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編者序言

人生旅程中充滿著變動不居的歷程，在這變動的過程中可能包括有環境上、身份上和心理上
單一變換或多重大變項的變化。Erikson的理論將
人生分成八大階段，他認為從每一階段走向另一
階段時都會為個體帶來衝擊，個性若能順利地因應
該衝擊就可以快樂地、正面地面對下一階段的人
生旅程；若無法順利地因應成長中各階段所面對
的問題，就會影響下一階段的成長任務。從心理
學角度出發來看，幼兒『過渡』(transition)的問
題一直是幼教領域裡關心的主題之一。但隨著研
究文獻的累積與後現代多元化思維之文化的影
響，幼兒『過渡』的問題除了從心理學角度來探
討外，是否會有更多新的觀點出現，可以讓我們
更有效率地去協助幼兒渡過『過渡』時期？這是
本期專題選擇『學習與銜接』的主要動機。

本期五篇專題文章具特色與焦點。林美嫦
之『『過渡』概念的最新發展』一文的重點在從
生態系統論之觀點去釐清『過渡』、「銜接」、
『調整』、「適應」等概念，對我們未來探討『幼
小銜接』有關之研究議題時，具有極具意義性的
啟示。陳怡君一文是從幼稚園老師和小一老師之
教育觀的差異性來探討幼小銜接策略上所面臨的
問題，文中提出許多情境性的資料與分析之觀
點，對幼教現場工作者提供了值得省思之案例的
分享。Laurie Makin一文強調『家園伙伴關係』
在協助幼兒在語文學習上，從家庭過渡到幼教機
構以及從幼教機構過渡到小學時的重要性，同時
提出了一些具體作法上的建議，深具實用價值。
伍瑞顏一文以數學課程內容和教學策略為分析之
變項，來探討低幼、高幼和小一學生在學習數學
科目時之銜接問題，研究結果對幼教與小一課程
設計（尤其是數學方面）深具參考價值。黃競和
胡婉珊一文是從家長處去了解幼兒上小一時所面
臨的困難、問題及因應策略，文中的資料有助於
高幼和小一老師和學校協助幼兒過渡至小一時之
作法上的參考。

本期除了五篇專題文章外，另外有一篇亦經
評審委員審查通過的文章是徐懷玉一文，該文主要
也是在概念上的釐清，是針對『質素』一詞之意
義的探討。概念上的探討提供了我們在學術與實
務工作時進行意見、觀念交流的一個平台。

在專欄的部分，主要的目的是資訊的傳遞與
流通，屬邀稿性質的文章。依慣例，我們每期都
會介紹一位幼教先行者之生平、教育思想及其對
幼教界的貢獻，期望在緬懷、尊重賢者之餘，我
們後進之士亦能有做效先賢之思。這期我們介紹
有名張雪門先生。我們介紹聖羅撒幼稚園，讓
各位讀者了解該校之特色。同時，本期介紹兩個
本系正在進行的計劃案，『比比和朋友』的計劃
是強調促進幼兒情緒健康的計劃；『香港健康幼
稚園』的計劃是強調促進幼兒身心健康的計劃；
『新世紀的數碼學習生活化』一文在提醒大家注
意，21世紀是個數碼學習的社會。

希望本期的內容有助於幼教學術與實務上品
質之提升。

執行編輯
簡楚瑛、林美嫦
Editorial

Life is full of changes. We may experience one or multiple contextual, status and psychological changes. According to Erikson’s (1977) “Eight Ages of Man”, he pointed out that an individual encounters a major psychological conflict in each stage. If one can successfully resolve the conflict, one can move to the next stage healthily and positively. If not, it would affect how an individual copes with the developmental task of next stage. From the psychological perspective, transition is always a topic of concern in early childhood education. However, with the accumulated literature of this topic and the influence of post-modern thinking, is there any alternative perspective that can effectively help us understand and support children through the transition period? Thus, “Transition in Learning” is chosen as the theme for this edition.

Five articles are selected in the symposium on transition in learning. Lam’s article focuses on defining the concept of transition, continuity, adaptation and coping from the perspective of The Rites of Passage and Ecological Systems Theory. It provides meaningful insights in further exploring the issues in transition from home to preschool and to school. Chen’s article examines the teachers’ and parents’ instructional viewpoints that influence their choice of transition strategies and practices from the perspective of continuity of experience. It provides abundant contextual information and analysis. The sharing of the research findings provides real cases for early childhood educators to reflect on. Makin’s article addresses home-school partnership in supporting transition in literacy learning from home to early childhood setting and to school. She also suggests practical ways in supporting transition in literacy learning. Ng’s article focuses on the continuity problems in lower kindergarten, upper kindergarten and primary one with regard to mathematic curriculum and teaching strategies. Her research results has contributed to the design of mathematic curriculum in both preschool and primary one. Wong and Woo’s article investigates parents’ perspectives on their children’s difficulties, problems and coping strategies in the transition to primary. The article provides reference for upper kindergarten and primary teachers to support children’s transition to primary.

In General article section, Tsui’s article reviews and discusses the concept of teaching quality. This concept clarification provides a platform for the exchange of opinions and viewpoints on theory and practice of teaching quality.

In Features section, the aim of the invited articles is to disseminate information to the field of early childhood education. One early childhood pioneer in mainland China is introduced in each edition. By introducing the pioneers’ biographies, educational beliefs and contributions to early childhood education, we pay tribute to our pioneers as well as to learn from them. In this edition, Mr Zhang Xuemen (張雪門先生) is introduced. In Preschools section, St. Rose of Lima’s Kindergarten is introduced. This edition also introduces two research projects in progress in our Department of ECE. “Zippy’s Friends” is a mental health promotion program for young children whereas “Health Promoting Kindergarten” focuses on promoting the physical and mental health of young children. Lastly, the article “Daily Learning in the Information Age” reminds us that 21st century is an information age.

We hope that the contents of this edition can help raising the academic quality as well as professional practice of early childhood education.

CHIEN Chu Ying Ingrid and LAM Mei Seung
Edition Editors

References:
Recent Development of the Concept of Transition

林美嫖
香港教育學院 幼兒教育學系

Abstract
During the stage of early childhood education, most children have to encounter two “ecological transitions”, including the one from home to kindergarten and that from kindergarten to primary school, which have essential and profound impact on their learning career. This article discusses the recent development of the concept of transition and its related concepts. It aims at providing early childhood educators a comprehensive understanding of transition in order to facilitate appropriate policies and practices for helping children smoothly cope with transitions.

