

Subject Description Form

Subject Code	APSS343											
Subject Title	Philosophy of Welfare											
Credit Value	3											
Level	3											
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	Nil											
Assessment Methods	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 33%;">100% Continuous Assessment</th> <th style="width: 33%;">Individual Assessment</th> <th style="width: 33%;">Group Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1. Seminar</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50 %</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2. Paper</td> <td style="text-align: center;">50 %</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grade is calculated according to the percentage assigned; The completion and submission of all component assignments are required for passing the subject. 			100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment	1. Seminar	50 %	--	2. Paper	50 %	--
100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment										
1. Seminar	50 %	--										
2. Paper	50 %	--										
Objectives	<p>The subject aims to help students develop a better understanding of the controversies which underlie and animate various local issues with regard to who should be responsible for welfare provision. The subject will also introduce students to some of the basic concepts necessary for understanding the ethical issues and predicaments in social work.</p>											
Intended Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. recognize the controversial issues involved in welfare provision; b. analyze and deliberate on those issues from a philosophical perspective; c. develop their own critical responses to the ethical problems in social work. 											
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. philosophizing about the rights and wrongs of ‘welfare’ b. the challenge of economics c. the challenge of ‘value-free’ social science 2. The Normative Basis of Welfare Provision <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the market and utility <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) maximizing human happiness ii) ‘pro-welfare’ and ‘anti-welfare’ arguments iii) the ‘safety-net-welfare’ alternative 											

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. the primacy of social justice <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the distribution of wealth and civil rights ii) the commitment to reason and fairness iii) the importance of our intuitions and judgements iv) equal basic liberties v) fair equality of opportunity vi) benefiting the least advantaged c. the primacy of private property rights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the sanctity of private ownership and free transfer ii) ‘welfare’ and taxation as theft and robbery iii) the redistribution vs. liberty paradox iv) the individual vs. society paradox d. the primacy of community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) the limits of individualism ii) the importance of culture and tradition iii) citizenship and welfare rights <p>3. A critique of Welfare Philosophy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the primacy of the economic process b. the nature of capitalism c. the forces of history d. the grounds for a better future <p>4. Philosophy of Welfare and the Local Context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the Western theories vs. Hong Kong Chinese society paradox – the abstract theories vs. pragmatic practice paradox b. limits and possibilities in Hong Kong
--	--

Teaching/Learning Methodology	The approach will be comprised of lectures and seminars. Key concepts and issues related to the subject are introduced through lectures. In their seminar presentation, students are expected to formulate their own arguments and articulate them in a clear and systematic fashion.
--------------------------------------	---

Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes	<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Seminar</td> <td>50 %</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Paper</td> <td>50 %</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100 %</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Since the above assessment methods allow students to demonstrate their critical</p>	Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c				1. Seminar	50 %	✓	✓	✓				2. Paper	50 %	✓	✓	✓				Total	100 %						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting			Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																			
		a	b	c																																			
1. Seminar	50 %	✓	✓	✓																																			
2. Paper	50 %	✓	✓	✓																																			
Total	100 %																																						

	<p>thinking abilities as well as their understanding of the concepts covered, they are appropriate for assessing the intended learning outcomes. Specifically, in both the paper and the seminar presentation, students will be mainly assessed on their ability to articulate clearly their ideas, develop coherent, cogent and well-supported arguments, and illustrate key philosophical concepts with appropriate examples.</p>	
Student Study Effort Expected	Class contact:	
	▪ Lecture	24 Hrs.
	▪ Seminar	15 Hrs.
	Other student study effort:	
	▪ Seminar Preparation	42 Hrs.
	▪ Paper Writing	42 Hrs.
	Total student study effort	123 Hrs.
Medium of Instruction	Chinese	
Medium of Assessment	English	
Reading List and References	<p><u>Essential</u></p> <p>Hayek, F. A. (1976). <i>Law, legislation and liberty, vol. 2: The mirage of social justice</i>. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.</p> <p>Kymlicka, W. (2002). <i>Contemporary political philosophy: An introduction</i> (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Plant, R., Lesser, H., & Taylor-Gooby, P. (2009). <i>Political philosophy and social welfare: Essays on the normative basis of welfare provision</i> (New Ed.) London: Routledge.</p> <p>Rawls, J. (1999). <i>A theory of justice</i>. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.</p> <p>Taylor, C. (1985). <i>Philosophical papers II: Philosophy and the human sciences</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p><u>Supplementary</u></p> <p>Barry, N. (1999). <i>Welfare</i> (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.</p> <p>Harris, D. (1987). <i>Justifying state welfare: The new right versus the old left</i>. Oxford: B. Blackwell.</p> <p>Jordan, B. (1990). <i>Social work in an unjust society</i>. Hemel Hempstead, Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.</p> <p>Mulhall, S., & Swift, A. (1996). <i>Liberals and communitarians</i> (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.</p>	

	<p>Nussbaum, M. (2001). <i>The fragility of goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy</i> (Rev. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.</p> <p>Plant, R. (2009). <i>Social and moral theory in casework</i>. Abingdon: Routledge.</p> <p>Plant, R. (2010). <i>The neo-liberal state</i>. Oxford: Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Richardson, F., Fowers, B., & Guignon, C. (1999). <i>Re-envisioning psychology: Moral dimensions of theory and practice</i>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.</p> <p>Sandel, M. (2009). <i>Justice: What's the right thing to do?</i> New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.</p> <p>張五常 (1983)。賣桔者言。信報出版社。</p>
--	---