

國立暨南國際大學 97 學年度比較教育學系博士班研究生入學考試

【本試題共八頁、三題，滿分 100 分，請注意翻閱；以中英文答題皆可。】

壹、閱讀下則新聞後，請針對內容加以摘要(30%)，摘要以不超過三百字為限。

*The European Parliament today voted in favour of adopting the Recommendation on the establishment of the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF), proposed by the Commission in September 2006. The EQF will act as a translation device between Member States' qualifications systems in order to help employers and individuals compare and better understand citizens' qualifications and thus support mobility and lifelong learning.*

The European Qualifications Framework (EQF) is a translation grid for qualifications around Europe. It has two principal purposes: (1) to promote mobility between countries, and (2) to facilitate lifelong learning. Both are indispensable for achieving more and better jobs and growth, as Europe faces the challenges of becoming an advanced, knowledge-based economy. The European Parliament has today approved the Commission proposal for a Recommendation to set up the EQF.

Ján Figel', European Commissioner for Education, Training, Culture and Youth, explained its significance: "*People in Europe too often face obstacles when they try to move from one country to another to learn or work. They sometimes also face obstacles when they want to move from one part of their own country's education system to another, e.g. from vocational education and training to higher education. The EQF will make different qualifications more easily readable between different European countries, and so promote increased mobility for learning or working. Within countries, it has already encouraged the development of National Qualifications Frameworks. This will promote lifelong learning, for example by making it easier to gain credit for the learning people have already achieved.*"

At the core of the EQF are its eight reference levels, covering basic to most advanced qualifications. These describe what a learner knows, understands

and is able to do, regardless of the system in which the learner's qualification was acquired.

The EQF therefore shifts the focus away from learning inputs (such as the length of a learning experience, or the type of institution), to learning outcomes. Shifting the focus towards learning outcomes brings significant advantages:

- it supports a better match between education and training provisions and the needs of the labour market (for knowledge, skills and competences);
- it facilitates the validation of non-formal and informal learning; and
- it facilitates the transfer and use of qualifications across different countries and education and training systems.

As an instrument for promoting lifelong learning, the EQF encompasses general and adult education, vocational education and training, as well as higher education. The eight EQF levels cover the entire span of qualifications from those achieved at the end of compulsory education, up to those awarded at the highest level of academic and professional or vocational education and training.

The Recommendation approved by the European Parliament foresees that Member States relate their national qualifications systems to the EQF by 2010, and that individual certificates or diplomas should bear an EQF reference by 2012.

It will therefore enable individuals and employers to use the EQF as a reference tool to compare the qualifications levels of different countries and different education and training systems.

資料來源：Brussels, 25 October 2007

<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=IP/07/1601&type=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

貳、閱讀下文後，請為本文下一標題(20%)，並簡單解釋理由為何(10%)。

The parts of any educational system are interdependent, and need to be examined in relation to the whole. Many attempts to make international comparisons across several countries fall into the trap of assuming that things with the same name must have the same function. They may, but there can also be substantial differences. 'Primary school', for example, means in England and Wales a school for children between the ages of five and eleven; but in Scotland it is from 5 to 12, and in the Republic of Ireland usually from 4 to 12. This is within one area, the British Isles, with close past or present political links; elsewhere, the difference might be greater. What is usually translated as primary school or *ecole primaire* or *Grundschule* can cover the ages of 7 to 16 in Denmark and in Sweden, and so on. Various systems organise the structure differently, preferring in some cases to make the main division at mid-adolescence, the end of compulsory schooling, and in others at the point of transition from undifferentiated to subject specialised teaching.

Similarly, the term 'secondary school' may mean the entire stage from pre-adolescence onwards (as in the systems of the British Isles or the USA), or it may be only the stage entered after compulsory school, as in Scandinavia. But this does not apply everywhere. In some countries, only certain post-compulsory schools--generally those leading to higher education--are designated as 'secondary', thus distinguishing them from vocational or trade schools. The Irish Republic offers an example of what used to be a common Western European practice. Further, structural changes may take place but old titles may remain in use. Even on official notices they use the formal title, with the informal and old-fashioned title, which is what everyone says and which has a different structure (as in Germany). It is a dangerous business, especially when translation is involved, to pull institutions with similar sounding titles out of context for separate examination.