引言
在幼兒教育階段，從家庭到幼稚園和從幼稚園到小學是兩份兒童須經歷的兩個「生態的過渡」(ecological transition) (Bronfenbrenner, 1979)。幼稚園是兒童第一個教育體制，兒童從中萌發學校是學習的地方和學生身份的觀念，對兒童的學習生涯有重要和深遠的影響。本文旨在探討「過渡」概念的最新發展及其相關概念，提供幼教工作者對過渡有更深的認識，從而制定適當的政策和安排，協助兒童順利過渡。

最近，部份研究人員指出過渡不單是環境的轉變，也是身份的轉換和一個轉變的過程 (Brooker, 2002; Fabian & Dunlop, 2002; Griebel & Niesel, 2002; Corsaro & Molinari, 2005)。Fabian和Dunlop (2002, p. 3) 將過渡定義為：「當兒童（及其家庭）由一個環境轉移到另一個環境，直到兒童成為新環境中的其中一員，當中所經歷的改變過程，是一個具強烈和急速發展需要的時期」。事實上，兒童在過渡的過程中，面對許多的轉變，包括：新的學習環境、新的學習活動、新的人際關係、新的規範和期望等，不同性格與特質和生活經驗的兒童，可能需要不同程度的調整，直至合乎社會、老師、家長和兒童本身對幼
稚園學生或小學學生身份的期望。

過渡觀念的發展主要受兩套理論影響。van Gennep (1960) 在其「通過禮儀」(The rites of passage) 中提到「過渡的階段」、「空間的轉換」及「地位的轉變」三個概念，將過渡理解為走進一個新環境及新社會身份的一個轉變過程，這個轉變過程包括分離、過渡和再統合三個階段。分離是指個人離開原先的生活脈絡；過渡是個體適應新環境和新身份的禮儀和典禮（即文化）而作出的改變，是一段不確定和模棱兩可的摸索的階段；再統合是個體以新身份成為新團體的成員。例如：兒童由家庭進入幼稚園這個新環境，他們由小孩或子女的角色轉變為幼稚園學生的身份，在併入新學生身份前的儀式包括：報名、參與入學前適應活動、收到開學信是、和家長分開要自己留在課室、開學禮、點名和開學首數週的適應安排等。雖然 van Gennep 的觀點能提供現時對過渡的認識，可是，他認為，個體是被動地調整自己的行為以適應新環境和新身份，並不合乎現時的兒童觀。根據現時兒童觀的發展，兒童是主動學習者，他們並不是被動地和盲目地遵守一切對他們的要求和期望，正如 Dunlop 和 Fabian (2002, p. 147) 指出，兒童在教育的過渡 (educational transitions)「不是被動地轉化，等待加工處理，繼續行進下一階段」，而是積極的建構和重構環境，主動地與人協商，會因應環境而作出應對，直至找到適應新環境和新角色的方法。

Bronfenbrenner (1979) 對研究過渡提供了新的觀點，在其有關人類發展的「生態系統論」(ecological systems theory) 中，他提出「生態的過渡」(ecological transition)，指個體因著生態環境的轉變在角色上也會相應地轉變。例如由家庭入幼稚園或小學，他們從中建構對幼稚園學生和小學學生的期望和行為，是一個整合的過程。Bronfenbrenner的理論強調兒童的發展是在與環境互動（物理環境和社會環境）中進行，他把環境的層次由小至大分為微系統、中間系統、外系統和大系統，這些環境包括家庭、學校、社區和社會，並強調各種環境之間的聯繫和合作對兒童發展起著重要的作用。關係愈緊密，愈能幫助兒童發展和適應的過渡，因此家庭和學校之間的聯繫和合作是十分重要的。其後Bronfenbrenner描述他的觀點為「生命的生態模式」(biocological model) (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998)，他增加了時間系統，強調時間對發展的重要。

Rimm-Kaufmann 和 Pianta (2000) 根據 Bronfenbrenner的理論基礎發展出「生態及動態模式」(ecological and dynamic model) 的過渡的模式 (models of transition)。其後，Pianta 和 Kraft-Sayre (2003) 進一步提出「發展性過渡」(developmental model)，指兒童過渡到學校是一個過程，他們是隨著時間經歷不同環境脈絡而成長，包括家庭、學校、社區及不同環境之間的影響。他們強調成功的過渡實務 (transition practices) 要涵蓋不同環境的聯繫，包括：家庭和學校的聯繫、兒童和學校的聯繫、兒童和兒童的聯繫與社區聯繫。過渡實務或過渡計劃是協助兒童順利過渡和適應學校的策略和程序 (Margets, 2002)。雖然他們提出環境和環境之間聯繫的重要，卻沒有對學校的環境如：物理環境、課程和學習活動、人際關係和常規的過渡安排作出具體的建議。

總而言之，過渡在幼兒教育被理解為是由家庭到幼稚園、由幼稚園到小學的環境上的轉變；過渡亦可以被解釋為身份的轉變—由家庭裏的小孩和子女到幼稚園學生到小學學生的身份的轉變；在過渡的過程中，兒童並非被動修改自己已從和接受一切對他們的要求和期望，而是主動地對新環境和新身份作出建構和調整，直至兒童適應與老師、家長和兒童本身對幼稚園學生或小學學生身份的期望。這個轉變可能是一個很短的過程，但也可以是漫長的過程，視乎兒童本身的特質、家庭生活經驗、教育機構經驗、新學校環境的過渡安排和期望以及家庭、學校和社區的聯繫。

研究中較常被使用及理解。而中文方面，「銜接」常與「過渡」通用，如常用的幼小銜接 (朱慕菊，1995；張翠娥，1998)；在台灣，「過渡」一詞常被譯為「轉換」，含有「中介、預備與過渡的緩衝和接續性質」的意思（黃世鈺，2002，頁15）。

此外，在參考文獻上，過渡的概念與以下的概念有著密切的關係：「銜接」(continuity) 與「不銜接」(discontinuity)；「準備就緒入學」(readiness for school) 與「準備就緒的學校」(ready school)；「調整」(adjustment) 與「適應」(adaptation)；「應對策略」(coping strategies) 與「策略行為」(strategic actions)。

