policies would be to increase the proportion of poor and working-class students at Ivy League colleges.

But these well-intentioned initiatives have produced disappointing results. A recent study by researchers at the Equality of Opportunity Project based on anonymous tuition records and tax filings reveals that Princeton, Yale, Dartmouth, Penn and Brown have more students from the top 1% of the income distribution than from the bottom 60%. Moreover, of the 10 highly selective colleges that enrolled the highest shares of low- and middle-income students, none are in the Ivy League.

In practice, Ivy League admissions demonstrate little preference for poor and working-class students. In a 2006 study that examined 19 selective colleges (including Harvard, Yale and Princeton), former Princeton president Bowen and others concluded that "applicants from low socioeconomic backgrounds, whether defined by

考 試 科 目	社會學	系 所 別	社會系	考 試 時 間	2 月 10 日(四) 第 2 節
---------	-----	-------	-----	---------	-------------------

family income or parental education, get essentially no break in the admissions process.” More recently, a statistical analysis released during the Harvard lawsuit revealed that socioeconomically disadvantaged applicants received at most a very modest “tip” in admissions.

Myth No. 5: Ivy League graduates dominate leadership positions in America.

Ivy League alumni conspicuously crowd some of our country’s most prominent institutions: Seven of the nine members of the Supreme Court were undergraduates at Ivy League colleges, and all nine of them attended either Harvard or Yale for law school. Every president after Ronald Reagan has had a degree from the Ivy League, often multiple. A number of studies have shown that Ivy League graduates are vastly overrepresented in positions of corporate and political leadership: Almost a third of officers and directors in the corporate elite earned undergraduate degrees from elite schools.

But overrepresentation is far from dominance. In a comprehensive 2017 study of “3,990 senior executives drawn from 15 sectors, including government,” researchers at the University of California at Riverside found that barely 10% attended Ivy League colleges. Ivy League graduates were most represented in industries involving media, including publishing, journalism and the arts — but even there, they were a decided minority.

Attending an Ivy League college is far from a prerequisite for leadership in America’s major institutions. In this regard, the United States is far more open and democratic than Britain, where Oxford and Cambridge graduates occupy positions in the elite to a degree unlike anything in this country: Three-quarters of Britain’s prime ministers, and the majority of its judges, journalists and civil servants, attended Oxford or Cambridge.

\* The SAT is a standardized test widely used for college/university admissions in the United States.

\*\* A legacy student is someone whose parent or other family member attended the same school.

(Jerome Karabel, March 22, 2019, *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/five-myths/five-myths-about-the-ivy-league/2019/03/22/13fdb0da-4bf0-11e9-93d0-64dbcf38ba41\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/five-myths/five-myths-about-the-ivy-league/2019/03/22/13fdb0da-4bf0-11e9-93d0-64dbcf38ba41_story.html))

1. According to the author, what is the reality behind the five myths about the Ivy League?
2. The author argues that the Ivy League schools ‘select students whose qualities seem most likely to make them future members of what the sociologist C. Wright Mills called the “power elite,” what Marxists dubbed the “ruling class.”’ Please explain the concepts and features of the “power elite” and the “ruling class.”
3. According to this article, how is education linked to economic stratification and social mobility in the United States? How is the case of the United States in comparison with that in the UK?
4. Can this article’s arguments about the Ivy League be applied to explain the recruitment system of the higher

考試科目	社會學	系所別	社會系	考試時間	2 月 10 日(四) 第 2 節
------	-----	-----	-----	------	-------------------

education as well as its relationship with economic stratification in Taiwan? Please share and explain your viewpoint.

二、請回答以下問題：(12 分)

1. 請闡述「同化 (assimilation)」、「熔爐 (melting pot)」、和「多元文化主義 (multiculturalism)」三種有關族群關係的概念各為何，並由此討論這些概念對於東南亞籍與陸籍之配偶進入台灣社會時，和台灣主流族群之間在關係發展上的適用性（當中哪一個概念最可以用來呈現東南亞籍與陸籍配偶與台灣主流族群之間的互動關係，以及適用的理由）。
2. 請剖析台灣對於外籍與陸籍配偶居留與公民權相關的法律與制度所透露出的國族意識與族群想像。

三、高夫曼 (Goffman) 指出，人們在互動中，常會透過給予 (give) 及／或洩露 (give off) 進行訊息的交換。請先解釋「給予」與「洩露」的概念並簡要討論兩者關係，並請以日常生活中的互動為例說明之。(8 分)



