

考試科目	教育學(一)	所別	教育學(教育哲學組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第一節
------	--------	----	------------	------	--------------	-----

一、請以兩位教育哲學家為例闡述「人類圖像」(Menschenbild, Human-image)對於建構教育哲學思想體系的重要性。(本題 25%)

二、東方古代經典「大學」一書記載「大學之道在明明德，在親民，在止於至善」，請闡述其對於教育哲學研究「基本議題架構」可能之啟示。(本題 25%)

三、請翻譯以下一段文字為中文，並簡單評論其對於當前教育哲學研究方向之啟示。(本題 25%)

...I am talking about a culture of schooling in which more importance is placed on exploration than on discovery, more value is assigned to surprise than to control, more attention is devoted to what is distinctive than to what is standard, more interest is related to what is metaphorical than to what is literal. It is an educational culture that has a greater focus on becoming than on being, places more value on the imaginative than on the factual, assigns greater priority to valuing than to measuring, and regards the quality of the journey as more educationally significant than the speed at which the destination is reached. I am talking about a new vision of what education might and what schools are for. (Eisner, 2005 : 213)

四、請闡述以下一段文字所討論的「後現代陶養」教育哲學相關問題內涵。(本題 25%)

For a postmodern idea of Bildung there can be no absolute measure of a true human life....The promise of Bildung points to the fact that subject is not exhausted in its objectivity but is disclosed in relationships. The promise is the name of a relationship. (Løvlie, 2002 : 484)

考試科目	教育研究法(-)	所別	教育(教育哲學組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第2節
------	----------	----	-----------	------	--------------	-----

- 一、請創造一個行動研究(action research)的例子(限於教育相關領域):設定一個研究題目，列舉兩個研究問題，然後對照說明採取實證或詮釋兩種不同研究取向所可能產生的不同作法與態度。(25%)
  
- 二、請舉出一篇你讀過的、以理論發展或概念分析為主軸的文獻(限於教育相關領域)，說明這篇文章的優缺點，分析它的法論，並指出它的獨特貢獻。(25%)
  
- 三、在採取質性研究法(尤其是俗民誌/人種誌/人類學田野研究)時，有些研究人員進入現場很長一段時間後，仍然看不出什麼有意義的現象，有些人則不斷看到與預期一致的現象。請從知識論(epistemology 或科學哲學(philosophy of science)的觀點，分析這兩種研究人員的現象。(25%)
  
- 四、請說明辯證思考(dialectic thinking)和系統思考(systems thinking)在教育哲學研究歷程中所扮演的角色。(25%)

考試科目	英文	所別	教育系	教育博碩組 教育行政組 教育心理輔導組	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第3節
------	----	----	-----	---------------------------	------	--------------	-----

The following article is excerpted from a journal paper. Please answer the following questions in English according to the article. Thank you!

1. Please summarize the article (your summary must be no more than 150 words). (33%)
2. What are the main themes or issues the article tries to convey (no more than 100 words)? (33%)
3. What are your comments about this article (no more than 200 words)? (34%)

If there is any consensus about what education in a knowledge society should be like, it is to be found in a cluster of terms that pervade the oral and printed discourse on this issue—including especially the ‘futuristic business literature’ that Bereiter cites in his target article: lifelong learning, flexibility, creativity, higher-order thinking skills, collaboration, distributed expertise, learning organizations, innovation, technological literacy. At times these appear to be empty buzzwords, but they may also be thought of as attempts to give expression to a central intuition that has yet to be formulated in terms that are clear enough to be very useful in generating designs and policies. In this chapter I attempt to extract a main idea from these vague terms and show how it can be applied to generate a kind of education that really does address new challenges in a new way.

A central idea is collective cognitive responsibility. Although this concept does not capture everything suggested in the foregoing list of terms, it captures much that they have in common and something more. Let us first expand upon the idea in the context of adult work and then apply it in the context of education.

Expert medical teams, flight crews, and sports teams have begun to serve as models for the kinds of groups that are expected to carry on much of the higher-level work in knowledge-based enterprises. Expert teams exhibit continual learning, flexibility, good thinking, and collaboration; but they also exhibit other characteristics of a more distinctive nature. Although each member of the team may have particular expertise and particular duties, the team members are also able to take over for one another on a moment-to-moment basis. This provides a flexibility that enables the group effort to succeed despite unexpected complications. Along with the capability is a commitment on the part of each member to do whatever is necessary to make the team effort succeed. Expert teams have been around for a long time. The whaling crews that Melville described in Moby Dick exemplify what I have been

(背面還有試題)



考 試 科 目	英 文	所 別	教 育 學	教 育 哲 學 組 教 育 行 政 組 教 育 心 理 與 輔 導 組	試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星 期 六	第 3 節
---------	-----	-----	-------	---	-------	-------------------	-------

describing. And, of course, expert sports teams exhibit just the combination of distinctive roles and skills on one hand and resourceful cooperation on the other that go to make up collective responsibility. What is new is that expert teams are becoming the paradigms for working groups of all kinds, replacing the bureaucratic and assembly line paradigms, in which roles are fixed and the way to handle the unexpected is to refer it to a higher level in the organization.

Collective responsibility, then, refers to the condition in which responsibility for the success of a group effort is distributed across all the members rather than being concentrated in the leader. Collective cognitive responsibility involves an added dimension. In modern enterprises there is usually a cognitive dimension in addition to the more tangible and practical aspects. This is obviously the case in research groups and other groups directly concerned with knowledge production, but it is also the case in enterprises where knowledge is subordinate to other goals. The members of an expert surgical team, for example, will ideally share responsibility not only for carrying out the surgical procedure; they also take collective responsibility for understanding what is happening, for staying cognitively on top of events as they unfold. In a well-functioning office, the staff will not only keep records and appointments in order and get required work out on time; they will also take responsibility for knowing what needs to be known and for insuring that others know what needs to be known. This is what is meant by collective cognitive responsibility.