與「過渡」相關的概念

「銜接」與「不銜接」


Mayfield (2003) 認為銜接是一個課程的方向和程度要聯繫和建基於另一個課程，讓兒童在學習過程中獲益。在幼兒教育的環境中，她列舉了銜接包括六方面：哲學的（指的是教育目標、兒童觀和教學法）、課程的、兒童發展的（指幫助個別兒童發展的過渡安排）、物理環境的、組織的及行政的銜接；然而，在真實的情況下，由於普遍的家庭和教育機構在目標、結構和功能的不同，以及個別的發展和學校的多元性，非連續性在某程度上是無可避免地存在的。在這樣的情況下，幼稚園或小學作為接收單位，應考慮到兒童的過渡經驗或幼稚園經驗，從而將新的幼稚園或小學經驗調整過來，以減少改變的幅度及因改變而來的壓力 (Briggs & Potter, 1995)。例如：有些兒童不習慣集體聽故事和討論，可先安排較短的故事或主題時間，才逐漸加長時間。

「準備就緒入學」與「準備就緒的學校」


性；二是綜合的，因為課程類別不應由成年人人工地集結而成的；三是能提起兒童的學習興趣，令他們容易產生共鳴。最近，Serve (2000) 指準備就緒的學校之學校素質在於師資、課程教學、學校環境、行政人員、家庭及社會等。因此，在兒童在學習的過渡上，由傳統概念中強調兒童個人的能力具體到強調是家庭、學校和社區的共同責任。準備就緒的學校和準備就緒入學的關係是家庭、學校和社區的一個配合，三者應加強溝通和聯繫，增加彼此的認識和合作，共同支持兒童經過適應新學校時面對的轉變。

「應對策略」與「策略行為」

Lazarus (1993, p. 8) 在認知的協調方法 (cognitive mediational approach) 中形容調整是一個過程，應對則是「嘗試改變或解釋周遭的環境而令人容易適應」。「應對策略」(coping strategies) 大致可分為兩種：「問題主導的應對」 (problem-focused coping) 及「情感主導的應對」 (emotion-focused coping)。在情感主導的應對裏，兒童改變特定環境的詮釋以調節他們的情緒反應；而在問題主導的應對中，兒童會評估特定的環境及改變他們的行為，並嘗試改變環境，而不理會他們的改變是否發揮效用 (Sowa & McIntire, 1994)，他還指出應對的重點在於過程、改變和環境，換句話說，兒童利用應對策略去掌握、忍受或減少環境所帶來的壓力。兒童最主要的應對策略是取決於個性或環境，它會隨著時間和不同環境而改變。同樣地，Jackson and Warin (2000) 解釋「應對」一詞表達人們在面對陌生環境時的恐懼、焦慮、挑戰和興奮，它亦表達人們應付新經驗時將新經驗與舊有經驗聯繫起來。簡單而言，他們將調整和應對視為一種詮釋或行為的轉變，目的是為了適應及融入新環境。

在教育社會學的課室互動研究中，Woods (1983, p. 9) 主張，應對學校生活是「由文化衍生出來的觀念，是透過策略聯繫到行為上」。Pollard (1985) 闡述如應對策略之間的關係，如策略行為 (strategic actions) 在每一情況出現及被常規化，會成為決定的特定模式，在這樣的情況下應對策略便會產生。他強調策略行為具環境性、動態性及時間性，兒童在長年の學校生活面對不同的情況和處境會有不同的行為。

Pollard與Filer (1999) 還指出適應是積極地融入環境，非被動的，他們未必會公然藐視或對抗對他們的要求和期望，但兒童在學校會積極地建立、重構環境並創意和動態地回應，他們的應對策略反映在行為和身份，Pollard和Filer (1999) 還提出兒童的策略行為可分為：服從、反抗、非服從和重新定義四方面。此外，家長和老師在協助兒童適應安排上也有其應對策略，因此，長大及老師的應對策略是互動的、協商的和動態的。例如：兒童不願意做線條練習，他或會把此項活動安排在分組活動的最後時段才進行。當老師提示他去做的時候，他或會推說遲一點，到不能再拖的時候，他便假意去拿線條練習紙，當教師一不耐煩，他就走過去和小朋友玩，到教師再發現他的時候，他才勉強地去做或會告訴教師他不懂怎樣做等；教師的策略是提示、主動邀請和看管著兒童做線條練習，直至完成為止等。

「調整」與「適應」

在很多有關學校作為過渡的研究中，「調整」 (adjustment) 和「適應」 (adaptation) 經常交替地使用，這是用來描述兒童過渡到學校的過程和成果。至於調整和適應的差別，Lazarus (1991) 及Folkman and Lazarus (1984) 提出兩種心理學上的調整：調整作為一個成果 (adjustment as achievement) 及調整作為一個過程 (adjustment as process)。調整作為一個成果是指「適應環境而獲得的成果」 (Sowa & McIntire, 1994, p. 95)，它可以是成功融入新環境或是在適應上出現困難。調整作為過程是指個人以特有的方式應付特定環境的需求。所以，當評估兒童在過程的表現時，可以觀察兒童適應的結果，及其適應新學校的環境時的特有方式和需要的時間，他們的學習效果可以包括：健康及身體發展、社會和情感發展、學習方法、語言和溝通技巧、認知和常識、以及兒童在調整過程中所採取的策略行為和適應的時間等。

結論

總而言之，「適應」概念的最新發展的文獻指出，過渡不單是環境的改變，而且是身份的轉變和一個改變的過程，我們須考慮到其複雜性——個人、環境和期望之間的密切關係。在兒童的學習生涯裏，由家庭到幼稚園到小學是兒童的
重要的教育体制的过渡，也是建立学生身份的关键时期，它的影响是无法计量的。本文透过参考一些资料文献，检查过渡概念及其相关概念的最新发展，对幼儿教育的人力对过渡概念有更全面的了解，从而对过渡制定适当的政策和安排，与家长和社区合作，提供衔接的环境及协助儿童适应新环境，让儿童顺利地适应。更重要的是，让儿童有正面的过渡经验，帮助儿童感受到他们被新文化所接纳及对儿童接受他们新文化中的身份。
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從經驗連續性探討
台灣台北縣市幼稚園大班家長與幼小教師之幼小銜接教育觀與策略
Preschool Teachers, First-grade Teachers and Preschool Parents’ Instructional Viewpoints and Practices in the Transition from Preschool to First-grade in Taipei: Based on Continuity

