國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題 第2節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 1 頁

一、英譯中（30%）

The term "achievement gap" has taken on particular and important meanings in the past decade. "The achievement gap" has become a shorthand way to refer to differences in academic achievement between European Americans and members of minority groups who historically have been disenfranchised. For some, the gap refers exclusively to differences between African Americans and European Americans. For others, it refers to a broader group of students: those who aren't facile in English, the poor, or members of other disadvantaged ethnic groups.

Regardless of who is included in one's definition, the literature abounds with descriptions of gaps in student performance on test scores, which are probably the most commonly used indicators of student achievement (Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Lee, 2000; Kober, 2001). Additional evidence of a gap has been found in data related to other indicators of achievement, such as grades, dropout rates, college attendance or earnings. (Portes, 1996; Ferguson, 2001; Kane, 1998; Vars & Bowen, 1998; Johnson & Neal, 1998; Roderick & Cambrun, 1999) National organizations of schools dedicated to closing the gap, such as the Minority Student Achievement Network, have been formed to address this phenomenon. The benchmark against which minority achievement is measured is White/European-American performance, and closing the gap usually means increasing minority achievement relative to that of White/European Americans.

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題 **第 2 節**

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 2 頁

二、請寫出英文摘要與中文評論（35%）

Pedagogy and sociology
Émile Durkheim

I regard as the prime postulate of all pedagogical speculation that education is an eminently social thing in its origins as in its functions, and that, therefore, pedagogy depends on sociology more closely than on any other science. And since this idea will dominate all my teaching, as it already dominated the similar instruction that I formerly gave at another university, it seemed to me appropriate to use this first lecture to set it forth specifically in order that you might be better able to follow its ultimate applications. There can be no question of demonstrating it explicitly in the course of only a single lecture. A principle so general, the implications of which are so extensive, can be verified only progressively, successively as one gets into detailed facts and as one sees how it is applied to them. But what is possible now is to give you an overview of the whole; to indicate to you the principal reasons for its acceptance from the first step of the inquiry, even if only provisionally and subject to the necessary verification; finally, to mark out its scope as well as its limits—and this will be the object of this first lecture.

It is all the more necessary immediately to call your attention to this fundamental axiom because it is not very generally known. Until recently—and there are still exceptions—modern pedagogues agreed almost unanimously that education is an eminently individual thing, and, consequently, on making of pedagogy an immediate and direct corollary of psychology alone. For Kant as for Mill, for Herbart as for Spencer, the object of education would be above all to realize, in each individual, but carrying them to their highest possible point of perfection, the attributes distinctive of the human species in general. They stated as a truism that there is one education and one alone, which, to the exclusion of any other, is suitable for all men indiscriminately, whatever may be the historical

and social conditions on which they depend—and it is this abstract and unique ideal that the theorists of education propose to determine. They assumed that there is *one* human nature, the forms and properties of which are determinable once and for all, and the pedagogical problem consisted of investigating how the educational influence should be exercised on human nature so defined. No doubt, no one has ever thought that man is, at the outset, as soon as he enters life, all that he can and should be. It is quite clear that the human being is formed only progressively in the course of a slow growth which begins at birth and is completed only at maturity. But they supposed that this growth is only a realization of potentialities and only brings to light the latent energies which existed, fully formed, in the physical and mental organism of the child. The educator, then, would have nothing essential to add to the work of nature. He would create nothing new. His role would be limited to preventing these existing potentialities from becoming atrophied through disuse, or from deviating from their normal direction, or from developing too slowly. Therefore, conditions of time and place, the state of the social milieu, lose all interest for pedagogy. Since man carries in himself all the potentialities of his development, it is he and he alone who must be observed when one undertakes to determine in what direction and in what manner this development should be guided. What is important is to know what his native faculties are and what their nature is. Now, the science which has as its object the description and explanation of the individual man is psychology. It seems, then, that it should suffice for all the needs of the pedagogue.