In discussions with business people, I find that they instantly recognize cognitive responsibility as a problem, even though they have not previously thought of it in those terms. They recognize that their employees may be carrying out overt tasks with a high level of responsibility, but that things keep going wrong or projects deteriorate because problems are either not being recognized or are thought to be someone else's responsibility. The calendars, to-do lists, and project management software designed to keep people organized and on task provide little help in this regard. They may include cognitive items—"Decide...," "Look into...," "Plan..."—but these have the effect of limiting cognitive responsibility to particular people and of obscuring the continual living with problems and ideas that is part of the work life of an expert team. The irony is that in our so-called knowledge society, many people who are ostensibly doing knowledge work remain primarily engaged with material things, while the kind of knowledge processing that should be constantly going on in the background is slighted or left to management. Cognitive responsibility, it appears, is harder to maintain than responsibility for tangible outcomes.

考試科目	教育學(=)	所別	教育學(教育行政組)	考試時間	5月16日 第一節 星期六
<p>一、學校創新經營的推展，歐美先進國家行之有年，如美國的磁性學校(magnet school)、藍帶學校(blue ribbon school)、新美國高中(new American high school)和未來學校(school of the future)，英國的燈塔學校(beacon school)、專家學校(specialist school)和特色學校，德國的創意學校等等。臺灣，近八年來，有標竿學校、創新經營學校(InnoSchool)、優質學校(quality school)和特色學校的推展，也迭有成效。這些學校創新經營的內涵和策略為何？試擇一例說明之。(25分)</p> <p>二、教育領導理論，過去大致以「特質論」、「行為論」和「情境論」為範疇，1980年代之後，新的領導論如雨後春筍般出現。臺灣的教育領導，1994年教改大力推展之前較偏重「行政領導」(administrative leadership)，教改推展之後，「課程領導」(curriculum leadership)、「教學領導」(instructional leadership)等隨之而起，最近則有「空間領導」(space leadership)之述。試就所知，說明空間領導的要義，並要述空間領導的模式與策略。(25分)</p> <p>三、臺灣少子化問題日趨嚴重，根據行政院經濟建設委員會的推計，臺灣人口「出生數」，1986年為30.8萬人，2008年降為20.5萬人，未來將持續下降，至2056年，依中推計減少為13.2萬人，依高推計減少為16.2萬人，依低推計減少為9.4萬人。就學齡人口而言，6至11歲國小學童，2008年為167.8萬人，2018年減為122.6萬人，2028年再減為117.5萬人，2056年降至83.3萬人。12至17歲國中及高中青少年，2008年為192.6萬人，2018年減為135.6萬人，2028年再減為122.3萬人，2056年降至84.9萬人。18至21歲大學青年，2008年為128.4萬人，2018年減為117.2萬人，2028年再減為81.3萬人，2056年降至60.5萬人。即20年後，6至21歲學齡人口將面臨減少三成以上的情況。試問：面對少子化，初等教育、中等教育和高等教育有何值得關切的重大議題，請舉二例並說明其因應對策。(25分)</p> <p>四、全球永續發展的理念，促進了世界各國永續校園的發展，如澳洲的永續學校(sustainable school)，英國的生態學校(eco-school)，美國的健康學校(health school)、智能學校(smart school)、高成效學校(high performance school)和綠色學校(green school)，加拿大的種子學校(seeds)、日本的綠色學校(green school)，臺灣的永續校園等等，其中心概念大致以生態、節源、減廢、健康和教育為核心。試說明永續校園的規劃與設計，應注意之要點為何？(25分)</p>					
備	考 試 題 隨 卷 繳 交				

考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

一、解釋名詞並說明該方法的應用時機？(25%)

1. Analytic Hierarchy Process
2. Confirmatory Factor Analysis
3. Hierarchical Linear Model
4. Data Envelopment Analysis
5. Fuzzy Delphi

二、請根據美國心理協會(APA)寫作手冊第五版說明以下縮寫字與符號代表的意義(15%)

1. ns
2.  $\Delta$
3.  $\alpha$
4. LSD
5. d

三、中介變項與調節變項在量化研究中各有何檢驗方法？試申論之。15%

(背面還有試題)



考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

四、請閱讀以下取材於 2007 年 *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(1), 38-66.

的部分內容，並回答以下問題：

1. 簡要敘述 OCB 的定義及其向度? 10%
2. 本研究假設一~假設三為何? 並簡要敘述文獻探討與此三項假設的關係? 15%
3. 簡要敘述本研究結果內容。20%

#### OCB: Definition and Construct

OCB is defined in the study as discretionary behavior directed at individuals or at the organization as a whole, which goes beyond existing role expectations and benefits or is intended to benefit the organization (Organ, 1988). According to this definition, OCB refers to organizationally beneficial behaviors and gestures that can neither be enforced on the basis of formal role obligations nor elicited by a contractual guarantee of recompense. OCB consists of informal contributions that participants can choose to perform or withhold without regard to considerations of sanctions or formal incentives (Organ, 1990). Although most scholars agree on the multidimensionality of this construct, a review of the literature reveals a lack of consensus about its dimensionality. Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified almost 30 potentially different forms of OCB. However, they also asserted that the constructs greatly overlap, so they might be captured in five common dimensions: (a) *Altruism*, or helping behavior, which involves voluntarily helping others with an organizationally relevant task or problem, such as helping other teachers who have heavy workloads; (b) *Conscientiousness*, namely, going well beyond minimally required levels of attendance, punctuality, housekeeping, conserving resources, and related matters of internal maintenance, such as attending at work above the norm; (c) *Sportsmanship*, which reflects the employee's willingness to tolerate the inevitable inconveniences and impositions of work without complaining, such as not wasting time complaining about trivialities; (d) *Courtesy*, namely, behaviors aimed