陳怡君
國立台灣師範大學人類發展與家庭學系碩士班畢業

摘要
本研究以半結構式訪談法訪談台灣台北縣市 22 位大班家長與幼小教師。旨在探討幼小銜接關係人於銜接過程中之教育觀點，及其所選擇之銜接策略。研究結果包含：(一) 大班家長與幼小教師之幼小銜接教育觀點不完全相同；(二) 大班家長與幼小教師皆有進行銜接策略。但所進行的內容不完全相同；(三) 在缺乏哲學一致性之背景下，大班家長與幼小教師之銜接策略未能有效統整。

Abstract
This study examines the teachers and mothers' instructional viewpoints that influence their choices of practices, and also their chosen practices in the transition from preschool to first-grade. Moreover, it discusses the results on the basis of Continuity asserted by Sharon L. Kagan in 1991. Using the semi-structure interview approach, there are three major findings. First, the three groups have inconsistent instructional viewpoints. Second, the transition practices adopted by the three groups are not the same either. Finally, each groups’ practices cannot be effectively integrated for lack of the congruence of philosophy.

壹、緒論


「經驗連續 (continuity)」是 Sharon L. Kagan 於參與美國幼小銜接方案過程中，有感幼兒參與的各機構間 (家庭、幼兒保育機構等) 存在著多種不連續的現象，使得各機構單方面的努力無法滿足兒童與家庭的需求，而提出的觀點。其中主張以跨場所間的合作，提供一貫且連續的服務來進行銜接 (Kagan, 1991)。Kagan 認為若要進行有效的銜接活動，必須從三項原則著手，分別為：
(一) 哲學的一致性 (congruence of philosophy)：強調家庭與學校間對於各階段的教育目標、學習原則、各方角色等理念有共通的期望或看法；
(二) 教學的連續性 (continuity of pedagogy)：主
張保留部分舊經驗，以作為學習新經驗的基礎；(三) 構的一貫性 (consistency of structure)：承認不同單位在機構主管單位、立案或遵循的法規等（如：師生比、班級大小、教師資格）的不同，但認為彼此須努力以取得彼此間的一致（而
非結合）。最重要的是，經驗連續性須在哲學一致性的根基上，才得以發展。也就是在教育目標
缺乏共識的情況下，Kagan認為不同個場所間的教學將無法延續。

過去相關文獻已顯示，台灣幼小階段在課程
內容、上課時間、作業規定、情境佈置、評量等
方面仍存有差異（盧美貴，1993；何家儀，2003），而這些落差就是一個不連續現象的表徵。研究者
在經驗連續性的提醒下，認為關係人在選擇策略
時的教育觀點是否一致，將影響其策略能否彼此
互補或相互延續。因此本研究中，除瞭解大班家
長與幼小教師所採用的銜接策略，也探究其選擇
策略時所持的教育觀。最後，以經驗連續性觀點
比較三者間在銜接策略與教育觀點的異同，並對
此提出解釋。

為求研究結果的呈現能具體且聚焦，研究者
透過預試訪談與文獻整理，得知台灣家長與幼小
教師最為關注的銜接內容為「注音符號學習」與
「生活能力適應」。故於正式研究中，藉此二議
題了解受訪者對銜接的看法與作法。

根據上述，發展出研究目的：
(一) 瞭解幼稚園大班家長與幼小教師之幼
小兒童教育觀。
(二) 瞭解幼稚園大班家長與幼小教師之注
音符號學習與生活能力適應的銜接策略。

(三) 比較幼稚園大班家長與幼小教師之注
音符號學習與生活能力適應之幼小兒
童教育觀與銜接策略。
(四) 從經驗連續性探討幼稚園大班家長與
幼小教師之幼小兒童教育觀與注音符
號學習與生活能力適應之銜接策略的
異同。

貳、研究方法
一、研究方法的選擇
本研究欲獲取幼小銜接相關人員之較為深層
的看法與意見，適合採用訪談法進行研究。為能
彌補結構式訪談標準化流程無法蒐集到的深層資
料，也能避免開放式訪談可能導致的失焦問題，
因此，本研究中以半結構式訪談法（「引導—開
放」的問法）蒐集資料。

二、研究取樣對象
研究範圍包括台灣台北縣市大班家長以及幼
小教師。為能收取不同區域之受訪者之意見，本
研究以分層便利抽樣（台北縣市—教育程度—學
校類型）方式，以讓不同縣市（台北縣市）、不
同教育程度之行政區（平均值以上與平均值以
下）及不同類型場所（公私立幼稚園、公私立小
學、家庭）的關係人都有代表。合計22位受訪者
（如表3-1）。取樣對象非配對樣本，為研究限制
之一。

其中，行政區教育程度之計算，是以台北市
政府與台北縣政府網站公告之「民國92年 15歲

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>縣市</th>
<th>台北市</th>
<th>台北縣</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>行政區教育程度</td>
<td>平均值以上</td>
<td>平均值以下</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>學校類型</td>
<td>公立</td>
<td>私立</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大班教師</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大班家長</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小一教師</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>合計</td>
<td>22人</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

三、資料處理
將錄音資料轉換為逐字稿後，對逐字稿內容進行編碼與歸納，再以社會科學統計套裝軟體 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences，SPSS，11.5版) 進行描述性統計分析 (雖嘗試進行卡方考驗，但因細格人數不足，故不進行)。

研究中以「參與者核稿」與「評分者一致性」考驗本研究之信度。前者，將所得之研究資料，經由研究參與者進行查核，認定與評估 (黃政傑，1987)。多數受訪者對逐字稿內容與資料處理結果均表示意見。後者，針對5份分析資料 (訪談份數20%) 進行考驗，本研究信度為0.79。

參、研究結果
研究結果依循經驗連續性的脈絡，依序呈現大班家長與幼小教師之幼小教育觀、所採用的幼小幼接策略。最後以經驗連續觀點剖析目前幼小幼接概況。

一、幼稚園大班教師、大班家長與小一教師之
幼小教育觀
從訪談資料中，整理出可能影響幼小教師與
大班家長的敘述理论，包含：發展合宜、小學預
備觀；幼小階段各有其學習重心、理想的白紙
說、重視常規與生活能力的養成等。

