系所:<u>翻譯研究所</u>科目:<u>英文(含作文)</u>

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第1頁

Part A: Multiple Choices (50%)

Instructions: There are two reading sections that contain a total of 25 questions. In each question, you must select one best answer out of four choices.

Section 1:

In the early 1990s, at the dawn of the Internet era, an explosion in academic productivity seemed to be around the corner. But the corner never appeared. Instead, teaching techniques at colleges and universities, which pride themselves on spewing out creative ideas that disrupt the rest of society, have continued to evolve at a glacial pace.

Sure, PowerPoint presentations have displaced chalkboards, enrollments in "massive open online courses' often exceed 100,000 (though the number of engaged students tends to be much smaller), and "flipped classrooms" replace homework with watching taped lectures, while class time is spent discussing homework exercises. But, given education's centrality to 1 productivity, shouldn't efforts to reinvigorate today's sclerotic Western economies focus on how to reinvent higher education?

One can understand why change is slow to take root at the primary and secondary school level, where the social and political obstacles are <u>2</u>. But colleges and universities have far more capacity to experiment; indeed, in many ways, that is their *raison d'être*.

For example, what sense does it make for each college in the United States to offer its own highly 3 lectures on core topics like freshman calculus, economics, and US history, often with classes of 500 students or more? Sometimes these giant classes are great, but anyone who has gone to college can tell you that is not the norm.

At least for large-scale introductory courses, why not let students everywhere watch highly produced recordings by the world's best professors and lecturers, much as we do with music, sports, and entertainment? This does not mean a one-size-fits-all <u>4</u>: there could be a competitive market, as there already is for textbooks, with perhaps a dozen people dominating much of the market.

And videos could be used in <u>5</u>, so a school could choose to use, say, one package to teach the first part of a course, and a completely different package to teach the second part. Professors could still mix in live lectures on their favorite topics, but as a treat, not as a boring routine.

A shift to recorded lectures is only one example. The potential for developing specialized software and apps to <u>6</u> higher education is endless. There is already some experimentation with using software to help understand individual students' challenges and deficiencies in ways that guide teachers on how to give the most constructive feedback. But so far, such initiatives are very limited.

系所:<u>翻譯研究所</u>科目:<u>英文(含作文)</u>

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第2頁

Perhaps change in tertiary education is so glacial because the learning is deeply interpersonal, making human teachers <u>7</u>. But wouldn't it make more sense for the <u>8</u> of faculty teaching time to be devoted to helping students engage in active learning through discussion and exercises, rather than to sometimes hundredth-best lecture performances?

Yes, outside of traditional brick-and-mortar universities, there has been some 9 innovation. The Khan Academy has produced a treasure trove of lectures on a variety of topics, and it is particularly strong in teaching basic mathematics. Although the main target audience is advanced high school students, there is a lot of material that college students (or anyone) would find useful.

Moreover, there are some great websites, including Crash Course and Ted-Ed, that contain short general education videos on a huge variety of subjects, from philosophy to biology to history. But while a small number of innovative professors are using such methods to reinvent their courses, the tremendous resistance they face from other faculty holds down the size of the market and makes it hard to 10 the investments needed to produce more rapid change.

Let's face it, college faculty are no keener to see technology cut into their jobs than any other group. And, unlike most factory workers, university faculty members have enormous power over the administration. Any university president that tries to run roughshod over them will usually lose her job long before any faculty member does.

Of course, change will eventually come, and when it does, the potential effect on economic growth and social welfare will be enormous. It is difficult to suggest an exact monetary figure, because, like many things in the modern tech world, money spent on education does not capture the full social 11. But even the most conservative 12 suggest the vast potential. In the US, tertiary education accounts for over 2.5% of GDP (roughly \$500 billion), and yet much of this is spent quite inefficiently. The real cost, though, is not the squandered tax money, but the fact that today's youth could be learning so much more than they do.

Universities and colleges are pivotal to the future of our societies. But, given impressive and ongoing advances in technology and artificial intelligence, it is hard to see how they can continue playing this role without reinventing themselves over the next two decades. Education innovation will disrupt academic employment, but the benefits to jobs everywhere else could be enormous. If there were more disruption within the ivory tower, economies just might become more <u>13</u> to disruption outside it.

When Will Tech Disrupt Higher Education? by Kenneth Rogoff

1. (A) boosting (E

(B) raising

(C) creating

(D) sustaining

2. (A) significant

(B) abundant

(C) stunning

(D) massive

3. (A) idiosyncratic

(B) individual

(C) creative

(D) sophisticated

系所:<u>翻譯研究所</u>科目:<u>英文(含作文)</u>

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第3頁

4. (A) case	(B) condition	(C) contingency	(D) scenario
5. (A) components	(B) units	(C) modules	(D) divisions
6. (A) promote	(B) advance	(C) propagate	(D) sustain
7. (A) necessary	(B) compulsory	(C) essential	(D) critical
8. (A) bulk	(B) chunk	(C) core	(D) substance
9. (A) stunning	(B) marvelous	(C) incredible	(D) remarkable
10. (A) verify	(B) quantify	(C) justify	(D) normalize
11. (A) impact	(B) consequence	(C) result	(D) shock
12. (A) conjecture	(B) speculation	(C) calculations	(D) estimates
13. (A) sustainable	(B) resilient	(C) flexible	(D) adaptive

Section 2:

China has invested billions of dollars to increase its soft power, but it has recently suffered a 14 in democratic countries. A new report by the National Endowment for Democracy argues that we need to rethink soft power, because "the conceptual vocabulary that has been used since the Cold War's end no longer seems adequate to the contemporary situation."