考試科目	教育研究法(二)	所別	教育系(教育行政組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第二節
------	----------	----	------------	------	--------------	-----

at preventing work-related problems with others, such as not abusing the rights of others; and (e) *Civic virtue*, which reflects responsive, constructive involvement in the organization, such as keeping abreast of changes at school. Based on this typology, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, and Fetter (1990) developed a systematic and comprehensive measure of OCB, which was adopted in the study.

### Antecedents of OCB

Determining the reasons why individuals engage in OCBs has attracted a substantial amount of research attention in both organizational behavior and social psychology. Attempts to understand the correlates and causes of OCB frequently focus on individual characteristics. This literature implicitly assumes that people's personal characteristics and their reactions in and to the workplace influence the extent to which they will exceed the call of duty. However, recently scholars have argued that these behaviors might be further understood by an investigation of how they are embedded in different contexts, such as the work group, the department, or the organization (DiPaola & Hoy, 2005a, 2005b; DiPaola & Tschannen-Moran, 2001; George & Bettenhausen, 1990; Somech & Drach-Zahavy, 2004). Accordingly, we chose to examine the impact of the individual variables of affectivity and perceived superior's support and the organizational variable of individualism-collectivism.

### *The Relationship Between Individual Characteristics and OCB*

Based on a thorough review of the OCB literature, Podsakoff et al. (2000) identified two main categories of individual characteristics: employees' attitudes and dispositional variables. The employee attitudes category, which has been thoroughly treated in research, suggests an important relationship between OCB and satisfaction (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Lee & Allen, 2002), organizational commitment (VanYperen, Van den Berg, & Willering, 1999), perceptions of fairness (Folger, 1993; Moorman, Niehoff, & Organ, 1993), perceptions of organizational/supervisor support (Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann, & Birjulin, 1999), and intrinsic and extrinsic job attitudes (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Williams & Anderson, 1991). Examples of dispositional variables are affectivity (George, 1990), agreeableness (Konovsky & Organ, 1993), and conscientiousness (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Here we chose to examine the most frequently investigated antecedents of OCB, namely, perceived supervisor support (employee's attitude) and affectivity (a dispositional variable); to our knowledge, no study thus far addresses these connections in

(背面還有試題)



考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

schools. Furthermore, most research examines either attitudes or dispositional variables, but examining them simultaneously allowed us to learn about the relative impact of these variables on OCB in schools.

*Perceived supervisor support.* Employees develop general views concerning the degree to which supervisors appreciate their contributions and care about their well-being (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenberghe, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002). Perceived superior support is also valued as assurance that aid will be available from the supervisor when it is needed to carry out one's job effectively and to deal with stressful situations (Randall et al., 1999). Supportive supervisors are seen as taking pride in their employees, compensating them fairly, and looking after their needs (Eisenberger et al., 2002). Moreover, because supervisors act as agents of the organization, having responsibility for directing and evaluating subordinates' performance, employees view their supervisor's favorable or unfavorable orientation toward them as an indication that the organization favors or disfavors them. On the basis of social exchange principles and reciprocity norms (e.g., Blau, 1964), individuals will attempt to reciprocate those who benefit them. The notion of fairness underlies the norm of reciprocity in that people seek to balance their inputs and outcomes in relation to others (Flynn, 2003). According to Organ (1988), employees interpret fairness to mean that their supervisors can be trusted to protect their interests; this in turn engenders an obligation to repay their supervisors through "positive," beneficial actions. Accordingly, beneficial actions directed at employees by the organization and/or its representatives contribute to the formation of high-quality exchange relationships that oblige employees to reciprocate in positive, beneficial ways (e.g., Lambert, 2000). Several researchers (e.g., Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) have argued that OCB is especially suitable material for reciprocity because workers have much discretion in performing it, whereas traditional in-role behaviors are primarily a function of work processes and the worker's abilities (e.g., Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). The proposition that OCB is the currency of reciprocity is supported by research (Organ & Ryan, 1995; Schnake, 1991). For example, based on a meta-analysis of the literature, Podsakoff et al. (2000) indicated that perceptions of fairness, and perceived supervisor's support have significant relationships with OCB of roughly comparable strength (ranging from .21 to .31). In our case, we posited that high perceived supervisor's support should produce a felt obligation to care about the school's welfare and to help the school attain its objectives by exhibiting high frequency of OCBs:

*Hypothesis 1:* Perceived superior support will be positively related to OCB.

