

考 試 科 目	專業英文	所 別	教育學系	考 試 時 間	2 月 26 日(六) 第 三 節
---------	------	-----	------	---------	-------------------

1. For the following passage:

- (1) Please translate the passage to Chinese (25 points);
- (2) Please describe two learning tasks in English. Use the first task to demonstrate cooperative learning and the second one to demonstrate collaborative learning (25 points).

The study of group learning began long before Computer-supported collaborative learning (CSCL). Since at least the 1960s, before the advent of networked personal computers, there was considerable investigation of cooperative learning by education researchers. Research on small groups has an even longer history within social psychology. To distinguish CSCL from this earlier investigation of group learning, it is useful to draw a distinction between cooperative and collaborative learning. In a detailed discussion of this distinction, Dillenbourg defined the distinction roughly as follows:

“In cooperation, partners split the work, solve sub-tasks individually and then assemble the partial results into the final output. In collaboration, partners do the work ‘together.’”

He then referred to Roschelle & Teasley’s definition of collaboration:

“This chapter presents a case study intended to exemplify the use of a computer as a cognitive tool for learning that occurs socially. We investigate a particularly important kind of social activity, the collaborative construction of new problem solving knowledge. Collaboration is a process by which individuals negotiate and share meanings relevant to the problem-solving task at hand.... Collaboration is a coordinated, synchronous activity that is the result of a continued attempt to construct and maintain a shared conception of a problem.”

In cooperation, the learning is done by individuals, who then contribute their individual results and present the collection of individual results as their group product. Learning in cooperative groups is viewed as something that takes place individually and can therefore be studied with the traditional conceptualizations and methods of educational and psychological research.

By contrast, in the Roschelle & Teasley characterization of collaboration, learning occurs socially as the collaborative construction of knowledge. Of course, individuals are involved in this as members of the group, but the activities that they engage in are not individual-learning activities, but group interactions like negotiation and sharing. The participants do not go off to do things individually, but remain engaged with a shared task that is constructed and maintained by and for the group as such. The collaborative negotiation and social sharing of group meanings—phenomena central to collaboration—cannot be studied with traditional psychological methods.

請注意：背面還有試題。

備	註	試	題	隨	卷	繳	交
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

考試科目	專業英文	所別	教育學系	考試時間	2 月 26 日(六) 第三節
------	------	----	------	------	-----------------

2. For the following passage:

(3) Please translate the passage to English (25 points);

(4) Please provide an example, in English, of your own experiential learning experience according to Kolb's model described in the passage (25 points).

Kolb 體驗學習模式是沿自 John Dewey 的體驗教育與 Kurt Lewin 的社會心理學理論，強調體驗在個人學習過程中的重要性。根據這個學習模式，學習是一個四階段的循環。第一階段是具體經歷；第二階段是觀察反思；第三階段是建立原則；第四階段是主動驗證。也就是說，學習者必須開放地、毫無偏見地參與新事物的體驗；他必須能多方面的觀察與體會他所有的經歷；他必須能以創新的觀念去整合他的觀察，去形成具邏輯性的假設；他必須測驗這個假設的真實性，並能使用驗證的結果去作決定或解決問題。這四個階段亦代表四種學習能力，而且構成兩組不同的特質。第一組特質稱為認知能力，具體經歷與抽象思維是這組特質的兩個極端。第二組特質稱為處理能力，而觀察反思及主動驗證是這組特質中的對立能力。學習者完成一個循環之後再進入下一個循環，藉此不斷累積體驗內容，從而增進對自我、他人與社會的了解。

考試科目

教育研究法

所別

教育系

考試時間

2月26日 星期六 第2節

一、除訪談及實地札記外，質化研究資料還使用所謂的「文件」資料，請回答下列三個問題：

1. 為何「文件」可作為教育研究的資料？（5%）
2. 「文件」資料可以有哪些類型，並簡述各類型資料之研究價值？（10%）
3. 「文件」資料與訪談資料、實地札記資料間有何差異？（5%）

二、請闡述「人類經驗是以詮釋作為媒介」這句話在教育研究上之意涵。（15%）

三、「抽樣」對任何種類的研究都是重要的問題，我們無法將所有感興趣的案例都納入，也無法窮盡。請提出您所知在教育學質化研究取向上關於「抽樣」方面的觀點與主張，並舉出具體例子說明之。（15%）



備

註

試題隨卷繳交

請注意：背面還有試題。

考試科目	教育研究法	所別	教育系	考試時間	2月26日(六)第2節
------	-------	----	-----	------	-------------

四、解釋名詞 (20 分)：請以中文回答以下每一子題內的兩個名詞。

1. Microfilm / Microfiche
2. EndNote / Refworks (reference management software)
3. Google Scholar / ERIC
4. AMOS / MPLUS (statistical modeling program)
5. MAXQDA / Nvivo (qualitative data analysis software)

