

# 國立臺北教育大學 103 學年度博士班招生入學考試

## 課程與教學傳播科技研究所博士班 課程與教學理論 科試題

一、課程理論歷經幾次典範轉移，請問從以下三位學者的提問，顯現其對於課程研究的關注重點有何差異？因為關注問題的差異，而導致怎樣不同的課程理論發展？(25 分)

Spencer：何種知識最有價值？

M. Apple：誰的知識最有價值？

T. Popkewitze：最有價值的知識如何可能？

二、心理學者 Bruner 認為科學並不獨立存在於自然界中，不論對學生或教師而言，均是一種心靈的工具，提出科學的敘事(narratives of science)，請闡述敘事在教學上的意涵。(25 分)

三、請解釋以下這段敘述的意義(10 分)，並據以說明你在台灣觀察到哪些文中所描述的現象或問題(15 分)。

Intensification “represents one of the most tangible ways in which the work privileges of educational workers are eroded.” It has many symptoms, from the trivial to the more complex—ranging from being allowed no time at all even to go to the bathroom, have a cup of coffee or relax, to having a total absence of time to keep up with one’s field. We can see intensification most visibly in mental labor in the chronic sense of work overload that has escalated over time....It is also part of a dynamic of intellectual de-skilling in which mental workers are cut off from their own fields and again must rely even more heavily on ideas and processes provided by “experts”. While these effects are important, one of the most significant impacts of intensification may be in reducing the quality, not the quantity, of service provided to people.... As I shall document, a number of these aspects of intensification are increasingly found in teaching, especially in those schools which are dominated by behaviorally prespecified curricula, repeated testing, and strict and reductive accountability systems.

四、請閱讀下文並作答：(1)以英文摘要大意(2)闡述美學在課程研究及實踐的意義及特性（中英文均可）。(25 分)

The difference between aesthetic and traditional research modes is in their relationship to means-end thinking. The causal relationships sought by traditional research efforts are replicable, generalizable, and verifiable; traditional research seeks rules of cause and effect, rules that enable us to understand, predict, and ultimately control events.... Aesthetic inquiry, like art criticism, serves an evaluative purpose by enabling us to see why we react as we do. In this sense it illuminates in ways that may help us to make practical decisions about the curriculum—we may elect not to change the cheerful tone of a textbook if it seems that that tone governs children’s positive response to it. But we are not able to generalize from one piece of aesthetic inquiry about a curriculum to other curricula.... Aesthetic inquiry does not partake of the means-ends thinking that governs the search for causality in traditional research. It rarely helps us to predict our reactions to other curricular events, focusing instead of the particular. It is partly this abstention from seeking generalizable rules that contributes to its maverick identity within educational research circles.

A number principles clarify the analogy between the work of art and a set of curriculum materials and as such strengthen the case for applying art-criticism techniques to curriculum decisions...The principles describing a curriculum as an artifact analogous to a work of art include these:

1. Both a curriculum and a work of art are products of human construction; they are “artifactual.”
2. Both are means of communication between the originators (developer or artist) and an audience (students of museum-goers).
3. Both are transformations of the knowledge of the originator into a form that is accessible to the audience.... , and the curriculum can be seen as a transformation of a content expert’s knowledge into a form accessible to young children.
4. Both are the products of a problem-solving process. Ecker’s (1963)description of artistic work as a series of meeting and resolving problems of form and expression has a clear parallel in the kinds of deliberations engaged in by curriculumists.
5. Both depend for their meaning on an encounter with an audience: both provide situations in which the audience’s response is invited and demanded.
6. Both provide sets of “brackets” or boundaries to the audience’s experience: both curricula and works of art present selections from the total realm of experience, shaped in a way that structure the viewer’s perceptions. Both do this deliberately.
7. When they succeed in capturing the attention of an audience, both can

- provide strong reactions. Neither is often received neutrally.
8. Both can be placed within a tradition of history and style change; both are partners in an ongoing development of style and a cumulation of tradition. Any curriculum or work of art can be superseded in style by something more “modern” or more “innovative.”
  9. Both invite criticism and assessment.

註：本文摘自 Vallance, E. (1991). *Aesthetic Inquiry: Art Criticism*. In E. C. Short (ed.) *Forms of curriculum inquiry* (pp.155-172). Albany: State University of New York Press.