

碩士在職專班入學試題: 經濟學

- 請依題號依序作答。
- 請詳述理由或計算推導過程, 否則不予計分。
- 回答問題需簡潔到位, 太過冗長將予扣分。

Problem 1 (30%) 以下為台北市某國中公民科段考考題。

阿雅一家人打算利用國慶連假到台東遊玩, 於是上網查詢民宿價格。附表是阿雅查到的房價參考表, 請問, 這種價格變動最可以用哪一種經濟學原理來解釋?

日期	六人房價格
平日 (星期一至星期四)	2500 元
假日 (星期五至星期日)	3200 元
連續三天以上的國定假日	4000 元

該單選題的選項如下: (A) 機會成本, (B) 需求法則, (C) 供給法則, 以及 (D) 負擔能力原則。根據解答, 此題目的答案為 (B), 請回答以下問題。

1. 何謂需求法則? 你覺得此房價價格變動是否是反映了需求法則?
2. 如果台東的民宿是完全競爭市場, 請解釋此房價價格變動。
3. 如果台東的民宿是獨佔市場, 請解釋此房價價格變動。

Problem 2 (30%) 假設有 A, B 兩個國家, 各自僅生產兩種產品 X 與 Y 。當年度產量分別為 Q_X^A, Q_X^B, Q_Y^A 以及 Q_Y^B , 其中, Q_i^j 代表 j 國生產 i 商品, $j = A, B$ 且 $i = X, Y$ 。當年度商品價格分別為 P_X^A, P_Y^A (以 A 國貨幣計價), 以及 P_X^B, P_Y^B (以 B 國貨幣計價)。假設 A, B 兩國的貨幣之兌換比率為: 一單位的 B 國貨幣可以換到 S 單位的 A 國貨幣。

1. 請計算 B 國的名目 GDP。
2. 透過匯率換算, 請以 A 國幣值計算 B 國的名目 GDP。
3. 請以 A 國為基準, 計算 B 國以購買力平價平減的名目 GDP。

Problem 3 (30%) 以下文章來自 “X not V: Taiwan’s standard of living has just surpassed Japan’s”, *The Economist*, Nov 11th 2010.

In the 1930s the Japanese economist Kaname Akamatsu proposed a theory of how the economies of Asia might take wing. It became known as the flying geese model of development. As Akamatsu pointed out, “Wild geese fly in orderly ranks forming an inverse V, just as aeroplanes fly in formation.” Japan, the first Asian country to industrialise, would lead the way. Its neighbours would follow, breaking into new industries as the goose in front graduated out of them. Yet this year Japan was overtaken by a goose in its slipstream—not China, which remains far poorer than Japan, even if its economy is now bigger, but rather the island economy of Taiwan. In 2010, according to the IMF, Japan’s income per head will be \$33,800; Taiwan’s will be over \$34,700.

These incomes are converted not at market exchange rates, but at purchasing-power parities (PPPs), taking account of the higher cost of living in Japan. By this measure, Taiwan is not the first of the trailing geese to overtake the leader. Singapore and Hong Kong caught Japan in the early 1990s. South Korea is also closing the gap. Akamatsu’s inverse V is beginning to turn into an X. Calculated at market rates, Japan’s per head income (\$42,300) remains far higher than Taiwan’s (\$18,300). Tokyo’s chic districts are richer than their Taipei counterparts. And if Akamatsu’s theory applies to a country’s industrial mix, rather than its standard of living, Japan is well out in front. It is further along in the transition to a service economy, with industry accounting for less than a quarter of its GDP, compared with almost a third for Taiwan.

Yet despite 15 years of deflation, punishingly high prices still take a toll in Japan on people’s standard of living. PPPs are based on a global survey of prices led by the World Bank in 2005. It found that Taiwan’s housing was a third cheaper than Japan’s, even though Taiwan has almost double the population density. Taiwan’s food also costs only half as much as Japan’s. The survey’s price-checkers did their best to compare like with like, matching the price of staples and delicacies in each country. Inevitably the comparisons can be contested. Taiwanese food may seem cheap next to Japan’s sashimi and fugu. But then again, how much would you pay for stinky tofu?

請回答以下問題。

1. 根據此文章, 請從產業結構的觀點來評論 Kaname Akamatsu 所提出之理論。
2. 在 Problem 3 中, 我們所計算的是, 理論上以購買力平價平減的名目 GDP。然而, 實務上, 我們是先透過跨國物價調查資料間接推算購買力平價調整因子 (PPP converters), 再將各國名目 GDP 以購買力平價調整因子平減。若一國的物價較低, 其購買力平價調整因子就會比較小, 進而使得以購買力平價平減的名目 GDP 變大。根據此文章, 當我們利用購買力平價調整因子所算出的人均所得作跨國比較時, 有何值得注意的地方?

3. 利用購買力平價調整, 台灣的人均所得已高過日本的人均所得, 我們都會據此稱讚台灣物美價廉, 但是此文章的評論為何?

Problem 4 (10%) 「老吳早上買了一份早餐到學校, 發現他的同事也還沒吃早餐, 因此把早餐分出一半與同事共享。由此可見, 早餐具有共享性 (no-rival)」請評述以上說法是否正確。