考試科目	社會學	系所別	社會系	考試時間	2月10日(四)第2節
------	-----	-----	-----	------	-------------

四、請依各子題的提問，在每一子題當中皆需運用至少兩個社會學概念或觀點，討論下列台灣的三個議題。

1. 當日韓都把東南亞移工視為人力缺口的解方，薪水毫無競爭力的台灣，如何因應？勞動部新制明年上路，不只要開放移工，還要銜接到移民，用比日本更寬鬆的條件，留下優質移工。疫情穩定下，儘管 2021 年 11 月勞動部重啟移工入境，但相較從家庭到產業的人力缺口，卻是無濟於事。更大的隱憂在於，當日、韓都把東南亞移工視為解決本國勞動力缺口的解方之一，薪水毫無競爭力的台灣，長期將不再受到移工青睞，勞動力缺口恐進一步惡化。對此，勞動部勞動力發展署署長蔡孟良明白告訴《天下》，台灣人口結構轉變，移工政策也要調整，為紓解缺工，不再是總額管制，而是採取警戒指標，達到有效管理。同時為了吸引優秀移工，將追隨日本腳步，預計明年上半年開放在台工作滿 6 年、技能檢定和薪資均符合條件的移工，能取得永久居留資格（天下雜誌 737 期）。請問若有越來越多的「移工變移民」入籍台灣，對台灣社會的各種影響為何？我們該如何因應？(17%)

2. 「珍愛藻礁」公投案最終未通過，同為環團，但立場是反方的地球公民基金會副執行長蔡中岳說，關於三接與藻礁，很明顯過去政府沒特別去重視，才會有程序上的爭議，也才會有 70 萬人連署讓公投成案，所以過去程序的不正義被民眾重視，也因為這樣，政府才提出再外推方案，對於藻礁的保育有更多的進展。蔡中岳認為，在這個前提下，這次公投不能說是哪方勝利，這確實是台灣在面對能源轉型中的艱困課題，必須要選擇發電來源，也必須在僅有的土地做選擇，而這件事情扣連著生態保育、空氣污染、整體能源轉型的議題。蔡中岳強調，會持續監督接下來各接收站，包括整體能源轉型選址、社會溝通的問題，因為作為長期監督政府環境議題的組織，瞭解大趨勢，但也希望細部的地方也能夠真正處理好（自由時報 2021/12/18）。請你探討在藻礁公投案的提出與爭議過程中，公民團體、政府與民眾之間的權力關係為何。(17%)

3. 加州的矽谷是全球科技創新的動力源頭中心，但卻有論者質疑，「矽谷到底是創業天堂或高物價地獄，為何灣區睡街道住帳篷的遊民卻數量上升？」(中央社)。那麼，因為台灣掌握晶片製造的高階技術為全球市場所需，因而促使台積電需到中南部四處獵地設廠，並順勢帶動相關產業鏈進駐，請問你認為高階晶圓廠到中南部設廠會對當地的經濟發展與資源配置會帶來哪些衝擊？(16%)

備

註

- 一、作答於試題上者，不予計分。
- 二、試題請隨卷繳交。

考試科目	社會學研究方法	系所別	社會學系	考試時間	2月10日(四)第3節
------	---------	-----	------	------	-------------

- 一、請說明樣本平均數之抽樣分配 (sampling distribution) 的各項特徵，以及如何運用其抽樣分布進行母體平均數的信賴區間估計。(25分)
- 二、運用迴歸分析時，研究者需要進行迴歸診斷 (regression diagnosis)，請問何謂迴歸診斷，其主要內涵為何？(25分)
- 三、請說明何謂抽樣誤差？什麼因素會影響抽樣誤差？(25分)
- 四、請解釋何謂實驗研究？實驗研究的優點及缺點為何？社會科學如何進行實驗研究？請舉例說明。(25分)



備註	一、作答於試題上者，不予計分。 二、試題請隨卷繳交。
----	-------------------------------

考試科目	社會學理論	系所別	社會學系	考試時間	2 月 10 日(四) 第四節
------	-------	-----	------	------	-----------------

一、請援引當代理論的一家流派或學說，並搭配特定現象為例證，申論新興經濟和科技環境對於性別、性慾，或者愛情文化可能產生的後果影響為何？(25%)

二、請先依據 K. Marx 的前後期思想，申論商品拜物教是或不是異化勞動的直接結果？請再參照金融化或區塊鏈現象，申論資本的積累是或不是交換價值的貨幣形式？(25%)

三、M. Foucault 的權力理論有何特色？特別是知識、權力與主體之間的關係為何？也因此，他對於啟蒙、批判與解放的想法，與 I. Kant 有何不同？(25%)

四、E. Durkheim 在《自殺論》與 M. Weber 在《基督新教倫理與資本主義精神》中，都有對於天主教（舊教）與基督新教的教義與影響，進行了比較。請問他們兩人對於此一主題的討論為何？(25%)

備註

- 一、作答於試題上者，不予計分。
- 二、試題請隨卷繳交。