But opportunities for misunderstanding do not end there. What happens at one level of a system has to be considered in the light of what happens before and after it. This can be illustrated by going back to the example of contrasting American high school and English grammar school standards. We have seen that academic attainment is only part of the picture; but even if we confine our attention to that for a moment, the comparison is still misleading, because it is incomplete.

In most European countries the end of secondary schooling is still quite a reasonable point at which to consider what standards have been achieved. Enough of the age-group stay on to make the judgement worthwhile, and too few go on to higher education to suspend judgement for one stage more. (This is changing in a number of countries.) But this is not so in the USA where something like half the age-cohort proceeds to tertiary education. Some take only short-cycle courses, some of these transfer to full higher courses, others enter longer ones from the start but drop out, and some of these drop back in again. This makes it difficult to keep track of any particular age-group, but a reasonable estimate would be that about a quarter eventually complete first degrees.

Admittedly, the standard of American degrees varies considerably. Some American universities and colleges can easily stand comparison academically with any higher educational institutions in the world, while others award degrees too mediocre to be recognised in other countries, or in the USA itself. In between can be found almost every imaginable variety, from the admirable to the abysmal. But, with very few exceptions, even the worst could be reckoned to come up at least to English A-level standard and, of course, most go well beyond that. It follows, therefore, that in the USA a higher proportion of the population reaches at least A-level standard than was ever admitted to grammar school in England in the heyday of selective schooling. Even by the narrowest scholastic criteria more get there in the end. Unless we postulate some mystic law whereby certain standards must be attained by a fixed age, American education appears to perform more creditably than its detractors on both sides of the Atlantic would allow. To attempt an adequate assessment of a system, we have to look at all of it, not just a part. A similar point could be made about the age of starting primary school and the relevance of pre-school provision.

Nor need such considerations be confined to the formal school system, for other organisations can attend to 'curricular enrichment', as the Soviet Pioneers did. That is all gone now. But there are some parallels in China and Cuba, and of course the folkehojskoler in Denmark and the various Church organisations in some other countries, particularly in Latin America, fulfil some needs for 'public enlightenment', especially for young adults. Many countries have youth and adult organisations in the cultural, linguistic, nature and athletic areas. The limitations of most of these are that they often lack adequate support and finance; they also tend to be fragmented so that they touch few of the young people or children at which they are aimed. But they

are there, and sometimes function, as a vital adjunct to the normal experience of formal schooling.

There are other examples, but these should make the general point--educational systems need to be examined as wholes, and in their contexts, before cross-cultural studies can be expected to yield much benefit. Objective data on particular institutions can seem quite precise; but unless they are seen in relation to other institutions in the same system, and unless that system is examined in the light of the factors that make it what it is, we are in danger of misunderstanding how it works. Further, since the most common use of evidence out of context is to back up educational arguments at home, there is the additional danger that such misunderstandings may simply reinforce misunderstanding of one's own system. This is not what *comparative education* is for.

資料來源：Comparative Education, 2000, 36(3), pp. 309-317.

參、請閱讀 B. Lingard 與 F. Rizvi 有關全球化與教育的論述，繼之回答以下

問題：（一）全球化帶來哪些變遷或特質？(10%)（二）全球化下的這

些改變或特質對教育領域有何影響？(20%) 你對此有何想法？(10%)

In 1993, we commenced work on a research project which utilised the then emerging concept of globalisation to investigate the ways in which the work of an international organisation, namely the OECD, affected the processes of educational policy-making in Australia (Rizvi, Lingard, Taylor and Henry, 1995-97). Little did we realise then how ubiquitous would the use of the concept of globalisation become in just five years. Nowadays the talk of globalisation is everywhere – in the media, in social and economic analyses, in academic writings and in political rhetoric rationalising particular policy preferences. Some of this interest in globalisation can be put down to theoretical fashion, though much of it also relates to genuine attempts to understand the global reconfiguration of social and economic relations, particularly as they affect nation states. There is the often repeated suggestion of political imperatives that determine the policy options for governments. There is the assertion that the world economic system is converging. Further still, there is genuine community fear about the homogenisation, read as Americanisation, of national identities and cultures. In this paper, we explore the extent to which this fear of homogenisation is justified, especially as it relates to education policy-making.

