

國立中山大學 99 學年度博士班招生考試試題

科目：比較政治【政治所甲組】

- 一、How important is “information” in a democracy? Please at least adopt the perspectives both from Anthony Downs’ “An Economic Theory of Democracy” (1957) and from Robert Dahl’s “Polyarchy” (1971) to answer this question. It is also welcome to discuss some other publications that mention about the role of information in a democracy. (Please answer only in English) (30%)
- 二、Please explain the following terms (not translation only) and offer some examples to support your explanation of a term.
- 1.tutelage democracy (5%)
 - 2.adversary democracy (5%)
 - 3.real democracy (5%)
 - 4.dual democracy (5%)
- 三、How would you propose we advance our understanding of “political development”?(20%) (請英文作答)
- 四、
- 1.國家理論研究中，何謂「國家相對自主性(state relative autonomy)」？「國家鑲嵌自主性(state embedded autonomy)」？與「國家職能性(state capacity)」?(10%)
 - 2.國家自主性與國家職能性之間的關係為何？(10%)
 - 3.國家自主性或國家職能性之強弱與國家總體上之強弱(strong/weak state)是否相關?(10%)

1. What is "Globalization"? Please use structural realism, neo-institutionalism, and critical theory respectively to interpret the implications of globalization. (Please answer only in English) (25%)
2. 請先列舉出三項西方國際關係學界近十年(2000-2010)來之重要研究議題，並請針對其中任何一項議題詳細說明其主要研究內容、論證爭議、以及妳/你對該議題之簡要評論(請以中文作答)。(25%)
3. Please analyze the connection between international organization and domestic affairs in the era of globalization with one example. (30%) (Please answer the question in English).
4. Please analyze the regional order in East Asia in the era of globalization in term of security community. (20%) (You may answer this question either in English or in Chinese).

國立中山大學 99 學年度博士班招生考試試題

科目：政治學方法論【政治所】

1. What were the chief characteristics of the philosophical movement known as logical positivism? (25%)
2. Give a brief account of Karl Popper's idea of falsification. (25%)
3. 請以三到五句話解說以下兩段文字的大意及作者立場（30%，注意：請勿以直接翻譯當作回答），並以一至兩段文字寫下個人評論（20%，注意：立場的選擇不影響評分）（請以中文作答）。

Rational choice theorists are not the first to believe that the way to place the study of politics on the secure path of a science is to embrace a new paradigm, outlook, approach, or general theory. At different times, systems theorists, structural-functionalists, and Marxists, among others, have all harbored comparable theoretical ambitions. Although it is always possible that an architectonic effort of this sort will bear fruit, the history of accumulated failures leaves us skeptical. In our view, advances in political science are more likely to come at the level of the hypothesis or middle-level generalization than at that of the grand theory or paradigmatic innovation, and the energy that is poured into developing new theories and paradigms, translating the existing stock of knowledge into them, and defending them against all comers, would be better spent on problem-driven research. As we have sought to establish in the preceding pages, this stance is not borne of any particular animus toward theorizing. Rather, it rests on the pragmatic judgment that empirical sustainable general theories about politics are unlikely to be formulated in any other way.

Nor does this stance place us at odds with the interdisciplinary outlook with which rational choice scholarship is often advertised. Problem-driven research pays no particular heed to existing disciplinary divisions. Whether the tools of economics, psychology, sociology or some other discipline should be brought to bear in the study of a given problem is ways an open question, depending on the nature of the problem and the prior history of attempts to study it in these and other disciplines. Unlike many of our critics, we see no more reason to suppose that economic models will be successful across the board than those drawn from psychology or sociology. To assume the contrary is to clothe what is actually a parochial, not to say myopic, outlook in an interdisciplinary spirit is seen by others as intellectual imperialism. Rational choice theorists will encounter less resistance when they supply a satisfactory answer to the question: what has been learned from rational choice theory? The present response to Diermeier and others, that its empirical accomplishments will be judged "eventually," while true, is not enough.