In sum, education, far from having as its unique or principal object the individual and his interests, is above all the means by which society perpetually recreates the conditions of its very existence. Can society survive only if there exists among its members a

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題 第2節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 **10** 頁
第 **3** 頁

92 *Émile Durkheim*

sufficient homogeneity? Education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in advance, in the mind of the child, the essential similarities that collective life presupposes. But, on the other hand, without a certain diversity, would all co-operation be impossible? Education assures the persistence of this necessary diversity by becoming itself diversified and by specializing. It consists, then, in one or another of its aspects, of a systematic socialization of the young generation. In each of us, it may be said, there exist two beings which, while inseparable except by abstraction, remain distinct. One is made up of all the mental states which apply only to ourselves and to the events of our personal lives. This is what might be called the individual being. The other is a system of ideas, sentiments, and practices which express in us, not our personality, but the group or different groups of which we are part; these are religious beliefs, moral beliefs and practices, national or occupational traditions, collective opinions of every kind. Their totality forms the social being. To constitute this being in each of us is the end of education.

It is here, moreover, that are best shown the importance of its role and the fruitfulness of its influence. Indeed, not only is this social being not given, fully formed, in the primitive constitution of man, but it has not resulted from it through a spontaneous development. Spontaneously, man was not inclined to submit to a political authority, to respect a moral discipline, to dedicate himself, to be self-sacrificing. There was nothing in our congenital nature that predisposed us to become servants of divinities, symbolic emblems of the society, to render them worship, to deprive ourselves in order to do them honor. It is society itself which, to the degree that it is firmly established, has drawn from within itself those great moral forces before which man has felt his inferiority. Now, if one leaves aside the vague and indefinite tendencies which can be attributed to heredity, the child, on entering into life, brings to it only his nature as an individual. Society finds itself, so to speak, with each new generation, faced with a *tabula rasa*, very nearly, on which it must build anew. To the egoistic and asocial being that has just been born it must, as rapidly as possible, add another, capable of leading a social and moral life. Such is the work of education, and you can readily see its great importance. It is not limited to developing the individual organism in the direction indicated by nature, to eliciting the hidden potentialities which need only be manifested. It creates in man a new man, and this man is made up of all the best in us, of all that gives value and dignity to life. This creative quality is, moreover, a special prerogative of human education. Anything else is what animals receive, if one can apply this name to the progressive training to which they are subjected by their parents. It can, indeed, foster the development of certain instincts that lie dormant in the animal; but such training does not initiate it into a new life. It facilitates the play of natural functions; but it creates nothing. Taught by its mother, the young animal learns more quickly how to fly or build its nest; but it learns almost nothing from its parents that it would not have been able to discover through its own individual experience. This is because animals either do not live under social conditions, or form rather simple societies which function through instinctive mechanisms that each individual carries within himself, fully formed, from birth. Education, then, can add nothing essential to nature, since the latter is adequate for everything, for the life of the group as well as that of the individual. By contrast, among men the aptitudes of every kind that social life presupposes are much too complex to be able to be contained, somehow, in our tissues, to take the form of organic predispositions. It follows that they cannot be transmitted from one generation to another by way of heredity. It is through education that the transmission is effected.

A ceremony found in many societies clearly demonstrates this distinctive feature of human education and shows, too, that man was aware of it very early. It is the initiation ceremony. It takes place when education is completed; generally, too, it brings to a close a last period in which the elders conclude the instruction of the young man by revealing to him the most fundamental beliefs and the most sacred rites of the tribe. Once this is accomplished, the person who has undergone it takes his place in the society; he leaves the women, among whom he had passed his whole childhood; henceforth, his place is among the warriors; at the same time, he becomes conscious of his sex, all the rights and duties of which he assumes from then on. He has become a man and a citizen. Now, it is a belief universally diffused among all these peoples that the initiate, by the very fact of initiation, has become an entirely new man: he changes his personality, he takes another name, and we know that the name was not then considered as a simple verbal sign, but as an essential element of the person. Initiation was considered as a second birth. The primitive mind conceives of this transformation symbolically, imagining that a spiritual principle, a sort of new soul, has come to be incarnated in the individual. But if we separate from this belief the mythical forms in which it is enveloped, do we not find under the symbol this idea, obscurely glimpsed, that education has had the effect of creating a new being in man? It is the social being.

However, it will be said, if one can indeed conceive that the distinctively moral qualities, because they impose privations on the individual, because they inhibit his natural impulses, can be developed in us only under an outside influence, are there not others which every man wishes to acquire and seeks spontaneously? Such are the divers qualities of the intelligence which allow him better to adapt his behavior to the nature of things. Such, too, are the physical qualities and everything that contributes to the vigor and health of the organism. For the former,

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題　第2節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 4 頁

at least, it seems that education, in developing them, may only assist the development of nature itself, only lead the individual to a state of relative perfection toward which he tends by himself, although he attains it more rapidly thanks to the co-operation of society.