The report describes the new authoritarian influences <u>15</u> around the world as "sharp power." A recent cover article in *The Economist* defines "sharp power" by its reliance on "subversion, bullying and pressure, which combine to promote self-censorship." Whereas soft power harnesses the <u>16</u> of culture and values to augment a country's strength, sharp power helps authoritarian regimes compel behavior at home and manipulate opinion abroad.

The term "soft power" – the ability to affect others by attraction and persuasion rather than the hard power of coercion and payment – is sometimes used to describe any <u>17</u> of power that does not involve the use of force. But that is a mistake. Power sometimes depends on whose army or economy wins, but it can also depend on whose story wins.

A strong narrative is a source of power. China's economic success has generated both hard and soft power, but within limits. A Chinese economic aid package under the Belt and Road Initiative may appear benign and attractive, but not if the terms turn sour, as was recently the <u>18</u> in a Sri Lankan port project.

Likewise, other exercises of economic hard power undercut the soft power of China's narrative. For example, China punished Norway for awarding a Nobel Peace Prize to Liu Xiaobo. It also threatened to restrict access to the Chinese market for an Australian publisher of a book critical of China.

If we use the term sharp power as shorthand for information warfare, the contrast with soft power becomes plain. Sharp power is a type of hard power. It manipulates information, which is intangible, but

系所:<u>翻譯研究所</u>科目:<u>英文(含作文)</u>

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第4頁

intangibility is not the distinguishing characteristic of soft power. Verbal threats, for example, are both intangible and coercive.

When I introduced the concept of soft power in 1990, I wrote that it is characterized by voluntarism and indirection, while hard power rests on threats and inducements. If someone aims a gun at you, <u>19</u> your money, and takes your wallet, what you think and want is irrelevant. That is hard power. If he persuades you to give him your money, he has changed what you think and want. That is soft power.

Truth and openness create a dividing line between soft and sharp power in public diplomacy. When China's official news agency, *Xinhua*, broadcasts openly in other countries, it is employing soft-power techniques, and we should accept that. When China Radio International covertly backs 33 radio stations in 14 countries, the boundary of sharp power has been <u>20</u>, and we should expose the breach of voluntarism.

Of course, advertising and persuasion always involve some degree of framing, which limits voluntarism, as do structural features of the social environment. But extreme deception in framing can be viewed as coercive; though not violent, it prevents meaningful choice.

Techniques of public diplomacy that are widely viewed as propaganda cannot produce soft power. In an age of information, the scarcest resources are attention and credibility. That is why exchange programs that develop two-way communication and personal relations among students and young leaders are often far more 21 generators of soft power than, say, official broadcasting.

The United States has long had 22 enabling visits by young foreign leaders, and now China is successfully following suit. That is a smart exercise of soft power. But when visas are manipulated or access is limited to restrain criticism and encourage self-censorship, even such exchange programs can shade into sharp power.

As democracies respond to China's sharp power and information warfare, they have to be careful not to overreact. Much of the soft power democracies wield comes from civil society, which means that openness is a crucial 23. China could generate more soft power if it would relax some of its tight party control over civil society. Similarly, manipulation of media and reliance on covert channels of communication often reduces soft power. Democracies should avoid the temptation to imitate these authoritarian sharp-power tools.

Moreover, shutting down legitimate Chinese soft-power tools can be counter-productive. Soft power is often used for competitive, zero-sum 24; but it can also have positive sum aspects.

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第5頁

For example, if both China and the US wish to avoid conflict, exchange programs that increase American attraction to China, and vice versa, would benefit both countries. And on transnational <u>25</u> such as climate change, where both countries can benefit from cooperation, soft power can help build the trust and create the networks that make such cooperation possible.

While it would be a mistake to prohibit Chinese soft-power efforts just because they sometimes shade into sharp power, it is also important to monitor the dividing line carefully. For example, the Hanban, the government agency that manages the 500 Confucius Institutes and 1,000 Confucius classrooms that China supports in universities and schools around the world to teach Chinese language and culture, must resist the temptation to set restrictions that limit academic freedom. Crossing that line has led to the disbanding of some Confucius Institutes.

As such cases show, the best defense against China's use of soft-power programs as sharp-power tools is open exposure of such efforts. And this is where democracies have an advantage.