(一) 發展合宜
從表4-1-1顯示，幼小教師與大班家長在
「發展合宜」的觀點中，三者的反應次數不完
全相同。大班教師最關注「重視幼兒發展」
(29.4%)，其次為「小肌肉發展」(25.3%)，可見
大班教師普遍以「幼兒發展」為主，幼小教師
學習成字；大班家長則較為關注「大班幼兒的個
人特質」(35.7%)，可能家長對孩子的個性或習慣
有較深的瞭解，以及在接觸過程中所關注是「單
一幼兒」，與幼小教師同時需要照料數十位學童
不同，因此顯見其他二者經常以幼兒的個人特
質來安排不同形式的接觸活動；而小一教師則較以
小一新生的「學習動機與意願」(36.4%) 來考量
接觸策略的安排，小一教師認為這是小一新生能
否在學習過程中持續學習與進步的關鍵。

(二) 小學預備說
在「幼稚園需要為小學預備」中，有75%的大
班教師、87.5%的大班家長與83.3%的小一教師
表示有條件的「預備小學課程」，其中又以大
班家長的比率最高。所謂有條件的「預備小學課程」表示在
某些情況下「預備小學課程」，如：大班幼兒有意願
學習、注音符號教學方法「正確」等。從大
班教師與家長的看法中，可以感受到其「矛盾」
心理：雖不希望大班幼兒提早做預備，可是在「提早學習注音的風氣」、「對小一教師的不相
任」、「避免小一新生受到學習上挫折」等因素
考量下，則認為需要提前做準備。但大班教師與
家長皆表示會「轉換」方法與態度 (如透過遊戲
方式進行)，以免影響幼兒未來的學習意願；也
有大班教師(12.5%) 與大班家長 (12.5%) 表示
「無條件的」，也就是認為「一定」要提前預
備小學課程。小一教師多表示「有條件的」，
在小一新生需要同時適應課程與新生活的考量
下，認為幼稚園階段先以較輕鬆的方式做預備，
能讓小一新生適應的較輕鬆。

(三) 幼小階段各有其學習重心
所有受訪者皆認為「幼小階段各有其學習
重心」，不外在程度上仍有些差異。有75%的大
班教師、87.5%的大班家長及66.7%的小一教師
表示「有條件的」的「預備小學課程」，指在「多
數幼稚園沒有提早教注音」或「在小一教師願意
按部就班教注音」的情況下，受訪者認為大班幼
兒「本來」就不需提前學習注音，應該開心的體
驗生活。顯示三者雖肯定童年的珍貴，仍認為有
必要提前預備小學課程 (特別是注音符號)，可見
理想與現實間的落差。但仍有25% 的大班教
師、12.5% 大班家長與33.3% 小一教師表示
「無條件的」，認為幼小階段本有其不同的學
習重心，堅持不在學前階段提前預備小學課程，
表4-1-1
幼小兒童教育觀次數統計表 (N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>主軸</th>
<th>選項 / 受訪者</th>
<th>大班教師 (N=8)</th>
<th>大班家長 (N=8)</th>
<th>小一教師 (N=6)</th>
<th>總計 (N=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>發展合宜</td>
<td>重視幼兒整體發展</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>小肌肉發展</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>衝突與親子關係特質有關</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>順其自然就好</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>肯定幼兒的學習能力(潛能)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>重視孩子的學習動機</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總反應次數 (次)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小學預備說</td>
<td>不贊成</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有條件贊成</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>無條件贊成</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>無所謂</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計 (人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>幼小階段各有</td>
<td>不贊成</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有條件贊成</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>無條件贊成</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計 (人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>理想的白紙說</td>
<td>不要教注音</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>一定要教注音</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>可以教/有條件的教</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計 (人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>重視常規</td>
<td>贊成</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(禮貌、品格)</td>
<td>與生活能力</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
並表示在學前階段應確實培養大班幼兒的生活自理、人際溝通、解決問題等能力才是最有助於順利銜接小學的。

(四) 理想白紙說
　
當小一教師表示希望幼稚園不要教注音符號的時候，會以「白紙」來形容小一新生，如：「那我們寧願他像白紙一樣，讓我們來教他，他更能吸收。」(ET 市公 1-1 - p4)。表 4-1-1 顯示，50% 的小一教師認為白紙的觀點，但大班教師與大班家長的反應似乎不如小一教師來的支持。有 87.5% 的大班教師與 75% 的大班家長持「一定要教」或「可以教/有條件的教」等與上述小一教師相反的說法。此外也有 16.7% （一位）的小一教師表示以目前的狀況（指多數幼兒有提前學習）來說，還是需要先做點預備。

(五) 常規與生活能力的培養
　
所有的幼小教師與大班家長一致重視常規禮貌等生活態度、以及生活能力的培養，甚至有人表示這樣的能力比認知能力更重要，如：「生活能力方面，我們通常會要求比較嚴格，……因為我覺得幼稚園就在生活自理方面比他的認知重要嘛。」(KT 縣公 2-1 - p 6)。

小結

在幼小兒童教育觀中，幼小教師與大班家長在「發展合宜」、「常規與生活能力的重要」等皆表示同意，但在「小學預備課」、「幼小階段各有其學習重心」與「理想的白紙說」等項目上則不如前述三項的完全一致，也顯示出多數受訪者在銜接過程中論及「課業預備」時，原本的理想童年的理念與學習目標可能受到挑戰，而必須在「有條件」(如：公私立幼稚園皆將注音符號課程回歸小學、肯定小一教師會按部就班的教學等) 的情況下來繼續支持。

從研究結果可知，目前幼小教師與大班家長對於「條件」的定義，並沒有一致（非指「相同」）的看法，僅有各自的標準與期待來為大班幼兒／小一新生進行銜接工作。在幼小教育理念與重心未能在幼小教師間達成一致協議的狀況下，幼小兩階段的學習內容可能出現重複（幼小教師同時認為很重要）或缺乏（幼小教師同時忽略）的情形，而未能達到「互補」或「連續」的目標。