But what demonstrates, despite appearances, that here as elsewhere education answers above all to external, that is social, necessities, is that there are societies in which these qualities have not been cultivated at all, and that in every case they have been understood very differently in different societies. The advantages of a solid intellectual culture have been far from recognized by all peoples. Science and the critical mind, that we rate so high today, were for a long time held in suspicion. Do we not know a great doctrine which proclaims happy the poor in spirit? And we must guard against believing that this indifference to knowledge had been artificially imposed on men in violation of their nature. By themselves, they had then no desire for science, quite simply because the societies of which they were part did not at all feel the need of it. To be able to live they needed, above all, strong and respected traditions. Now, tradition does not arouse, but tends rather to preclude, thought and reflection. It is not otherwise with respect to physical qualities. Where the state of the social milieu inclines the public conscience towards asceticism, physical education will be spontaneously relegated to the background. Something of this sort took place in the schools of the Middle Ages. Similarly, following currents of opinion, this same education will be understood very differently. In Sparta its main object was to harden the limbs to fatigue; in Athens it was a means of making bodies beautiful to the sight; in the time of chivalry it was required to form agile and supple warriors; today it no longer has any but a hygienic end, and is concerned above all with limiting the dangerous effects of a too intense intellectual culture. Thus, even those qualities which appear at first glance so spontaneously desirable, the individual seeks only when society invites him to, and he seeks them in the fashion that it prescribes for him.

You see to what degree psychology by itself is an inadequate resource for the pedagogue. Not only, as I showed you at the start, is it society that outlines for the individual the ideal which he should realize through education, but more, in the individual nature there are no determinate tendencies, no defined states which are like a first aspiration to this ideal, which can be regarded as its internal and anticipated form. There is no doubt that there exist in us very general aptitudes without which it would evidently be unrealizable. If man can learn to sacrifice himself, it is because he is not incapable of sacrifice; if he has been able to submit himself to the discipline of science, it is because it was not unsuitable to him. Through the very fact that we are an integral part of the universe, we care about something other than ourselves; there is in us, therefore, a primary impersonality which prepares for disinterestedness. Similarly, by the fact that we

think, we have a certain tendency to know. But between these vague and confused predispositions (mixed, besides, with all kinds of contrary predispositions) and the very definite and very particular form that they take under the influence of society, there is an abyss. It is impossible for even the most penetrating analysis to perceive in advance, in these indistinct potentialities, what they are to become once the collectivity has acted upon them. For the latter is not limited to giving them a form that was lacking in them; it adds something to them. It adds to them its own energy, and by that very fact it transforms them and draws from them effects which had not been contained in them in primitive form. Thus, even though the individual mind would no longer have any mystery for us, even though psychology would be a real science, it would not teach the educator about the end that he should pursue. Sociology alone can either help us to understand it, by relating it to the social conditions on which it depends and which it expresses, or help us to discover it when the public conscience, disturbed and uncertain, no longer knows what it should be.

But if the role of sociology is predominant in the determination of the ends that education should follow, does it have the same importance with respect to the choice of means?

Here psychology clearly comes into its own. If the pedagogic ideal expresses, above all, social necessities, they can, however, be realized only in and by individuals. In order that it may be more than just a mental construct, an idle injunction of the society to its members, it is necessary to find the way to make the conscience of the child conform to it. Now, the conscience has its own laws which one must know to be able to modify it, if at least one wishes to be spared the empirical gropings which it is precisely the object of pedagogy to reduce to a minimum. To be able to stimulate activity to develop in a given direction, one must also know what its causes are and what their nature is; for it is on this condition that it will be possible to exert the appropriate influence, based on knowledge. Is it a matter, for example, of arousing either patriotism or the sense of humanity? We shall know all the better how to shape the moral sensibility of our pupils in one or the other direction, when we shall have more complete and more precise notions about the totality of phenomena that are called tendencies, habits, desires, emotions, etc., of the divers conditions on which they depend, of the form that they take in the child. According to whether one sees in such tendencies a product of agreeable or disagreeable experiences that the species has been able to have, or indeed, on the contrary, a primitive fact prior to the affective states which accompany their functioning, one will have to treat them in very different ways in order to regulate their development. Now it is up to psychology, and more specifically, child psychology, to resolve these questions. If it is