五、問題背景：A 學者進行描述統計分析的結果，獲得以下報表 (請見次頁之 TABLE 2)。試針對 TABLE 2 的結果，進行統計分析與結果的說明(請參見以下西文之提示說明) (15 分)。

提示說明：The overall mean scores revealed that high school principals sometimes or often practiced DDDM in addressing administrative problems in all the four leadership constructs. The highest overall mean score among these four constructs was the leadership dimension of school instruction ($M = 3.99, SD = 0.54$). The frequency of principals' DDDM practices in the leadership areas of school organizational operation was also relatively high ($M = 3.88, SD = 0.67$). The overall mean scores of the frequency of principals' DDDM practices in the leadership dimension of school vision were in third place ($M = 3.71, SD = 0.71$), but close to the overall means of the above two dimensions. In comparison to the above three dimensions, the principals' DDDM practices were frequently low in the leadership dimension of collaborative partnerships ($M = 3.29, SD = 0.77$).

六、何謂懷德術 (Delphi method) (請參見以下西文之提示說明)？試以懷德術設計一個教育專題研究(研究題目請自行命題)，並詳述實施過程 (15 分)。

提示說明：The Delphi method is a structured communication technique, originally developed as a systematic, interactive forecasting method which relies on a panel of experts. In the standard version, the experts answer questionnaires in two or more rounds. After each round, a facilitator provides an anonymous summary of the experts' forecasts from the previous round as well as the reasons they provided for their judgments. Thus, experts are encouraged to revise their earlier answers in light of the replies of other members of their panel. It is believed that during this process the range of the answers will decrease and the group will converge towards the "correct" answer. Finally, the process is stopped after a pre-defined stop criterion (e.g. number of rounds, achievement of consensus, and stability of results) and the mean or median scores of the final rounds determine the results.

考試科目	教育研究法	所別	教育系	考試時間	2月26日(六)第2節
------	-------	----	-----	------	-------------

Item	M	SD
Leadership in School Vision		
1. I use data to develop a school vision that promotes the success of all students.	3.71	0.71
2. I use data to make decisions in aligning resources with the school vision.	4.01	0.92
21. I use data to determine what strategies to use in achieving the goals of advocating for all students.	3.98	0.87
5. I use data to generate potential elements of a vision statement.	3.76	0.90
19. I use data to develop alternatives for implementing the vision.	3.56	1.01
22. I use data to define possible problems in vision implementation.	3.49	0.87
	3.36	0.96
Leadership in School Instruction		
23. I use data to identify problems in student learning.	3.99	0.54
7. I use data to generate approaches to curriculum improvement.	4.24	0.69
6. I use data to make recommendations regarding learning programs.	4.23	0.71
28. I use data to determine whether specific programs lead to improved achievement.	4.20	0.73
9. I use data to plan professional development programs.	4.16	0.70
17. I use data to evaluate the instructional efficiency of the school.	4.04	0.78
15. I use data to assess learning equity for different populations.	3.84	0.86
18. I use data to predict the outcome of new instructional programs.	3.77	0.96
	3.66	0.90
Leadership in School Organizational Operation and Moral Perspective		
12. I use data to promote an environment for improved student achievement.	3.88	0.67
27. I use data to monitor instructional practices of the school organization.	4.28	0.72
10. I use data to advocate for policies that promote success for all students.	4.18	0.75
8. I use data to assign human resources in ways that promote student achievement.	4.10	0.87
3. I use data to insure that staff members are treated fairly.	3.93	0.82
11. I use data to identify safety issues.	3.90	1.02
13. I use data to judge my performance in effective management.	3.83	0.92
	3.68	0.86
Leadership in Collaborative Partnerships and Larger-Context Politics		
29. I use data to measure the effectiveness of outreach to the community.	3.29	0.77
24. I use data to develop effective communication plans.	4.16	0.70
4. I use data to understand the larger context of the community, which affects opportunities for students.	3.70	0.90
25. I use data to determine what type of community input should be gained.	3.66	0.93
16. I use data to mobilize community resources for the benefit of student learning.	3.32	0.94
14. I use data to gauge the effectiveness of collaborative relationships with the community.	3.28	1.01
20. I use data to develop effective approaches for school-family partnership.	3.21	0.96
30. I use data to generate approaches with school stakeholders that reflect their concern.	3.20	0.94
26. I use data to negotiate with political decision makers for the improvement of students' educational opportunities.	3.20	1.02
	3.18	1.11

NOTE: P3DMI = Principal Data-Driven Decision Making Index.

