

國立臺北教育大學 99 學年度博士班招生入學考試

課程與教學研究所博士班 課程與教學專業英文 科試題

一、閱讀下文後，請組織並陳述作者的主要論點，然後以台灣的教育情境評論作者的看法。(40 分)

A common underpinning for definitions of leadership is the exercise of influence over others' practices (Christie and Lingard 2001, Lingard et al. 2003, Seers et al. 2003), where a leader may be defined as 'any person who influences individuals and groups within an organization, helps them in the establishment of goals, and guides them toward achievement of those goals, thereby allowing them to be effective' (Nahavandi, in Sather 1999: 512). Therefore, just as a teacher can be a leader if his or her practices encourage colleagues to improve their educational practices, students might also be considered leaders if they create opportunities for peers and teachers to improve their practices.

Recent reviews of the educational leadership literature have identified tensions between transactional and transformational leadership approaches (e.g. Busher et al. 2000, Christie and Lingard 2001, Hopkins 2003). In stable school contexts, transactional leadership practices are likely to be employed by designated leaders to manage school systems and structures. In contrast, transformational leadership is more congruent with cultural change where the focus is on 'the people involved, their relationships' and the transformation of 'feelings, attitudes and beliefs' (Hopkins 2003: 56). This implies a leadership style that empowers faculty, fosters collegiality, and shapes a shared vision (Busher and Harris 1999). In contrast to individual-centred approaches to leadership, a distributed perspective views leadership as complex, fluid, and emergent; involving tasks and practices stretched over personnel and other resources within a field or organization (Spillane et al. 2001, 2004). A field can be a spatial/temporal setting like a school or an academy that is characterized by the enactment of particular culture (Swartz 1997). Distributed leadership is generated from the interactions and dynamics within a field because leadership is not embodied in a designated leader (Harris 2003). However, decentring the prominence of individual designated leaders does not diminish the significance of organizational leadership roles. Designated leaders will continue to be responsible for such important roles as vision building, creating networks and structures to support the work of others, and negotiating boundaries (Lingard et al. 2003).

二、請仔細閱讀下列文獻後進行下面三件事情：

(一)用 50 個字以內的英文寫出其中心意旨(20 分)

(二)用 100 字以內的中文寫出其中心意旨(20 分)

(三)簡要寫出你對該篇論文的評述(20 分)

Sociological work on the school curriculum, and knowledge more generally, is usually dated to the early 1970s, and the New Sociology of Education (Young 1971; Moore and Muller 1999) although, as Burgess (1986: 202) has indicated, this view ‘overlooks the earlier interventions that were made by sociologists and other commentators’. What Young and his colleagues (see especially Esland 1971; Bernstein 1971) did at the beginning of the 1970s was to place knowledge and the curriculum as central to the processes and project of education. The theorists and educationalists associated with this new sociology of education made explicit the relationships between (educational) knowledge, social control and cultural reproduction. They raised questions about knowledge and the curriculum, and considered the mechanisms by which knowledge is selected, classified and transmitted within the education system, and how this in turn reflects social control and the distribution of power (Bernstein 1971).

This approach has since given rise to, and been subsumed by, complementary strategies of knowledge analysis. Knowledge relations have also been revealed as gender relations and race relations (Cody *et al.* 1993; Weiner 1994; Fordham 1996; Paechter 1998; Coffey and Delamont 2000). Postmodernist and post-structuralist approaches have consolidated these perspectives, disrupting the claims to universal knowledges based on scientific truths, relating knowledge to issues of power and agency, and utilizing the concepts of discourse and discursive practices in the construction and production of knowledge (cf. Foucault 1974, 1982). This recognizes that individuals are active in engaging in discourses through which they in turn are shaped (Weiner 1994), and that discourse(s), knowledge and power are intertwined:

In other words we are already subjects and our everyday lives, socially, culturally and institutionally are made up of webs, spirals, waves of discourses which are fluid and shifting, which compete or co-exist and which are always related through these webs. The positioning of an individual with regard to these competing discourses is discursive; that is, individuals can be placed with reference to a number of discourses and be situated in a number of ways.

(Haw 1998: 25)

Hence there are long-standing and contemporary debates over the kinds of knowledge legitimated by/through formal education, and the balance of control over these knowledges. Theoretical perspectives on the sociology of the curriculum have been concerned with exploring the ways in which curriculum content, pedagogical style, and latterly the discursive practices of the curriculum (Bernstein 1990; Haw 1998), contribute to the processes of social, cultural and economic reproduction (Bourdieu and Passerson 1997; Apple 1982). This has involved a consideration of the ways in which knowledge is hierarchically organized, how it is transmitted, to whom and when. Some knowledge domains have been seen as superordinate in relation to others (Bourdieu 1993). Paechter (1998: 64) locates this within what she describes as the 'hegemony of reason and rational thought', arguing that the knowledge that is taught in schools is reasoned or decontextualized knowledge. Paechter maintains that it is decontextualizes knowledge that is valued in educational arenas, and that this takes precedence over other kinds of knowledge. Utilizing the concept of 'situated knowledge', Stanley and Wise (1993) locate knowledge within social and cultural contexts. Following Paechter's argument, normal educational arenas do not legitimate knowledge located in everyday practices and contexts. Hence 'contextualized' knowledge, emotional knowledge, 'non-rational' knowledge are negatively framed in formal curriculum discourse. Of course, sociologists and educationalists have long acknowledged the ways in which the everyday practices of school and classroom life contribute to learning, and the ways in which this is distinct from the formal curriculum. This has often been referred to as the hidden or para-curriculum of schooling (Burgess 1986; Measor and Sikes 1992). Feminist commentators, in particular, have acknowledged the situatedness and social positioning of all knowledge claims, and have located knowledge within political processes of certification, superordination and subordination. Weiner (1994: 99), for example, writes of the dominant discourse of knowledge; 'the knowledge that is produced as truth is the knowledge that is linked to the system which produces and sustains it'. Weiner shows how power relationships and subjectivities are reconstituted through discursive practices, arguing that

The curriculum is central to the production and maintenance of any political and social regime. Curriculum is also heavily implicated in the production of regulative understandings: it is as much concerned about what it means to be an intelligent pupil, a loyal worker or the good mother as about the legitimization of certain forms of knowledge.

(Weiner 1994: 100)