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題　第2節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 5 頁

94　*Émile Durkheim*

incompetent to fix the end, or rather the ends, of education, there is no doubt that it has a useful role to play in the establishment of methods. And since no method can be applied in the same fashion to different children, it is psychology, too, that should help us to cope with the diversity of intelligence and character. We know, unfortunately, that we are still far from the time when it will truly be in a condition to satisfy this desideratum.

There could be no question, then, of not recognizing the services which the science of the individual can render to pedagogy, and we shall acknowledge its role. But even in that circle of problems in which it can usefully enlighten the pedagogue, it cannot do without the co-operation of sociology.

First, because the ends of education are social, the means by which these ends can be attained must necessarily have the same character. And indeed, among all the pedagogical institutions there is perhaps not one which is not analogous to a social institution the principal traits of which it reproduces, in a smaller and abridged form. There is a discipline in the school as in the community. The rules which set his duties for the schoolboy are comparable to those which prescribe his conduct for the adult man. The rewards and punishments that are attached to the first are not unlike the rewards and punishments that sanction the second. Do we teach children science ready-made? But the science that is growing teaches itself, too. It does not remain enclosed in the brains of those who conceive it, but it becomes truly operative only on the condition of being communicated to other men. Now, this communication, which sets in motion a whole network of social mechanisms, constitutes an instruction which, in order to address itself to the adult, does not differ in nature from that which the pupil receives from his teacher. Is it not said, besides, that the scientists are teachers for their peers, and is the name of schools not given to the groups that are formed around them? One could multiply examples. This is why, indeed, as the scholastic life is only the germ of social life, as the latter is only the consequence and the blossoming of the former, it is impossible for the principal procedures by which the one operates not to be found in the other. One can foresee, then, what sociology, the science of social institutions, contributes to our understanding of what pedagogical institutions are or to our conjectures on what they should be. The better we understand society, the better shall we be able to account for all that happens in that social microcosm that the school is. On the contrary, you see with what prudence and within what limits it is appropriate to use the data of psychology, even with respect to the determination of methods. By itself alone, it could not provide us with the necessary elements for the construction of a technique which, by definition, has its prototype not in the individual, but in the collectivity.

Moreover, the social conditions on which pedagogical ends depend do not limit their influence to this.

They also affect the conception of methods; for the nature of the end implies, in part, that of the means. When society, for example, is oriented in an individualistic direction, all the educational procedures which can have the effect of doing violence to the individual, of ignoring his inner spontaneity, will seem intolerable and will be disapproved. By contrast, when, under pressure of lasting or transitory circumstances, it feels the need of imposing on everyone a more rigorous conformity, everything that can provoke excessive initiative of the intelligence will be proscribed. In fact, every time that the system of educational methods has been profoundly transformed, it has been under the influence of one of those great social currents the effect of which has made itself felt throughout the entire collective life. It is not as a consequence of psychological discoveries that the Renaissance opposed a whole set of new methods to those that the Middle Ages had practiced. But it is because, as a result of the changes that had come about in the structure of European societies, a new conception of man and of his place in the world had emerged. In like manner, the pedagogues who, at the end of the eighteenth century or at the beginning of the nineteenth, undertook to substitute the inductive method for the abstract method, were above all the reflection of the aspirations of their time. Neither Basedow, nor Pestalozzi, nor Froebel were very good psychologists. What their theory expresses above all is that respect for inner liberty, that horror for any restriction, that love of man and consequently of the child, which are at the base of our modern individualism.

Thus, under whatever aspect one considers education, it appears to us everywhere with the same character. Whether it is a matter of the ends that it follows or the means that it employs, it is social needs that it answers; it is collective ideas and sentiments that it expresses. No doubt, the individual himself finds some benefit in it. Have we not expressly recognized that we owe to education the best in us? But this is because the best in us is of social origin. It is always to the study of society, then, that we must return; it is only there that the pedagogue can find the principles of his speculation. Psychology will indeed be able to indicate to him what is the best way to proceed in order to apply these principles to the child, once they are stated; but it will hardly help us to discover them.