China's Soft and Sharp Power by Joseph S. Nye

14. (A) setback	(B) defeat	(C) backlash	(D) blow
15. (A) being felt	(B) felt	(C) that were felt	(D) that have been felt
16. (A) attraction	(B) allure	(C) enchantment	(D) glory
17. (A) execution	(B) imposing	(C) exercise	(D) exhibition
18. (A) case	(B) condition	(C) contingency	(D) scenario
19. (A) requests	(B) begs	(C) demands	(D) inquires
20. (A) ignored	(B) broken	(C) vitiated	(D) crossed
21. (A) efficient	(B) effectual	(C) effective	(D) powerful
22. (A) initiatives	(B) programs	(C) agendas	(D) policies
23. (A) chip	(B) component	(C) asset	(D) value
24. (A) goals	(B) purposes	(C) issues	(D) agendas
25. (A) goals	(B) purposes	(C) issues	(D) agendas

Part B: Summary and Response (50%)

Instructions: Briefly summarize the article. Write a response essay to argue (for or against) the opinion. Illustrate with your observation or experience. Totally no less than 300 words.

Are Hospitals Becoming Obsolete?

By EZEKIEL J. EMANUEL

The New York Times

系所:<u>翻譯研究所</u>科目:<u>英文(含作文)</u>

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第6頁

Hospitals are disappearing. While they may never completely go away, they will continue to shrink in number and importance. That is inevitable and good.

The reputation of hospitals has had its ups and downs. Benjamin Rush, a surgeon general of the Continental Army, called the hospitals of his day the "sinks of human life." Through the 19th century, most Americans were treated in their homes. Hospitals were a last resort, places only the very poor or those with no family went. And they went mainly to die.

Then several innovations made hospitals more attractive. Anesthesia and sterile techniques made surgery less risky and traumatic, while the discovery of X-rays in 1895 enhanced the diagnostic powers of physicians. And the understanding of germ theory reduced the spread of infectious diseases.

Middle- and upper-class Americans increasingly turned to hospitals for treatment. Americans also strongly supported the expansion of hospitals through philanthropy and legislation.

Today, hospitals house M.R.I.s, surgical robots and other technological wonders, and at \$1.1 trillion they account for about a third of all medical spending. That's nearly the size of the Spanish economy.

And yet this enormous sector of the economy has actually been in decline for some time.

Consider this: What year saw the maximum number of hospitalizations in the United States? The answer is 1981.

That might surprise you. That year, there were over 39 million hospitalizations — 171 admissions per 1,000 Americans. Thirty-five years later, the population has increased by 40 percent, but hospitalizations have decreased by more than 10 percent. There is now a lower rate of hospitalizations than in 1946. As a result, the number of hospitals has declined to 5,534 this year from 6,933 in 1981.

This is because, in a throwback to the 19th century, hospitals now seem less therapeutic and more life-threatening. In 2002, researchers from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that there were 1.7 million cases of hospital-acquired infections that caused nearly 100,000 deaths. Other problems — from falls to medical errors — seem too frequent. It is clear that a hospital admission is not a rejuvenating stay at a spa, but a trial to be endured. And those beeping machines and middle-of-the-night interruptions are not conducive to recovery.

The number of hospitals is also declining because more complex care can safely and effectively be provided elsewhere, and that's good news.

When I was training to become an oncologist, most chemotherapy was administered in the hospital. Now much better anti-nausea medications and more tolerable oral instead of intravenous treatments have made a hospital admission for chemotherapy unusual. Similarly, hip and knee replacements once required days in the hospital; many can now be done overnight in ambulatory surgical centers. Births outside of hospitals are also increasing, as more women have babies at home or at birthing centers.

Studies have shown that patients with heart failure, pneumonia and some serious infections can be given intravenous antibiotics and other hospital-level treatments at home by visiting nurses. These "hospital at home" programs usually lead to more rapid recoveries, at a lower cost.

As these trends accelerate, many of today's hospitals will downsize, merge or close. Others will convert to doctors' offices or outpatient clinics. Those that remain will be devoted to emergency rooms, high-tech

系所: <u>翻譯研究所</u>	科目: <u>英</u>	文(含作文)
------------------	--------------	--------

☆☆請在答案紙上作答☆☆

共7頁,第7頁

services for premature babies, patients requiring brain surgery and organ transplants, and the like. Meanwhile, the nearly one billion annual visits to physicians' offices, imaging facilities, surgical centers, urgent-care centers and "doc in the box" clinics will grow.

Special interests in the hospital business aren't going to like this. They will lobby for higher hospital payments from the government and insurers and for other preferential treatment, often arguing that we need to retain the "good" jobs hospitals offer. But this is disingenuous; the shift of medical services out of hospitals will create other good jobs — for home nurses, community health care workers and staff at outpatient centers.

Hospitals will also continue consolidating into huge, multihospital systems. They say that this will generate cost savings that can be passed along to patients, but in fact, the opposite happens. The mergers create local monopolies that raise prices to counter the decreased revenue from fewer occupied beds. Federal antitrust regulators must be more vigorous in opposing such mergers.

Instead of trying to forestall the inevitable, we should welcome the advances that are making hospitals less important. Any change in the health care system that saves money and makes patients healthier deserves to be celebrated.