The fear of homogenisation is expressed in a variety of different ways, and is articulated by a number of theorists. Such theorists normally subscribe to some sort of notion of world system. For example, the world-systems theories of Wallerstein seek to identify the universal in the particular, whether as commodification or as time-space distancing. In education, many theorists have pointed to the hegemonic convergence of a particular way of thinking about educational policy-making and governance. Green (1996) has, for example, provided a detailed account of the dominance of a particular organisational paradigm in education around the world. Slee, Weiner and Tomlinson (1998) have shown how 'school effectiveness thinking' has become global. Other writers have pointed to the diminishing importance of the structures of national policy-making. In the cultural field, the fear of homogenisation is encapsulated in Barber's (1992) term 'McWorld'. Barber (1992, p. 54) argues that 'four imperatives make up the dynamics of McWorld: a market imperative, a resource imperative, an information-technology imperative and an ecological imperative'. Each of these, argues Barber, contributes to 'shrinking the worlds and diminishing the salience of national borders'. Nowhere is the fear of homogenisation greater than in relation to the emerging global mass culture. American mass culture, in particular, is seen as eroding and dissolving local cultures and traditions.

In this paper, we argue that the case for homogenisation produced by globalisation is overstated, and that it rests on a deterministic logic that assumes that choices are no longer available to political communities within nations. The fear of homogenisation suggests that local traditions are in imminent danger of being sucked into a global vortex, but this suggestion is itself based on a flawed understanding of the processes of globalisation. We argue that globalisation does not impinge on all nation states and at all times in exactly the same way. And not all effects of globalisation are straightforwardly negative or positive. The way globalisation rhetoric is taken up in educational policy communities varies considerably. We suggest that a debate about globalisation centred around homogenisation is not terribly helpful, and that 'it is not a question of homogenisation or heterogenisation' but rather of the ways in which both of these tendencies have become features of life across much of the late twentieth century world' (Robertson, 1994, p. 27). What we need to discern is how both of these tendencies are mutually implicated in particular circumstances. This makes globalisation an empirical problem, demanding description of the particular, and the ways in which the particular has been produced by the general.

The literature on globalisation talks about three interrelated dimensions of globalisation, namely economic, political and cultural effects of globalisation are used in ways that are markedly different in different countries and under different political regimes within the same country. This account is intended to demonstrate the flaws inherent in the homogenisation thesis, and the various ways in which the local and the national remain the most significant sites of cultural production and political struggle.

In this paper, we have argued that the concept of globalisation encapsulates some of the real changes going on in the world at the present time. One way in which these changes associated with globalisation has been interpreted is in terms of the threatening force of homogenisation. In our view, such an interpretation is at best overstated, if not misleading. This is particularly the case in respect of the nation state, whose premature death has been announced by some globalisation theorists. We have argued that while the nation state remains important in educational policy production terms, the processes of globalisation have seen a restructuring of its organisation and modes of practice, manifest as the emergent competitive state. What has emerged is a changing pattern of relations, which, as Cerny (1997, p. 253) observes, derives 'from complex congeries of multilevel games played on multi-layered institutional playing fields, above and across, as well as within, state boundaries.' Globalisation is mediated within the nation state by its history, culture, politics, political structures and by the nature of the government of the day. The extent of that mediation is at times an indication of whether or not the ideological or empirical effects globalisation are having greater or lesser impact on national policy production in education. For example, in writing about developing countries, Stewart (1996) distinguishes between 'virtuous and vicious cycles of development' in different countries in the context of globalisation. Nor does globalisation entirely determine how nation states relate to their awareness of its salience. Waters (1995, p. 3) observes that in a way globalisation can be regarded as 'the direct consequence of the expansion of European cultures across the world via settlement, colonisation and cultural mimesis', though it is also linked to the development of global capitalism and the global economy. This does not imply that the entire globe has or must become capitalistic or Westernised, but it does suggest that all spheres of social life much establish their position 'in relation to the capitalist West' (Waters 1995, p. 3). Western capitalism has become a reference point against which nation states entertain their policy options.

Of course, the manner in which different nation states relativise their policies and histories, political institutions, cultural traditions and the economic constraints within which they operate. The mode of this relativisation cannot therefore be stated in any *a priori* manner, and must be investigated empirically, to achieve a picture of the ways the local and the global articulate each other generally and specifically within education.

資料來源：B. Lingard & F. Rizvi(2000).Globalisation and the Fear of Homogenisation in Education. Edited by Stephen J. Ball, Sociology of Education: Major Themes (pp. 2099-2111).London: RoutledgeFalmer.