I add, in closing, that if there was ever a time and a country in which the sociological point of view was indicated, in a particularly urgent fashion, for pedagogues, it is certainly our country and our time. When a society finds itself in a state of relative stability, of temporary equilibrium, as, for example, French society in the seventeenth century; when, consequently, a system of education is established which, while it lasts, is not contested by anyone, the only pressing questions which are put are questions of application. No serious doubt arises either over the end to attain

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題 第2節

科目：142 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 6 頁

or over the general orientation of methods; there can, then, be controversy only over the best way to put them into practice, and these are difficulties which psychology can settle. I do not have to tell you that this intellectual and moral security is not of our century; this is at the same time its trouble and its greatness. The profound transformations which contemporary societies have undergone or which they are in process of undergoing, necessitate corresponding transformations in the national education. But although we may be well aware that changes are necessary, we do not know what they should be. Whatever may be the private convictions of individuals or factions, public opinion remains undecided and anxious. The pedagogical problem is, then, posed for us with greater urgency than it was for the men of the seventeenth century. It is no longer a matter of putting verified ideas into practice, but of finding ideas to guide us. How to discover them if we do not go back to the very source of educational life, that is to say, to society? It is society that must be examined; it is society's needs that must be known, since it is society's needs that must be satisfied. To be content with looking inside ourselves would be to turn our attention away from the very reality that we must attain; this would make it impossible for us to understand anything about the forces which influence the world around us and ourselves with it. I do not believe that I am following a mere prejudice or yielding to an immoderate love for a science which I have cultivated all my life, in saying that never was a sociological approach more necessary for the educator. It is not because sociology can give us ready-made procedures which we need only use. Are there, in any case, any of this sort? But it can do more and it can do better. It can give us what we need most urgently; I mean to say a body of guiding ideas that may be the core of our practice and that sustain it, that give a meaning to our action, and that attach us to it; which is the necessary condition for this action to be fruitful.

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題 第2節

科目：142 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 7 頁

三、請寫出英文摘要與中文評論（35%）

Rethinking School Improvement[1]

Karen Seashore Louis, James Toole, and Andy Hargreaves

Will Rogers once suggested that the way to end World War I was to drain the Atlantic Ocean and there would not be any more German submarine threat. When asked how he was going to do it, he is reported to have answered, "Well, that is a detail. I am not a detail man."

Rogers' comment still amuses us after three quarters of a century because we recognize the temptation to proclaim grand truths (national standards, professional community, or every child can learn) while understanding the complex context into which these ideas must fit.

In the area of school improvement, the details have proven so perplexing that the domain has become one of the most researched in educational administration. This chapter therefore needed both to recognize the value and depth of the existing literature and the need to articulate and provoke fresh perspectives on change, practice, and policy.

Ten years ago the first edition of this handbook (Boyan, 1988) contained an excellent review by Firestone & Corbett (1988). The earlier and subsequent comprehensive reviews by Fullan (1982) and Fullan & Stiegelbauer (1991) acted as important references for the field. School improvement has received serious attention by scholars who have engaged in efforts to redefine the field, vigorously mining related areas of organizational theory, public management, and business administration. New theoretical paradigms like postmodernism and organizational learning have generated debates at professional conferences and in print. Most importantly, a new *International Handbook of Educational Change* (Hargreaves, Lieberman, Fullan, & Hopkins, 1998) covers virtually every imaginable topic. It would be hubris for us to synthesize this opus in a few pages, and we do not seek to do so.

Our goals for this chapter are, thus, to briskly review some highlights of what is known and then make the issue of school improvement problematic (to explore why it is so challenging). We introduce a set of frames that, we argue, help to sort the most current research into useful analytic categories. We finally focus on possible future research and leadership perspectives on school change. In each section we seek to provoke new reactions rather than reaffirm current wisdom that is well supported elsewhere.

The scholarly language in the research domain that we review is imprecise. The terms "change," "improvement," "implementation," and "reform" are, along with others, often used interchangeably. We acknowledge that there are significant differences, but we do not compensate for the lack of agreement among scholars whose work has contributed to our thinking. Change (defined as doing something differently) may occur without any improvement (defined as a progress toward some desired end). Change is also different than implementation, which is commonly viewed as accomplishing a set of pre-determined goals, which is, when the goals are broad, categorized as reform. In this paper we will use these terms interchangeably in order to focus on deeper issues and leave it to other authors to propose a definitive lexicon. In general, when we use any of these terms, we mean altering the behavior of school employees or the performance of the school on any set of pre- or post-determined indicators as within the bounds of our review.