考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

*Affectivity*. Affectivity, or mood, is a personality structure that represents pervasive and generalized affective states (Clark & Isen, 1982; George, 1996). Evidence suggests considerable stability of this trait during periods as long as 30 years (Williams & Shiaw, 1999). Affectivity is not directed at a particular target but concerns the naturally occurring feeling states that people experience. For example, although some particular event may put an individual into a good mood, this is a generalized affective state that will influence reactions and actions concerning a variety of stimuli unrelated to the positive mood-inducing event. Factors analysis of measures of self-reported affectivity suggests two dimensions: positive affectivity and negative affectivity. The two may be independent and can have different patterns of correlation with other variables (Agho, Price, & Mueller, 1992). Positive affectivity is an individual's disposition to be happy across time and situations. Such individuals tend to feel active, excited, enthusiastic, and optimistic, as well as enjoy work-related activities (Watson, Pennebaker, & Folger, 1987). Negative affectivity is an individual's disposition to experience discomfort across time and situations. Persons scoring high in negative affectivity are more prone to feel anxiety, threat, irritation, frustration, and discomfort, even in the absence of objective stressors in the environment (Agho et al., 1992).

The conceptual basis for predicting a relationship between affectivity and OCB derives from the social psychology experiments (Rosenham, Salovey, Karylowski, & Hargis, 1981), which strongly affirm a connection between positive affectivity and OCB (e.g., Rosenham, Salovey, & Hargis, 1981). One explanation is that employees with positive affectivity may be more likely to perceive situations and other workers in a more positive light (George, 1996). This increased attraction to others and generally favorable outlook may predispose employees to exhibit behaviors that benefit organization members, enhance organizational outcomes, or both. In addition, positive affectivity may lead to increased social awareness, such that employees will be more willing to display prosocial behaviors and, hence, may exhibit OCB as a means of protecting or prolonging their positive emotional state (e.g., Isen & Baron, 1991; Williams & Shiaw, 1999).

Regarding the link between negative affectivity and OCB, studies generally, but not entirely consistently, demonstrate the converse of the conclusion above—that negative affectivity tends to suppress or inhibit altruistic or helping gestures (e.g., Agho et al., 1992). Individuals high in negative affectivity are generally more likely to have a negative view of themselves, others, and the world around them and to interpret ambiguous stimuli negatively. Such individuals tend to increase the psychological

(背面還有試題)



考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

distance between self and others and, hence, to decrease their willingness to exhibit helping and prosocial acts (George, 1990):

*Hypothesis 2:* Positive affectivity will be positively related to OCB, and negative affectivity will be negatively related to OCB.

### *The Relationship Between Organizational Characteristics and OCB*

Because individuals perform OCB, it is appropriate to seek its causes in teachers' personal characteristics. However, teachers who do or do not display OCB do not do so in a vacuum, and the organizational context most likely serves to encourage or discourage them (George & Jones, 1997). For example, George and Bettenhausen (1990) and Podsakoff and MacKenzie (1997) found that less highly formalized organizations created an atmosphere of group cohesiveness that encouraged employees to engage in OCB, whereas bureaucratically structured organizations created an environment of employees' alienation that inhibited OCB. In a similar manner, the study of DiPaola and Tschannen-Moran (2001), which was conducted in schools, reveals a positive link between an open and collegial climate and OCB in teachers. In this study, we focused on school culture, as an organizational variable, which represents the normative system of shared values and beliefs that shapes how organization members feel, think, and behave (Schein, 1990; Veiga, Lubatkin, Calori, & Very, 2000). However, recently scholars have argued that culture is not merely an organizational feature, but that organizational events serve as a context within which individuals perceive culture. Accordingly, employees' culture perception derives both from their perceptions of their environment and from the ways they cognitively assess it through schemas derived from work-related values (L. A. James & James, 1989). In this study, we chose to examine the impact of the major dimension of organizational culture—individualism-collectivism—on teachers' OCB.

*Individualism-Collectivism.* Many researchers have suggested that much of the complexity of culture can be modeled by assuming that cultures vary along a number of dimensions (Hofstede, 1980; Triandis, 1995), whereas theorists (Gerstner & Day, 1994; Triandis, 1995) have described individualism-collectivism as a major dimension of cultural variation. Individualism-collectivism is an analytical dimension that captures the relative importance people accord to personal interests and shared pursuits (Wagner, 1995). Individualistic cultures emphasize self-reliance, autonomy, control, and



考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

priority of personal goals, which may or may not be consistent with in-group goals. An individual feels proud of his or her own accomplishments and derives satisfaction from performance based on his or her own achievements. By contrast, in collective cultures people will subordinate their personal interests to the goals of their in-group. An individual belongs to only a few in-groups, and behavior within the group emphasizes goal attainment, cooperation, and group welfare and harmony. Thus, pleasure and satisfaction derive from group accomplishment (Lam, Chen, & Schaubroeck, 2002; Triandis, 1995). Thinking about the implications of these differences suggests that variations in individualism-collectivism should influence personal tendencies to engage in OCB. A collectivistic orientation is expressed in strong feelings of loyalty, reciprocity, and solidarity among members of the same group, and people in this culture experience greater in-group regulation of behavior and a heightened sense of duty to the in-group, as compared with individualistic members (Bontempo, Lobel, & Triandis, 1990). When teachers perceive their organizational culture as collectivistic, they may be expected to value collaboration; when they perceive their school as individualistic, they may value competition. Accordingly, helping colleagues will be encouraged by the former perception and discouraged by the latter, because valuing collectivism may enhance social responsibility values that endorse the spreading of goodwill, whereas individualism may be more inwardly focused (George & Jones, 1997). Accordingly, we hypothesized

*Hypothesis 3:* Collectivism will be positively related to OCB, and individualism will be negatively related to OCB.

Finally, our model allowed us to examine the relative contributions of personal (perceived superior support and affectivity) and organizational (individualism-collectivism) characteristics on promoting teachers' OCB in schools.