二、幼稚園大班教師、大班家長與小一教師之
幼小銜接策略

本節呈現三類受訪者所進行的銜接策略，並比較策略間的異同。本節中呈現四個主題：(一)注音符號教學內容銜接；(二) 幼小教學方式與態度的銜接；(三) 生活能力的銜接；(四) 學習環境銜接與其他。

(一) 注音符號教學內容銜接
　
表 4-2-1 呈現大班教師與家長在幼稚園與家庭內所進行的注音銜接策略。大班教師最常進行的注音銜接策略為「由多到少」：(1)「運筆練習」(87.5%) 與「注音符號／國字的寫／抄寫／筆順練習」(87.5%)、「注音符號單音認識／唸讀練習」(75%) 與「注音符號雙音或三音的拼音練習練習」(75%)，如：「到（大班）下學期我們就會有拼音的，……我們就會讓孩子熟悉那個拼音，和音怎么唸」(KT 縣公 1-1 - p1)；但仍有少數（25% 以下）的大班教師並沒有進行相關活動的，原因是：(一) 未曾接受注音符號專業訓練而不教，如：「現在跟我們（以前）學的完全不一樣，現在他是直接就拼在裡面，……那對我們來說其實就，因為我們沒有受過這樣的訓練嘛」(KT 市公 1-1 - p3)；(二) 政策（教育局）規定不能教。

大班家長最常進行的注音銜接策略為「注音符號雙音或三音的拼音練習」(87.5%)，如：「在洗澡的時候就開始ㄅ啊，就开始唸開始ㄅ啊」，你就開始隨便唸嘛，……，他就開始ㄅ啊，然後給你唸ㄅ啊，就是這樣子……」(KP 縣公 1-1 - p3)；但 12.5% – 37.5% 的大班家長因幼稚園已經有教，所以在家中沒有進行相關活動。可見多數家長在家中有進行注音相關教學活動，沒有教的也是因為幼稚園教了。根據受訪家長之說法，其大班幼兒皆已提前預備注音能力。

研究結果顯示，大部分的大班教師與家長皆有進行注音符號教學，且幾乎不只進行「注音符號的認、唸」，較難的拼音部分也有提供學習機
表4-2-1
注音符號教學內容銜接次數統計表 (N=16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>主軸</th>
<th>選項</th>
<th>受訪者 (N=8)</th>
<th>大班教師 (N=8)</th>
<th>大班家長 (N=16)</th>
<th>總計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>運筆練習</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>有做</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5% 37.5% 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總計</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>注音符號單音認識、唸讀聼</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>有做</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0% 25.0% 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總計</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>注音符號雙音或三音的拼音練習</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>有做</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0% 12.5% 18.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總計</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>注音符號/國字的寫/抄寫/筆順練習</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>有做</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5% 37.5% 25.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總計</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

會。目前台灣教育政策仍規定幼稚園不應為小學課程預做準備，但多數幼稚園與家庭普遍為大班幼兒進行注音符號銜接，且教學內容與方式不一（有的會教，有的已經學過），使得小一新生入學時的注音符號程度參差不齊，對小一教師未來的教學來說勢必是一大挑戰。

（二）幼小教學方式與態度的銜接

表4-2-2呈現出幼小訪問者透過學前階段「由下往上」或小學「由上往下」進行銜接工作的情形。其中，所有的大班教師皆曾提供注音教材或課程來協助大班幼兒注音符號的學習。87.5%的大班教師則會讓幼兒體驗小學例行活動（如：抄聯絡簿、寫作業），如：「那我們比方說

在一些生活的互動就給他提供一些這樣的情境，那比如說老師現在要抄東西了，我們要抄聯絡簿了，……／(KT縣1-1-p5)。在「採用幼小教學方式／態度／教材」方面，全部的大班教師皆有採用該策略，其中包含模擬小一上課、蒐集小一教材給幼兒，如：「學生家長的哥哥姊姊有專的教材，就借給我們看……／(KT市私立1-1-p7)。

同樣的，全部的大班家長皆曾嘗試協助幼兒學習注音，如：「其實他週末都會做些功課，平常時也有在寫，那週末時，就會比較多一點，像
是看故事書等等。」(KP市私2-1-p8)。其中有
62.5% - 87.5% 的大班家長透過注音符號練習本、數學練習本等教材讓大班幼兒提早熟悉小學
寫功课的工作。

小一教師則普遍皆有提供注音符號補救課
程、施予個別的輔導或分組測驗等方式以協助新
生注音符號的學習，如：「等於分級一樣，你
分，這個（學生）最弱的，……，那我在考驗寫
的時候，他只要考這個，口；，好停，那邊開
始考，他是專門他的不一樣。」(ET縣私1-1-
p18)。在「小學例行活動的體驗」的部分，小一
教師皆有進行的活動是「考試規則的熟悉/練
習」，如：「小一考試是有階段性的，黑板上會
有範例，一定要考慮到幼稚園沒有那個（測
驗）」。」(ET縣公1-2)。「採用幼小教學方式／態
度／教材」方面，有83.3% 的小一教師則嘗試以
畫小日記、大班幼兒熟悉的手指操、使用幼稚園
教師常用的語言（如：做老師的小幫手），或以
擁抱的方式與小一學生「交心」，讓剛入學的小
一新生在新環境中能保有部分熟悉的經驗。

研究結果顯示，學前教育階段在教學方法與
課程設計上「由下往上」銜接小學；同樣地，小
一教師也盡力「向下銜接幼稚園」以幫助小一新
生適應新環境，雖然過去研究中較少肯定這個部
分，但於本研究中，確實感受與接收到小一教師
的付出與熱情。

表4-2-2
幼小教學方式與態度的銜接次數統計表 (N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>主軸</th>
<th>選項</th>
<th>受訪者</th>
<th>大班教師</th>
<th>大班家長</th>
<th>小一教師</th>
<th>總計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=6)</td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>協助注音符號教學之銜接策略的使用/提供</td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計(人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>小學例行活動的體驗</td>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
<td>(62.5%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計(人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>採用幼(小)教學方式/態度/教材</td>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
<td>(83.3%)</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計(人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
（三）生活能力的銜接
生活能力銜接活動中包含自理能力、常規、作息時間的銜接適應。