Lastly, we want to acknowledge before we enter this territory that the large research base on school improvement has moved us a remarkable distance over the past 30 years. There is a wealth of information to help those seeking to

251

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題　第 2 節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本試題
共 **10** 頁
第 **8** 頁

252   Karen Seashore Louis, James Toole, and Andy Hargreaves

improve schools. At the same time, as we will discuss later, the nature of our educational problems, our proposed solutions, change itself, and the environment in which change happens, ensure that anyone interested in healthy intellectual and emotional challenges can choose this field as an area of study for many years to come.

Research Traditions

Early Research

Empirical research on change in American education originated in the over 200 studies of school adaptiveness conducted at Teachers College between the 1930s and the 1950s (Mort, 1963). This research examined the diffusion of innovations within the educational system and, while criticized for its narrow focus (Firestone & Corbett, 1988), it produced enduring observations about educational and social change. Among the most important findings were that:

* The time between the introduction of a new idea and its spread throughout the entire educational system takes decades, although there is often a "burst of action" during which a new practice is adopted in many schools at the same time.
* Schools vary systematically in their willingness/capability to consider and adopt new practices.
* The various interest groups in the schools and community are critical determinants of the adoption process and its outcomes.
* Innovation diffusion in education is typically an organizational change process, rather than one of individual decision-making.

Strategies of Change

During the '60s, the study of change expanded rapidly. Research began to emphasize goal-directed strategies, identifying "organizational health" or generally improved school functioning as a preferred end state (Miles, 1965). Havelock, Guskin, Frohman, Havelock, Hill & Huber's (1969) comprehensive review of the '60s literature on planned change located three streams of research. The *Social Interaction Perspective* focused on the adoption of specific new practices by individuals, examining the effects of adopter characteristics and social networks on behavior (Rogers, 1983; Carlson, 1965). The *RDDU Perspective* (Research, Development, Diffusion, and Utilization) research model emphasized the flow of research-based information from universities to schools (Guba, 1968). Finally, the *Problem Solver Perspective*, based on the work of Kurt Lewin and the group dynamics research conducted at the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, focused on the process of individual or group change, and identified distinctive stages in the change process (Lippitt, Watson & Westley, 1958).[2]

Empirical studies throughout the 1970s continued to reflect the influence of these research traditions, including the development of the Concerns Based Adoption Model at the University of Texas (Hall & Hord, 1987), studies of educational dissemination (Louis & Sieber, 1979; Goodlad, 1975), and research about successful technical assistance and organizational development (Miles, Fullan & Taylor, 1980), as well as unsuccessful interventions (Gross, Guacquinta and Bernstein, 1971). The major emphasis of these studies was on:

* Illuminating the importance of interactions between external "change agents" and school innovators;
* Examining the impact of external agents on the school at various stages in the change process;
* Identifying mechanisms for overcoming barriers to cooperation between schools, school personnel, and other educational agencies with new ideas or developed programs; and
* Describing organizational or individual characteristics that promote the development of "temporary problem-solving systems."

Innovative Organizations

The new organizational change research model emerging in the mid-1970s, however, shifted temporarily away from finding better organizational intervention strategies and toward an elaboration of Mort's finding that schools vary in their adoption of new practices. This shift was part of a broader change in organizational studies, in which an emphasis on studying coherence in organizational behavior gave way to a fascination with the ways in which organizations exhibit regular, but non-rational behavior. Many studies attempted to locate statistical correlates of change in schools, rather than studying decision-making and intentionality (Deal, Meyer & Scott, 1975; Berman, McLaughlin, *et al.*, 1977; Daft & Becker, 1979; Rosenblum & Louis, 1981). The factors most frequently examined in these were:

* Structural features of the organization, such as size, complexity, formalization, or centralization;
* Characteristics of school "technology" (degree of individualization, pedagogical differences or curriculum focus);
* Organizational climate, including staff morale or past innovativeness; and
* Aggregate personnel characteristics (such as experience or professionalism), student characteristics, (racial or

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題 第2節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷繳回。

本 試 題
共 *10* 頁
第 *9* 頁

socio-economic mix), and environmental characteristics (region or political context).