(背面還有試題)

考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

## RESULTS

The intercorrelation matrixes at both the individual and the aggregate levels for all key variables included in the analysis are presented in Table 1. According to the means of teachers' OCB shown in Table 1, the subscale that received the highest scores was Sportsmanship ( $M = 4.25$ ), followed by Civic Virtue ( $M = 4.01$ ), Altruism ( $M = 3.94$ ), and Courtesy ( $M = 3.93$ ). The lowest average score was ascribed to Conscientiousness ( $M = 3.52$ ). All the correlations among the five subscales were positive and significant, ranging from .55 to .78. No significant correlation was found between Negative Affectivity and Positive Affectivity ( $p > .05$ ), indicating that these two personality dimensions were not polar extremes of the same continuum but distinct, independent constructs.

To test the study hypotheses, we first conducted separate mixed linear models analyses to predict the impact of each independent variable (perceived superior support, affectivity, individualism-collectivism) on the overall OCB Scale, as well as on the five dimensions of OCB (altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship, and civic virtue). Next, for the relative impact of the individual characteristics versus organizational characteristics on teachers' OCB, we conducted mixed linear models analyses with all the independent variables that were significantly associated with OCB in predicting the overall OCB Scale, as well as the five dimensions of OCB.

Hypothesis 1 concerns the relationship between the individual characteristic of perceived superior support and teachers' OCB. As shown in Table 2, a positive and significant relationship was found between perceived superior support and the overall scale of OCB,  $t(95) = 2.65, p < .05$ , as well as positive and significant relationships between perceived superior support and four dimensions of OCB: altruism,  $t(99) = 2.31, p < .05$ ; conscientiousness,  $t(73) = 2.65, p < .05$ ; sportsmanship,  $t(95) = 2.05, p < .05$ ; and civic virtue,  $t(94) = 2.02, p < .05$ . No significant relation was found between perceived superior support and courtesy ( $p > .05$ ).

Hypothesis 2 concerns the relationship between the individual characteristic of affectivity and teachers' OCB (see Table 3). Regarding positive affectivity, no significant relationship was found between positive affectivity and OCB ( $p > .05$ ). Regarding negative affectivity, as expected, a negative and significant relationship was revealed between negative affectivity and the overall scale of OCB,  $t(97) = -2.34, p < .05$ , as well as negative and significant relationships between negative affectivity and four out of the five dimensions of OCB: altruism,  $t(95) = -2.70, p < .05$ ; conscientiousness,  $t(98) = -2.17, p < .05$ ; sportsmanship,  $t(98) = -2.55, p < .05$ ; and civic virtue,  $t(97) = -2.50, p < .05$ . No significant relation was found between negative affectivity and courtesy ( $p > .05$ ).



考 試 科 目	教育研究法(二)	所 別	教育系(教育行政組)	考 試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星期六	第 二 節
---------	----------	-----	------------	---------	-----------------	-------

TABLE 1  
Correlations Among All Measures Calculated at the Individual Level ( $n = 104$ ) and at the Organizational Level ( $n = 8$ )

	M (SD)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Organizational citizenship behavior	4.02 (.58)	1.00	.89***	.76**	.87***	.81***	.89***	-.24*	.10	.24*	.32**
2. Altruism	3.96 (.77)	.81**	1.00	.55***	.73***	.67***	.77***	-.04	.04	.14	.27*
3. Sportsmanship	4.25 (.60)	.79**	.58*	1.00	.60***	.55***	.55***	-.18*	.21*	.19*	.35**
4. Conscientiousness	3.95 (.67)	.64**	.39*	.17	1.00	.60***	.76***	-.05	.08	.21*	.20*
5. Courtesy	3.95 (.57)	.54*	.25	.69**	.38*	1.00	.68***	.03	.15	.28**	.29**
6. Civic Virtue	4.01 (.80)	.91**	.79**	.52*	.79**	.24	1.00	-.10	.06	.22**	.28**
7. Negative Affectivity	2.06 (.50)	-.36*	-.57*	-.02	-.34*	-.15	-.57*	1.00	-.19	.17	-.18
8. Positive Affectivity	3.75 (.59)	.19	.31*	.08	.18	.02	.30*	-.24	1.00	.20	.19
9. Perceived Superior Support	3.96 (.79)	.15	.13	.07	.11	.43*	.28*	-.12	.15	1.00	.17
10. Collectivism	3.97 (.73)	.29*	.07	.17	.18	.43*	.32*	-.15	.04	.16	1.00

NOTE: Individual-level correlations above the diagonal. Organizational-level correlations below the diagonal. Individual-level correlations computed by disaggregating school-level measures to each individual in the school; organizational-level correlations computed by aggregating individual measures within schools. Means and standard deviations are reported for the individual level.

\* $p < .05$ . \*\* $p < .01$ . \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

(背面還有試題)



考試科目	教育研究法(二)	所別	教育系(教育行政組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第二節
------	----------	----	------------	------	--------------	-----

**TABLE 2**  
Results of Mixed Models Analyses, Testing the Effect of Perceived Superior Support on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Dependent Variable	Variable					
	Random Effect: School Level			Predictor: Perceived Superior Support		
	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value
OCB	.06	.09	.76	.21	.08	2.65*
Altruism	.06	.07	.71	.24	.10	2.31*
Conscientiousness	.07	.09	.77	.25	.09	2.65*
Courtesy	.06	.07	.77	.09	.07	.77
Sportsmanship	.08	.07	.73	.19	.09	2.05*
Civic virtue	.05	.09	.73	.23	.11	2.02*

\* $p < .05$ .