由表4-2-3可知，全部的大班教師皆曾為了大班幼兒即將要進小一而強調自理能力的養成，如：整理書包、物品歸位、如廁、吃飯等；在常規銜接方面，大班教師（75%）會以模擬小一制定班級公約或選舉班級幹部來進行，如：「然後我們會選班長，然後一排會選排長，跟小學一樣，⋯⋯，是帶動上國小，適應那個國小的風氣，⋯⋯」(KT市公2-1 - p11)；在「模擬幼小作息」的部分，大班教師（100%）會進行小學作息的模擬與到校時間的提醒（準時到校），如：「因為講到幼小，那我們幼稚園的部分的話，我會盡量把他安排像小學那個樣子啦，比如說，他們的作息時間，⋯⋯」(KT縣私2-1 - p1)。

同樣地，全部的大班家長在自理能力上也有要求，如自己穿衣服、協助家務等；而「常規銜接」方面，大班家長（87.5%）多關注在大班幼兒的坐姿調整；在作息時間的銜接上，87.5%的大班家長因重視作息時間的銜接，會在家中協助幼兒建立早睡早起的習慣，如：「我慢慢提升她睡眠的品質，對，那以前幼稚園有時候，她可以晚睡晚起，她現在就不行啊，⋯⋯，儘量九點以前到校⋯⋯」(KP市私1-1 - p10)。

小一教師在生活能力銜接的安排方面，全部皆曾透過課堂訓練（如：練習收拾書包、掛衣服等）、生活練習（如：不挑食、撿抹布、縫垃圾桶袋等）等方式來培養小一新生的自理能力；而且皆表示「常規」建立為小一新生入學後的首要工作之一。在作息時間銜接的部分，83.3%的小一教師進行協助小一新生適應小學作息時間的策略，

### 表4-2-3
生活能力的銜接次數統計表 (N=22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>主軸</th>
<th>選項\訪問者</th>
<th>大班教師</th>
<th>大班家長</th>
<th>小一教師</th>
<th>總計</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=8)</td>
<td>(N=6)</td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>加強自理能力的養成</td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計（人）</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>常規銜接</td>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(25.0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(75.0%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計（人）</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>模擬幼小的作息</td>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(87.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>總計（人）</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
如不立刻嚴格要求小一新生上課要坐滿40分鐘（三倍）、開學前幾週提供點心時間（一位）、午睡時間的延長（一位），如「他們剛來的時候我們都讓他們睡覺到兩點，他們前十週都睡覺到兩點」(ET縣公2-1-p14)。

由上述結果可知，生活能力銜接以「自理能力」與「模擬幼小作息」普遍受到幼小教師與大班家長的重視，顯示學前教育與小學教育階段皆有提供「緩衝」機會，希望藉此讓大班幼兒/小一新生能漸漸適應小學生活。

（四）學習環境與其他銜接
「學習環境銜接」的策略指受訪者是否在幼稚園教室內提供大班幼兒體驗小學座位，或在小學教室內提供角落供小一新生使用，與受訪者的「其他意見」（略）一併呈現於表4-2-4。由表可知，50%的大班教師表示為了解決大班幼兒適應小學學習環境，會提供相關的策略，如「聽鐘聲、上課坐在椅子上聽講（而非坐在地板上）」，但也同樣有50%的大班教師則表示沒有改變教室設置，原因包含教室原本就是有桌椅的擺設，或覺得沒有必要調整原本坐在地板上的習慣。

有83.3%的小一教師表示會在教室內設置學習區，提供小一新生彈性運用，如課時間、完成作業後的等待時間等。

表4-2-4
學習環境銜接與其他銜接策略次數統計表（N=22）

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>主軸</th>
<th>選項</th>
<th>受訪者 (N=8)</th>
<th>大班教師 (N=8)</th>
<th>大班家長 (N=8)</th>
<th>小一教師 (N=6)</th>
<th>總計 (N=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>教室設備的介紹或體驗</td>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>不適用</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(83.3%)</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總計(人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>其他銜接策略</td>
<td>未提</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>沒有做</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.5%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>有做</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(62.5%)</td>
<td>(75.0%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>總計(人)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>(100.0%)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
小結

由上述中，可知目前幼小教師與大班家長各自在其住所場所以內為幼小銜接工作而努力。除了從教學方面著手外，受訪者者雖非立法機構人員而難以針對法規部分進行調整，但仍盡力規劃類似幼小的教學環境（空間）及作息時間（制度）以符合Kagan所提之「結構的一貫性」。但從訪談資料中明顯可知三方銜接策略間缺乏系統性的規畫，以致於銜接經驗的重複或不足，而其結果顯現在大班幼兒／小一新生注音符號程度不一、部分小一新生自理能力未能與認知能力成正比等方
面，如：「他們（小一學生）對於很多的事情好像都還不懂，父母可能會教很多，但是相對的某方面的自理能力，就是在實踐方面欠缺，所以有時候在自理方面就沒有很落實，所以我們（小一教師）要花很多時間在常規訓練，……」(ET市公
1-1 - pl)。

三、從經驗連續觀剖析幼小銜接策略

歸納本研究之幼小教師與大班家長之幼小兒
童學習觀，顯示三方從事銜接策略的動機、目的以及期待並不一致，研究資料也顯示三方所選擇之銜接策略與經驗有重複（特別是注音符號）與不連續的現象。由上述可知，在幼小銜接重要關
係人間幼小兒童教育觀不一致的情況下，幼小銜
接工作最後只能落入重要關係人「各自努力」的
窘境。從經驗連續性來看，幼小教師與家長間幼
小兒童教育觀的不一致是其銜接策略重複與不連
續的可能原因；但過去台灣幼小銜接相關研究未曾從此觀點切入探究，研究者認為這也是多年來相
關研究所提之適應問題未能有所改善的可能原
因。

因此，幼小銜接相關人員應正視彼此不同的哲學思想（教育理念）對幼小兒童銜接結果的影
響。唯有盡快建立溝通管道，透過彼此充分的合
作與互補，才可能提供連續的銜接經驗以確實幫
助幼小兒童順利渡過銜接階段。