The "RAND Change Agent Study" (Berman, McLaughlin, et al., 1977; McLaughlin, 1990) identified the organizational consequences of federal grant programs designed to stimulate improvement. It was influential in shifting the emphasis away from adoption of innovations and toward implementation. Among the study's most frequently noted findings were that many innovations are abandoned quite quickly and that the organizational characteristics of schools and their settings help to account for this discontinuation. In addition, even implemented programs are often radically changed during implementation through "mutual adaptation," typically making them less potent.

Other studies of federal programs promoting educational change also suggested limited success for the large-scale improvement efforts designed around change models developed in the 1960s (Louis & Sieber, 1979; Herriott & Gross, 1979). Emergent organizational theories, such as those of March & Olsen (1976) and Weick (1976) pointed to the way in which events and structures limit the influence of "change management." The decade of the 70s thus ended with a sense of disillusionment about the possibility of easily engineered improvement in school organizations.

Models of Successful Change and Improvement

During the 1980s, research on organizational change in education began to develop two divergent themes. The first examined policy and practice levers that could explain why change happens in some contexts but not in others; the second focused on the development of better information about the nature of effective schools.

Successful Change Processes

In the 1980s, attention returned to studies of the relationship between education and environment. Meyer & Rowan (1977) emphasized that reform in education is usually imposed from the outside, through changes in social consensus about what schools "should look like," rather than generated from within, through organizational decision processes (Meyer, 1987). This line of research has prompted some policy researchers to argue that external pressures for change can be more effective than the capacity-building or grant-based inducements strategies generally advocated in the 1960s and 1970s (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987).

At the same time, there was a retreat from the large-scale quantitative studies of change conducted in the 70s (induced by declining federal funding for educational research), and an increase in research that attended to issues of leadership and design in the change (Huberman & Miles, 1984; Firestone & Wilson, 1985). In particular, role structures, values, and interactions and collaboration in schools were found to be related to the success or failure of change efforts (Little, 1982; Rossman, Corbett & Firestone, 1985). The capability of these smaller-scale studies to locate factors that seemed to influence the outcomes of change encouraged an interest in revisiting the question of "strategies of change," focusing on how to better manage a change process that inevitably takes place in rather chaotic, unpredictable, and often non-rational contexts (Louis & Miles, 1990).

Effective Schools

Influenced by the results of early studies of high performing schools (Brookover, 1979; Rutter, 1982), the "effective schools movement" moved into higher gear in the 1980s and 1990s. While the initial studies focused on factors that contributed to the success of students who typically did less well in schools, the more recent trend has been to look for characteristics of schools and classrooms that add to the performance of all students. There is a great deal of evidence that change programs that emphasize school effectiveness/teaching effectiveness practices can be successful, even in urban high schools (Louis & Miles, 1990; Stringfield & Teddlie, 1991; Mortimer, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis & Ecob, 1988). Stringfield (1995) has advocated more attention to school-based interventions that use effective schools' research, arguing that "high reliability" (vigilance in maintaining the organizational features that obtain successful achievement outcomes) outweighs other considerations in school improvement.

There are almost as many lists of effectiveness factors as there are research studies. Nevertheless, there are consistent themes that emerge from this line of research that suggest important areas for school-wide intervention. These have been summarized by Creemers (1994) and Scheerens (1992). Most of these authors call for a synthesis of school effectiveness research with school improvement research (Reynolds, Bollen, Creemers, Hopkins, Stoll, & Lagerweij, 1996).

The recent school effectiveness models are subject to several lines of criticism. Many critical and constructivist theorists object to the idea that one can identify specific aspects of the school's culture and/or instructional practices that will improve student learning, particularly if one is concerned with achievement beyond standardized test results. The predictive power of school effectiveness models —even when they include variables that are not amenable to practical interventions—suggest that we know a lot, but not enough to guarantee school success. Finally, the effective schools research is largely silent on the issue of "how to

國立暨南國際大學九十四學年度博士班研究生入學考試試題　第2節

科目：**142** 英文教育名著
系組：教政系

考生注意：
1. 依次序作答，只要標明題號，不必抄題。
2. 答案必須寫在答案卷上，否則不予計分。
3. 限用藍、黑色筆作答；試題須隨卷撤回。

本試題
共 10 頁
第 10 頁

254   Karen Seashore Louis, James Toole, and Andy Hargreaves

get there"—the process by which less effective schools may become more effective.