**TABLE 3**  
Results of Mixed Models Analyses, Testing the Effect of Affectivity on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable											
	Random Effect: School Level			Predictor: Positive Affectivity			Random Effect: School Level			Predictor: Negative Affectivity		
	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value
OCB	.07	.09	.32	.04	.12	.32	.04	.06	.29	-.28	.12	-2.34*
Altruism	.05	.09	.43	.17	.15	1.13	.04	.06	.27	-.41	.15	-2.70*
Conscientiousness	.04	.08	.34	.04	.13	.34	.04	.08	.31	-.12	.15	-2.17*
Courtesy	.03	.09	.32	.02	.11	.18	.06	.06	.29	-.14	.11	-1.19
Sportsmanship	.03	.09	.32	.03	.12	.29	.03	.07	.33	-.33	.13	-2.55*
Civic virtue	.03	.06	.37	.08	.16	.49	.04	.07	.36	-.42	.17	-2.50*

\* $p < .05$ .

Hypothesis 3 concerns the relationship between the organizational characteristic of individualism-collectivism and teachers' OCB. Table 4 shows positive and significant relationship between collectivism and the overall scale of OCB,  $t(55) = 2.10, p < .05$ , as well as positive and significant relationships between collectivism and four out of the five dimensions of OCB:

考試科目	教育研究法(二)	所別	教育系(教育行政組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第二節
------	----------	----	------------	------	--------------	-----

TABLE 4  
Results of Mixed Models Analyses, Testing the Effect of Collectivism  
on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Dependent Variable	Variable					
	Random Effect: School Level			Predictor: Collectivism		
	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value
OCB	.07	.06	.72	.28	.13	2.10*
Altruism	.07	.07	.71	.40	.18	2.19*
Conscientiousness	.07	.07	.72	.30	.14	2.18*
Courtesy	.08	.06	.74	.08	.14	.59
Sportsmanship	.06	.07	.69	.32	.13	2.44*
Civic virtue	.06	.07	.70	.38	.18	2.10*

\* $p < .05$ .

altruism,  $t(85) = 2.19, p < .05$ ; conscientiousness,  $t(97) = 2.18, p < .05$ ; sportsmanship,  $t(27) = 2.44, p < .05$ ; and civic virtue,  $t(57) = 2.10, p < .05$ . No significant relation was found between collectivism and courtesy ( $p > .05$ ).

Finally, to test the relative impact of individual characteristics and organizational characteristics on teachers' OCB, we conducted mixed linear models analysis with all the variables that were found, in the study, to be significantly associated with teachers' OCB: negative affectivity, perceived superior support, and individualism-collectivism. As shown in Table 5, the results indicate that the overall OCB Scale was positively and significantly related only to the organizational characteristic of individualism-collectivism,  $t(60) = 2.28, p < .05$ . No significant relations were found between the overall OCB Scale and the individual characteristics of perceived superior support and negative affectivity ( $p > .05$ ). Regarding the relationship between the five dimensions of OCB and the study variables, positive and significant relations were found between collectivism and four of the dimensions: altruism,  $t(60) = 2.28, p < .05$ ; conscientiousness,  $t(91) = 2.18, p < .05$ ; sportsmanship,  $t(47) = 2.46, p < .05$ ; and civic virtue,  $t(50) = 2.62, p < .05$ . Regarding perceived superior support, positive and significant relations appeared between perceived superior support and two of the dimensions: conscientiousness,  $t(98) = 2.57, p < .05$ , and courtesy,  $t(94) = 2.07, p < .05$ . No significant relations were found between negative affectivity and the five dimensions of OCB.

(前面還有試題)

考試科目	教育研究法(二)	所別	教育系(教育行政組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第二節
------	----------	----	------------	------	--------------	-----

TABLE 5  
Results of Mixed Models Analyses, Testing the Relative Effects of Individual and Organizational Characteristics on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB)

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable																	
	Random effect: School Level			Predictor: POS			Random Effect: School Level			Predictor: NA			Random Effect: School Level			Predictor: Collectivism		
	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value	b	SE	t Value
OCB	.06	.08	.61	.05	.08	.64	.08	.06	.43	-.05	.10	-.50	.07	.09	.69	.28	.12	2.28*
Altruism	.06	.08	.53	.03	.11	.23	.06	.09	.53	-.11	.14	-.79	.06	.08	.63	.38	.17	2.18*
Conscientiousness	.06	.06	.61	.19	.08	2.57*	.06	.06	.52	-.11	.12	-.43	.06	.09	.67	.23	.12	2.14*
Courtesy	.05	.07	.62	.22	.11	2.07*	.06	.05	.60	-.25	.14	-.36	.08	.07	.70	.17	.14	1.17
Sportsmanship	.06	.06	.44	.03	.09	.30	.08	.06	.56	-.25	.13	-2.00	.07	.07	.66	.33	.13	2.46*
Civic virtue	.04	.09	.42	.02	.11	.16	.07	.07	.47	.02	.14	-.42	.07	.07	.69	.42	.16	2.62*

NOTE: POS = Perceived superior support; NA = Negative affectivity.  
\* $p < .05$ .



考試科目	英文	所別	教育系	教育博組 教育行政組 教育心理輔導組	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第3節
------	----	----	-----	--------------------------	------	--------------	-----

The following article is excerpted from a journal paper. Please answer the following questions in English according to the article. Thank you!

