

系級	法律學系法律專業碩士班	考試時間	100 分鐘
科目	英文	本科總分	100 分

I. Reading and Writing (40%)

Answer the following questions according to the articles.

US Fat Cats Quizzed over High Salaries

Three former CEOs of U.S. banking giants are currently facing tough questions by American lawmakers over the size of their salaries. In particular, why their earnings, bonuses and leaving packages were so high when the companies they headed were doing so poorly. Ex-Merrill Lynch CEO Stanley O’Neal and Citigroup’s Charles Prince III resigned from their companies in late 2007 with million-dollar golden goodbyes. This is despite the fact that the corporations they headed lost billions of dollars and low-income homeowners lost their homes in America’s housing collapse. Democrat Henry Waxman said America was an unequal society. “Most Americans live in a world where economic security is [uncertain] and there are real economic consequences for failure. But our nation’s top executives seem to live by a different set of rules,” he said.

Many Democrat politicians focused on why top executives were paid so well when their decisions led to huge, billion-dollar losses. One concerned committee member asked: “When companies fail to perform, should they give millions of dollars to their senior executives?” Republicans defended the executives and asked questions of their own. Darrel Issa from California wondered why the CEOs were being targeted as “bad guys”. Mr Issa said the executives also suffered because the value of the hundreds of millions of dollars they received in stocks went down when share values plummeted. A majority of Americans believe that their business leaders are highly overpaid. CEOs earn about 600 times more than the average American worker. This figure has rocketed from 1980 levels, when CEOs earned just 40 times more than Jo Public.

(Retrieved from <http://www.breakingnewsenglish.com/0803/080310-ceo.html>)

1. Democrat Henry Waxman said, “But our nation’s top executives seem to live by a different set of rules.” What did he mean? (5%)
2. How did Darrel Issa defend the CEOs? Do you agree with him? Why or why not? (10%)
3. Do you think it is reasonable for CEOs to earn about 600 times more than the average American worker? Why or why not? (5%)

東吳大學 104 學年度碩士班研究生招生考試試題

第 2 頁，共 4 頁

系級	法律學系法律專業碩士班	考試時間	100 分鐘
科目	英文	本科總分	100 分

Against “Competitiveness”

Why Good Teachers Aren’t Thinking About the Global Economy

Here are some phrases that might reassure us if they were used to defend a particular education policy: “excitement about learning” . . . “deeper thinking about questions that matter” . . . “promoting social and moral development” . . . “democratic society.”

And here’s a phrase that ought to make us wince and back away slowly: “competitiveness in a 21st-century global economy.”

Various strands of evidence have converged to challenge the claim that the state of our economy is a function of how good our schools are at preparing tomorrow’s workers. For individual students, school achievement is only weakly related to subsequent workplace performance. And for nations, there’s little correlation between average test scores and economic vigor.

Schools make a tempting scapegoat when a company’s financial results are disappointing or when the economy as a whole falters. But an employee’s educational background is only one of many factors that determine his or her productivity. Worker productivity, in turn, is only one of many factors that determine corporate profitability. And corporate profitability is only one of many factors that determine the state of the economy – particularly the employment picture. Does anyone seriously believe, for example, that the main reason U.S. companies are shipping jobs by the millions to Mexico and Asia is because they believe those countries’ schools are better?

But let’s talk about values, not just facts. Is the main mission of schools really to prepare children to be productive workers who will do their part to increase the profitability of their future employers? Every time education is described as an “investment,” or schools are discussed in the context of the “global economy,” a loud alarm ought to go off, reminding us of the moral and practical implications of giving an answer in dollars to a question about schools. As Jonathan Kozol recently reminded us, good teachers “refuse to see their pupils as . . . pint-sized deficits or assets for America’s economy into whom they are expected to pump ‘added value.’”

Lending an even more noxious twist to the habit of seeing education in purely economic terms is the use of

東吳大學 104 學年度碩士班研究生招生考試試題

第 3 頁，共 4 頁

系級	法律學系法律專業碩士班	考試時間	100 分鐘
科目	英文	本科總分	100 分

the word “competitiveness,” which implies that our goals should be framed in terms of beating others rather than doing well. When the topic is globalization, it’s commonly assumed that competition is unavoidable: For one enterprise (or country) to succeed, another must fail. But even if this were true – and economists Paul Krugman and the late David Gordon have separately argued it probably isn’t — why in the world would we accept the same zero-sum mentality with respect to learning?

Consider the sport of ranking the U.S. against other nations on standardized tests. Once we’ve debunked the myth that test scores predict economic success, why would we worry about our country’s standing as measured by those scores? To say that our students are first, or tenth, on a list provides no useful information about how much they know or how good our schools are. If all the countries did reasonably well in absolute terms, there would be no shame in (and, perhaps, no statistical significance to) being at the bottom. If all the countries did poorly, there would be no glory in being at the top. Exclamatory headlines about how “our” schools are doing compared to “theirs” suggest that we’re less concerned with the quality of education than with whether we can chant, “We’re Number One!”

An essay published in Education Week last year reported that U.S. students are doing better in mathematics than earlier generations did. Was the author moved by this fact to express delight, or at least relief? On the contrary, he pronounced the current state of affairs “disturbing” because children in other countries are also doing well – and that, by definition, is considered bad news.

What if we just ignored the status of students in other countries? That wouldn’t be especially neighborly, but at least we wouldn’t be viewing the gains of children in other lands as a troubling development. Better yet, rather than defending whatever policies will ostensibly help our graduates to “compete,” we could make decisions on the basis of what will help them collaborate effectively. Educators, too, might think in terms of working with – and learning from – their counterparts in other countries.

Even beyond the moral justification for transcending reflexive rivalry, Janet Swenson at Michigan State University points out that “we’ll all benefit from the best education we can provide to every child on the face of this planet. Do you care if it’s a child in Africa who finds a cure for cancer rather than a child in your country?” she asks.

Almost any policy, it seems, no matter how harmful, can be rationalized in the name of “competitiveness” by

東吳大學 104 學年度碩士班研究生招生考試試題

第 4 頁，共 4 頁

系級	法律學系法律專業碩士班	考試時間	100 分鐘
科目	英文	本科總分	100 分

politicians and corporate executives, or by journalists whose imaginations are flatter than the world about which they write. But educators ought to aim higher. Our loyalty, after all, is not to corporations but to children. Our chief concern – our “bottom line,” if you must — is not victory for some but learning for all.

(Adapted from <http://www.alfiekohn.org/article/competitiveness/>)

4. Why is the author against competitiveness? (10%)
5. Do you agree with the author that competitiveness is bad? Why or why not? (10%)

II. Translation (10%)

1. 科學家認為，他們已經發現上夜班比較會變胖的原因。
2. 他們的研究顯示，上夜班的人不是吃比較多，而是燃燒較少卡路里。

III. Writing (50%)

Write a composition about the best or the worst teacher you have ever known.

※不可書寫個人姓名或任何足以識別
身分之文字或符號