The Problem of Change

Our brief review demonstrates that school improvement has been well studied over the past decades, but our knowledge base is never sufficient to keep pace with current demands. That change is a recurring, festering problem reflected by titles like Sarason's (1990) "The Predictable Failure of Educational Reform," and Cuban's (1990) "Reforming Again, Again, and Again." Research has taught us that the problem of change is much deeper than the *adoption* of new innovations. It also includes *implementation* (was the innovation ever really implemented?); *fidelity* (once implemented, did the innovation maintain its integrity and purpose?); *impact* (have students been positively and significantly affected?); *institutionalization* (did the innovation become integrated into the school's mission and organization?); *maintenance* (did successful programs continue to exist?); and *replication* (was it possible to transfer the innovation from one school context to another?).

Out of all these dimensions, one of the most perplexing continues to be how to make changes in the "substantive core of teaching and learning"—what it is that teachers actually do in their classrooms (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Elmore, 1995; Fullan, 1997). There is a great deal of "school improvement" activity that is ultimately unconnected to any improvement in student learning. As Newmann & associates (1996) point out, it is easy for instructional techniques that are potentially intellectually stimulating, like cooperative learning or student portfolios, to be implemented in ways that promote only lower-level thinking. In exploring why change has been and continues to be perceived as an unsteady course for school organizations, we examine in this section seven core problems related to school improvement that have important implications both for research and practice.

Problem #1: How We Evaluate the Success of School Improvement Efforts

All is flux, nothing is stationary. — Heraclitus.

It is demonstrable that many of the obstacles for change which have been attributed to human nature are in fact due to the inertia of institutions.—John Dewey (1938).

Public discussions about school improvement often focus on a single question: are things getting better or worse? As with most questions that assume a dichotomous answer, the data are mixed. On the one hand, evidence of relatively systematic change and improvement abounds. Over the past 50 years, the rate of students completing a high school education and obtaining some post-secondary experience has expanded enormously. Between 1950 and 1980, for example, the high school graduation rate for the United States rose from approximately 65% to nearly 80%, and it has continued to increase (Fitzpatrick & Yoels, 1992). The same trends are apparent in all other developed countries (OECD, 1998). At the other end of the spectrum, preschool and kindergarten attendance also increased. During this time, the equity education landscape also changed significantly. However controversial, laws governing the education of handicapped children changed opportunities for students who would previously have been consigned to limited roles in society, although it is an incomplete revolution in most countries (Sarason, 1996). The performance of some minority groups—notably African-Americans in the U.S.—on standardized tests has risen, although the gaps between their scores and those of white students have not been eliminated. In recent years, research has resulted in a host of new school-wide improvement efforts that appear to have evidence of success in increasing the reading achievement of disadvantaged students in multiple settings, such as Robert Slavin's "Success for All" and the "Reading Recovery" program (which originated in New Zealand). The positive side of the school improvement story in the U.S. has been documented by Berliner & Biddle (1995) and the annual "Bracey Reports" (for example, Bracey, 1997) that appear in *Phi Delta Kappan.*

On the other hand, there is ample evidence of stability. In spite of generations of work on the part of educators to introduce new teaching methods into American schools, knowledgeable scholars such as Goodlad, Cuban, and Sarason continue to argue that there has been little change in the culture of schools and classrooms. High school teachers who read Willard Waller's (1965) dyspeptic descriptions from the 1930s of the struggles between rigid community values, adolescent subcultures, and powerless teachers believe that they have stumbled on to descriptions of their own school. In spite of massive social efforts to desegregate our schools, minority "graduates" of Head Start programs still enroll in settings that are not well-funded and are less supportive than programs for middle-class students (Lee & Loeb, 1995). There is little empirical evidence that supports the contention that an increased focus on complex student learning (as measured by the National Assessment of Education Progress) has led to improved student achievement. The annual U.S. surveys conducted by the National Opinion Research Center indicate that anomie—an indicator of low social and civic cohesion—is increasing among youth.