1. Please summarize the article (your summary must be no more than 150 words). (33%)
2. What are the main themes or issues the article tries to convey (no more than 100 words)? (33%)
3. What are your comments about this article (no more than 200 words)? (34%)

If there is any consensus about what education in a knowledge society should be like, it is to be found in a cluster of terms that pervade the oral and printed discourse on this issue—including especially the ‘futuristic business literature’ that Bereiter cites in his target article: lifelong learning, flexibility, creativity, higher-order thinking skills, collaboration, distributed expertise, learning organizations, innovation, technological literacy. At times these appear to be empty buzzwords, but they may also be thought of as attempts to give expression to a central intuition that has yet to be formulated in terms that are clear enough to be very useful in generating designs and policies. In this chapter I attempt to extract a main idea from these vague terms and show how it can be applied to generate a kind of education that really does address new challenges in a new way.

A central idea is collective cognitive responsibility. Although this concept does not capture everything suggested in the foregoing list of terms, it captures much that they have in common and something more. Let us first expand upon the idea in the context of adult work and then apply it in the context of education.

Expert medical teams, flight crews, and sports teams have begun to serve as models for the kinds of groups that are expected to carry on much of the higher-level work in knowledge-based enterprises. Expert teams exhibit continual learning, flexibility, good thinking, and collaboration; but they also exhibit other characteristics of a more distinctive nature. Although each member of the team may have particular expertise and particular duties, the team members are also able to take over for one another on a moment-to-moment basis. This provides a flexibility that enables the group effort to succeed despite unexpected complications. Along with the capability is a commitment on the part of each member to do whatever is necessary to make the team effort succeed. Expert teams have been around for a long time. The whaling crews that Melville described in *Moby Dick* exemplify what I have been

(背面還有試題)

備	考試	題	隨	卷	繳	交
---	----	---	---	---	---	---

考 試 科 目	英 文	所 別	教 育 學	教育哲學組 教育行政組 教育心理與輔導組	試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星 期 六	第 3 節
---------	-----	-----	-------	----------------------------	-------	-------------------	-------

describing. And, of course, expert sports teams exhibit just the combination of distinctive roles and skills on one hand and resourceful cooperation on the other that go to make up collective responsibility. What is new is that expert teams are becoming the paradigms for working groups of all kinds, replacing the bureaucratic and assembly line paradigms, in which roles are fixed and the way to handle the unexpected is to refer it to a higher level in the organization.

Collective responsibility, then, refers to the condition in which responsibility for the success of a group effort is distributed across all the members rather than being concentrated in the leader. Collective cognitive responsibility involves an added dimension. In modern enterprises there is usually a cognitive dimension in addition to the more tangible and practical aspects. This is obviously the case in research groups and other groups directly concerned with knowledge production, but it is also the case in enterprises where knowledge is subordinate to other goals. The members of an expert surgical team, for example, will ideally share responsibility not only for carrying out the surgical procedure; they also take collective responsibility for understanding what is happening, for staying cognitively on top of events as they unfold. In a well-functioning office, the staff will not only keep records and appointments in order and get required work out on time; they will also take responsibility for knowing what needs to be known and for insuring that others know what needs to be known. This is what is meant by collective cognitive responsibility.

In discussions with business people, I find that they instantly recognize cognitive responsibility as a problem, even though they have not previously thought of it in those terms. They recognize that their employees may be carrying out overt tasks with a high level of responsibility, but that things keep going wrong or projects deteriorate because problems are either not being recognized or are thought to be someone else's responsibility. The calendars, to-do lists, and project management software designed to keep people organized and on task provide little help in this regard. They may include cognitive items—"Decide...," "Look into...," "Plan..."—but these have the effect of limiting cognitive responsibility to particular people and of obscuring the continual living with problems and ideas that is part of the work life of an expert team. The irony is that in our so-called knowledge society, many people who are ostensibly doing knowledge work remain primarily engaged with material things, while the kind of knowledge processing that should be constantly going on in the background is slighted or left to management. Cognitive responsibility, it appears, is harder to maintain than responsibility for tangible outcomes.



考試科目	教育學(三)	所別	教育學 教育心理與輔導組	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第一節
------	--------	----	-----------------	------	--------------	-----

一、對於那些因家庭失功能而導致行為偏差或中輟的個案，為提昇輔導成效，要掌握的重點為何？試說明之。25%

二、試從生態理論觀點，剖析那些顯現出學習落後或擾亂上課秩序學生行為的源由，並提出積極有效的輔導策略。25%

三、請從「特定領域 vs. 不限領域」(domain-specific vs. domain-general) 的觀點討論：(一) 皮亞傑所謂的發展階段；(二) 教學方法/策略；(三) 學習動機；(四) 創造思考；(五) 批判思考。25%

四、請對照分析生手教師 (novice teacher) 與專家教師 (expert teacher) 之間的差異。25%

考試科目	教育研究法	所別	教育	考試時間	5月16日	星期	天	第 2 節
------	-------	----	----	------	-------	----	---	-------

(三)

(教育心理輔導組)

作答說明：一律作答，不必抄題，每大題 25 分。

一、請根據下列報表數據，回答一系列的問題？(25分)

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.238	.282	8

Item-Total Statistics

Item Content	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Ill Enough to Go to a Doctor	13.69	.365	.125	.025	.217
Counselling for Mental Problems	13.19	.591	.117	.053	.200
Infertility, Unable to Have a Baby	13.17	.632	.081	.022	.222
Drinking Problem	13.15	.643	.131	.075	.210
Illegal Drugs (Marijuana, Cocaine)	13.16	.641	.065	.031	.229
Partner (Husband, Wife) In Hospital	13.21	.602	.044	.020	.243
Child in Hospital	13.21	.563	.131	.040	.187
Child on Drugs, Drinking Problem	13.16	.630	.120	.033	.208