考試科目	教育學	所別	教育學	考試時間	2月26日(六)第4節
------	-----	----	-----	------	-------------

一、試述蔡元培先生提出的教育思想體系？並申論該教育體系對我國教育發展的影響？
(25%)

二、試述裴斯塔洛齊的教育理念？並申論其教育理念對現代教育工作者的啟示？(25%)



請注意：背面還有試題。

備註 試題隨卷繳交

考試科目	教育學	所別	教育系	考試時間	2月26日(六)第4節
------	-----	----	-----	------	-------------

- 二、請依據教育社會學之相關理念與理論，回答下列問題：1) 分析 2000-2009 四年中 PISA 資料所顯示的跨國比較涵意 (20%)；2) 說明臺灣十五歲學生在上述國際評量表現所顯示之意義；(15%)
3) 論述 PISA 對各國教育政策及學校教育之可能影響評估(15%)。

2009 年 PISA 成績

表一 閱讀素養排名

國家/地區	排名	分數
上海	1	556
韓國	2	539
芬蘭	3	536
香港	4	533
新加坡	5	526
加拿大	6	524
紐西蘭	7	521
日本	8	520
澳洲	9	515
荷蘭	10	508
臺灣	23	495

OECD 平均分數 493

表二 數學素養排名

國家/地區	排名	分數
上海	1	600
新加坡	2	562
香港	3	555
韓國	4	546
臺灣	5	543
芬蘭	6	541
列支敦斯登	7	536
瑞士	8	534
日本	9	529
加拿大	10	527

OECD 平均分數 496

表三 科學素養排名

國家/地區	排名	分數
上海	1	575
芬蘭	2	554
香港	3	549
新加坡	4	542
日本	5	539
韓國	6	538
紐西蘭	7	532
加拿大	8	529
愛沙尼亞	9	528
澳洲	10	527
臺灣	12	520

OECD 平均分數 501

說明：PISA 是「Program for International Student Assessment (國際學生能力評量計畫)」的簡稱，由 OECD 主辦的十五歲學生評量，自兩千年開始舉辦，每三年施測一次，到了 2009 年增加到六十五國及地區參與，測量的項目閱讀、數學、科學三科素養。

資料來源：《臺灣 PISA2009 結果報告》

備註 試題隨卷繳交

考試科目	教育學		所別	教育系		考試時間	2月26日(六)第4節																								
	PISA 2000		PISA 2003		PISA 2006																										
聽讀	1.芬蘭 (546)	2.加拿大 (534)	3.紐西蘭 (529)	4.澳大利亞 (528)	5.愛爾蘭 (527)	6.韓國 (525)	6.英國 (523)	8.日本 (522)	9.瑞典 (516)	10.奧地利/比利時/冰島 (507)	1.芬蘭 (544)	2.韓國 (534)	3.加拿大 (528)	4.澳大利亞 (525)	4.列支敦士登 (525)	6.紐西蘭 (522)	7.愛爾蘭 (516)	8.瑞典 (514)	9.荷蘭 (513)	10.香港 (510)	1.韓國 (556)	2.芬蘭 (547)	3.香港 (536)	4.加拿大 (527)	5.紐西蘭 (521)	6.愛爾蘭 (517)	7.澳大利亞 (513)	8.列支敦士登 (510)	9.波蘭 (508)	9.瑞典 (507)	16.台灣 (496)
數學	1.日本 (557)	2.韓國 (547)	3.紐西蘭 (537)	4.芬蘭 (536)	5.澳大利亞 (533)	5.加拿大 (533)	7.瑞士 (529)	7.英國 (529)	9.比利時 (520)	10.法國 (517)	1.香港 (550)	2.芬蘭 (544)	3.韓國 (542)	4.荷蘭 (538)	5.列支敦士登 (536)	6.日本 (534)	7.加拿大 (533)	8.比利時 (529)	9.澳門 (527)	9.瑞士 (527)	1.台灣 (549)	2.芬蘭 (548)	3.香港 (547)	3.韓國 (547)	5.荷蘭 (531)	6.瑞士 (530)	7.加拿大 (527)	8.澳門 (525)	8.列支敦士登 (525)	10.日本 (523)	
科學	1.韓國 (552)	2.日本 (550)	3.芬蘭 (538)	4.英國 (532)	5.加拿大 (529)	6.紐西蘭 (528)	6.澳大利亞 (528)	8.奧地利 (519)	9.愛爾蘭 (513)	10.瑞典 (512)	1.芬蘭 (548)	1.日本 (548)	3.香港 (540)	4.韓國 (538)	5.列支敦士登 (525)	5.澳大利亞 (525)	5.澳門 (525)	8.荷蘭 (524)	9.捷克 (523)	10.紐西蘭 (521)	1.芬蘭 (563)	2.香港 (542)	3.加拿大 (534)	4.台灣 (532)	5.愛沙尼亞 (531)	5.日本 (531)	7.紐西蘭 (530)	8.澳大利亞 (527)	9.荷蘭 (525)	10.列支敦士登/韓國 (522)	
各國家括弧內的數字為平均數 (Mean Score) 資料來源: OECD																															
備	註	試題隨卷繳交																													