

國立臺北大學 103 學年度博士班一般入學考試命題紙

系（所）組別：公共行政暨政策學系

科目：專業英文

共 6 頁。

可 不可使用計算機。

可 不可使用英漢字典、電子辭典及手機 3C 等相關譯品。

一、解釋名詞：請以中文說明並解釋下列各項名詞（每題 5 分，25%）

- (一) Administrative state
- (二) Blacksburg Manifesto
- (三) Pay for performance
- (四) Pendleton Act
- (五) Transformational leadership

二、英翻中：請將下列各題之英文內容，翻譯為中文（每題 15 分，30%）

- (一) Organizations within a given field (e.g. welfare offices or universities) tend to adopt certain institutional arrangements and policies because of pressure from the government or from other organizations upon which they are dependent, as a response to uncertainty, or to comport with professional norms. In general, according

to this line of reasoning, organizations in a given field come to resemble one another in policies, programs, and structures through a process of “institutional isomorphism.” Organizations become copycats. A “logic of appropriateness” rather than a logic of consequences (means-ends concerns) drives agency structure and, hence, policymaking within and between organizations.

(二) Boundaries have long played a central role in American public administration. In part, this is because boundaries are central to the administrative process, as they define what organizations are responsible for doing and what powers and functions lie elsewhere. It is also because of the nation’s political culture and unusual system of federalism, in which boundaries have always been the focus of conflict. Five boundaries have historically been important in the American administrative system: mission, resources, capacity, responsibility, and accountability. New forces make managing these boundaries increasingly difficult: political processes that complicate administrative responses, indirect administrative tactics, and wicked problems that levy enormous costs when solutions fail. Working effectively at these boundaries requires new strategies of collaboration and new skills for public managers. Failure to develop these strategies — or an instinct to

approach boundaries primarily as political symbolism — worsens the performance of the administrative system.

三、中翻英：請將下列各題之中文，翻譯為英文（每題 5 分，25%）

- （一） 公務人力問題的探討：人力資本管理的觀點
- （二） 公私管理之異同：美國傑出公共行政與企業管理碩士學程之比較研究
- （三） 為什麼淪為不情願夥伴？：公私夥伴關係失靈個案的制度解釋
- （四） 電子治理下的跨域整合管理
- （五） 台灣民眾公民意識的變化：2008 年政權二次輪替前後的比較分析

四、申論題：請閱讀以下之新聞內容，並以英文表達您對相關議題的觀點與看法（20%）

Taipei Times

Mar 24, 2014

**Nothing matters without trust**

“The single most important thing to remember about any enterprise is that there are no results inside its walls,” management guru Peter Drucker once said. “The result of a business is a satisfied customer.”

He was talking about customer satisfaction as the key to

business success, yet his words are just as applicable to people's experience of government and their attitude toward it these days.

Dissatisfaction with the government is shown by the continued occupation of the legislative chamber by student activists, which, along with persistent public complaints about rising food prices, stagnant wages and high housing prices, have many questioning if the government ever listens to the people.

In the business world, companies that make customer satisfaction a top priority will see passers-by become loyal customers and gain more business from them and their friends in the long term. That is what customer loyalty is all about. By the same token, the public would whole-heartedly support a government that responded to their needs and one that was responsive to all sectors of society, not just big companies and groups of vested interests.

Yet has President Ma Ying-jeou's government addressed social issues and truly listened to the people?

Even a well-designed policy is worthless if most citizens do not consider it relevant to their lives, let alone a poorly considered policy like the cross-strait service trade pact which poses a potential threat to many people's livelihoods once it takes effect. Making people happy may be thought of as a cliché by most government officials, but that does not mean it is an unworthy

effort. Microsoft Corp founder Bill Gates once said: “Your most unhappy customers are your greatest source of learning.”

By applying this concept to the world of politics, a good government would not pretend it knows best and just expect people to follow its policies; it would be concerned when people opposed them and would consider what it could do differently.

However, listening to the voice of the people requires a genuine intention to empathize with and care about their plight and to respond in an appropriate way. While the response from the government might not always be what people want to hear, it can still be communicated with mutual respect. For those who believe a capable government should conduct open and sincere dialogue with people from all walks of life about the service trade pact, Ma’s administration has been a huge disappointment.

It is well understood that companies need to provide customers with consistently superb services to stay in business, especially at a time when consumers have more choice and the notion of empowerment is more prevalent. So does a responsible government — which must devise policies to provide citizens with better welfare — if it wants to continue governing the country. If a government fails to listen to, have respect for and conduct dialogue with its people, citizens have a right to choose their own government and their future.

Halfway through his second term, Ma and his administration are actually growing more secretive and extending their distance from people. They say they are willing to listen to anyone, but in fact they do anything they want. They say they would like to communicate, but recent experience shows that this government is now denying people's access to public information more frequently than ever — until their hand is forced — or simply accusing its opponents of holding back economic development. The lack of transparency in policymaking only fuels suspicion and perpetuates the tension between the government and the public. Today, bemoaning the Ma government's failures is the same as expressing sorrow about a company's loss of customer trust — once it is gone, nothing else matters.