- 問題：
1. 本報表是在進行什麼統計方法的分析？(5分)
  2. 本報表告訴研究者什麼訊息？(10分)
  3. 根據此報表的涵義，你會採取什麼決策或行動措施？(10分)

(背面還有試題)



考試科目	教育研究法 (三)	所別	教育 (教育心理與輔導組)	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第 2 節
------	--------------	----	------------------	------	--------------	-------

二、在教育學門的研究中，研究者常使用 z 考驗 (z-test) 和 t 考驗 (t-test) 作為一般的統計顯著性考驗方法。試問：z 考驗和 t 考驗在使用上，有何異同？他們各有何優勢和限制之處？(25 分)

三、質性研究法 (qualitative method) 在教育心理與輔導領域的研究裡，近年來，逐漸受到教育學者們的青睞，其原因之一是：已有諸多電腦軟體程式出版，可供使用者來分析「質化資料」的緣故。試問：請列舉一種質性研究法常用的電腦程式名稱？除簡述其功能和限制外，並說明該程式的大概使用步驟？(25 分)

四、何謂「經驗抽樣方法」(experience sampling method)？請敘述什麼樣的研究主題或研究領域，才會使用到這種方法？請列舉一個研究題目為例子或學者專家名字為例子說明之。(25 分)



考試科目	英文	所別	教育系	教育行政組 教育心理輔導組	考試時間	5月16日 星期六	第3節
------	----	----	-----	------------------	------	--------------	-----

The following article is excerpted from a journal paper. Please answer the following questions in English according to the article. Thank you!

1. Please summarize the article (your summary must be no more than 150 words). (33%)
2. What are the main themes or issues the article tries to convey (no more than 100 words)? (33%)
3. What are your comments about this article (no more than 200 words)? (34%)

If there is any consensus about what education in a knowledge society should be like, it is to be found in a cluster of terms that pervade the oral and printed discourse on this issue—including especially the ‘futuristic business literature’ that Bereiter cites in his target article: lifelong learning, flexibility, creativity, higher-order thinking skills, collaboration, distributed expertise, learning organizations, innovation, technological literacy. At times these appear to be empty buzzwords, but they may also be thought of as attempts to give expression to a central intuition that has yet to be formulated in terms that are clear enough to be very useful in generating designs and policies. In this chapter I attempt to extract a main idea from these vague terms and show how it can be applied to generate a kind of education that really does address new challenges in a new way.

A central idea is collective cognitive responsibility. Although this concept does not capture everything suggested in the foregoing list of terms, it captures much that they have in common and something more. Let us first expand upon the idea in the context of adult work and then apply it in the context of education.

Expert medical teams, flight crews, and sports teams have begun to serve as models for the kinds of groups that are expected to carry on much of the higher-level work in knowledge-based enterprises. Expert teams exhibit continual learning, flexibility, good thinking, and collaboration; but they also exhibit other characteristics of a more distinctive nature. Although each member of the team may have particular expertise and particular duties, the team members are also able to take over for one another on a moment-to-moment basis. This provides a flexibility that enables the group effort to succeed despite unexpected complications. Along with the capability is a commitment on the part of each member to do whatever is necessary to make the team effort succeed. Expert teams have been around for a long time. The whaling crews that Melville described in Moby Dick exemplify what I have been

(背面還有試題)

備	考試	題	隨	卷	繳	交
---	----	---	---	---	---	---



考 試 科 目	英 文	所 別	教 育 學	教育哲學組 教育行政組 教育心理與輔導組	試 時 間	5 月 16 日 星 期 六	第 3 節
---------	-----	-----	-------	----------------------------	-------	-------------------	-------

describing. And, of course, expert sports teams exhibit just the combination of distinctive roles and skills on one hand and resourceful cooperation on the other that go to make up collective responsibility. What is new is that expert teams are becoming the paradigms for working groups of all kinds, replacing the bureaucratic and assembly line paradigms, in which roles are fixed and the way to handle the unexpected is to refer it to a higher level in the organization.

Collective responsibility, then, refers to the condition in which responsibility for the success of a group effort is distributed across all the members rather than being concentrated in the leader. Collective cognitive responsibility involves an added dimension. In modern enterprises there is usually a cognitive dimension in addition to the more tangible and practical aspects. This is obviously the case in research groups and other groups directly concerned with knowledge production, but it is also the case in enterprises where knowledge is subordinate to other goals. The members of an expert surgical team, for example, will ideally share responsibility not only for carrying out the surgical procedure; they also take collective responsibility for understanding what is happening, for staying cognitively on top of events as they unfold. In a well-functioning office, the staff will not only keep records and appointments in order and get required work out on time; they will also take responsibility for knowing what needs to be known and for insuring that others know what needs to be known. This is what is meant by collective cognitive responsibility.

In discussions with business people, I find that they instantly recognize cognitive responsibility as a problem, even though they have not previously thought of it in those terms. They recognize that their employees may be carrying out overt tasks with a high level of responsibility, but that things keep going wrong or projects deteriorate because problems are either not being recognized or are thought to be someone else's responsibility. The calendars, to-do lists, and project management software designed to keep people organized and on task provide little help in this regard. They may include cognitive items—"Decide...," "Look into...," "Plan..."—but these have the effect of limiting cognitive responsibility to particular people and of obscuring the continual living with problems and ideas that is part of the work life of an expert team. The irony is that in our so-called knowledge society, many people who are ostensibly doing knowledge work remain primarily engaged with material things, while the kind of knowledge processing that should be constantly going on in the background is slighted or left to management. Cognitive responsibility, it appears, is harder to maintain than responsibility for tangible outcomes.