肆、 建議

依研究結果對幼稚園與小學（簡稱幼小學
校）、教育單位及未來研究人員提出建議。

(一) 對幼小學校的建議

從研究結果發現，幼小教師皆有進行銜接策
略，但在幼小兒童教育觀未能有共通期望的情況
下，三者之策略是點狀而非連續的。因此建議幼
小教師應嘗試建立溝通平臺，如：由當地小學於
學期協同下學年度之低年級教師舉辦幼小銜接
座談會，邀請該學區內之幼稚園與托兒所主管、
教師以及家長與會討論，以設法及早在教育觀點
上取得共識，再以此為根基，發展出符合教學連
續性的銜接策略。

(二) 對教育單位的建議

研究結果顯示，幼小教師與家長各自進行銜
接策略，可能使得幼兒在幼小階段產生經驗上的「重複」或「缺乏」。研究者建議教育單位可發揮
公部門力量，統整與規劃不同場所內的人員可分
別進行的銜接策略，及早提供給幼小學校與家庭
做參考，如：幼小銜接手冊—一家長版。

(三) 對未來研究的建議

研究結果顯示幼小銜接相關人員之幼小兒
童教育觀的不同，其所選擇的銜接策略也不一。但
研究中僅從訪談資料歸納影響受訪者的教育觀
點，尚未透過深入的後設分析，探究可能形成其
信念的原因與歷程。因此建議未來研究可嘗試瞭
解相關人員教育信念的成因，以作為未來師資培
育與親職教育課程安排之參考。
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Transitions in Literacy Learning in Early Childhood

Laurie MAKIN
Department of Early Childhood Education
The Hong Kong Institute of Education

Abstract
In this paper, I discuss transitions in literacy learning at two important periods in children’s lives: the transition from home to an early childhood setting; and the transition from an early childhood setting to school. While change is part of life, children need support to reconcile discontinuities. The central importance of partnerships between early childhood practitioners and families in supporting young children's literacy learning is emphasized and some of the issues involved in developing productive partnerships are explored. I suggest that a willingness to recognize and accept the knowledge and expertise of families is a key step, and I offer guidelines to support this process.

摘要
本文作者探讨兒童在生命中兩個重要時期的閱讀學習的銜接，這兩個時期包括由家庭過渡到幼教機構以及由幼教機構過渡到小學。轉變是人生中不可或缺的一部分；兒童需要支援才能順利過渡到不同階段。作者強調，幼兒教育工作者和家庭之間的夥伴關係是培養兒童閱讀學習能力的關鍵。要建立良好的夥伴關係，過程上往往遇到不少問題，本文亦會嘗試探討一些例子。要發展有效的家校合作，接納家庭擁有的知識是重要的一步。作者最後並提供有關的指引。

Introduction
Most children make the breakthrough into conventional literacy in one or more languages anywhere between the ages of four and seven (Teale & Sulzby, 1986). This seemingly simple statement raises a number of issues, for example, what we mean by the terms ‘literacy’ and ‘conventional literacy’, how we recognise the breakthrough, and how early childhood educational institutions support individual differences. In this paper, I focus on issues surrounding support at two major transition points in children’s learning trajectories - the transition between home-based care and children’s first early childhood setting; and the transition between prior to school services and the first year of school. These transitions include changes in:

• the contexts of literacy learning - for example, techno-literacy may be developed more at home than at school;
• the content of literacy learning - for example, schools may favour traditional, children’s narratives to information books; and
• teaching methods - for example, children may be more free to learn through exploration at home and at preschool than they are when they start school.

The last generation has seen a revolution in literacy, a term that is often replaced by the word ‘multiliteracies’ (New London Group, 1996). Paper-based print is increasingly superseded by technologies that are multimodal, including graphics, sound and non-linear design. Children may encounter the well-known classics of Western children’s literature on television, DVD or in the cinema before they encounter them in their original form (if, indeed, they ever do). The work of A. A. Milne as appropriated and interpreted by Disney is a prime example of this process. Early writing often begins with pressing computer keys and includes WordArt features. Increasing levels of environmental print (huge billboards, TV screens in shopping malls and subway platforms, advertisements on the sides of buses, logos and slogans on clothes, and so on) surround children in their everyday lives, both within their homes and in their communities. A consequence of this rapid change and of the conservative nature
of educational institutions in responding to societal change appears to be a growing gap between the literacy children encounter in educational settings and the literacy they encounter in their homes and communities (Lankshear & Knobel, 2003), which may mean that children are increasingly ill-prepared for their role as literate citizens in a globalised, technology-driven world.

There is now general recognition that literacy begins at birth - is ‘emergent’ - and that it is family members and staff in early childhood settings prior to school entry who are children’s first literacy educators. It is in the years prior to school entry that children begin to develop their knowledge of how literacy functions in their world and their dispositions to engage (or not) in early literacy experiences. Mullis et al. (2003), in a study of the reading achievement of children in 35 countries, found that a key factor in successful school reading was prior to school literacy experiences.

The term ‘emergent literacy’ refers to the knowledge and skills that children demonstrate prior to their becoming conventionally literate. A recent, ongoing project in New South Wales, Australia (Makin & Spedding, 2001; Makin, 2004) has found that:

- Children between birth and three years demonstrate a wide range of emergent literacy behaviours (ELBs);
- There are significant individual differences in the ELBs that are demonstrated by children within the same age windows (focus periods are 8-12 months, 18-22 months, and 32-36 months);
- Gender differences in ELBs are apparent to parents by the end of the first year of their child’s life: these appear to increase as the children grow older.

There are a number of important implications of this information, for example:

1. Partnerships between families and early childhood educators are essential if children’s early literacy learning is to be supported effectively;
2. All educational settings, including those in which children from birth to three are included, need to have a focus on early literacy and on supporting the work of families as their children’s first literacy educators;
3. Concerns about boys and literacy need to be addressed long before children enter school;
4. Teacher education programs (pre-service and in-service) should include a focus on communicating with families, as well as components relating to curriculum content and pedagogy.

**Developing partnerships**

There is currently general recognition of the importance of partnerships in literacy learning (see, for example, Hughes & MacNaughton, 1999), but in reality the ‘partnerships’ are often one-sided. In one study carried out in New South Wales, Australia (Makin et al., 1999), it was found that information about literacy in 79 early childhood settings (preschools and long day care centres) was predominantly a one-way transmission - from the setting to the home, not vice versa. Other findings were that this was particularly so in communications in multilingual communities, and that teachers in all areas under-estimated the extent to which this was the case, i.e., they thought the information exchange was much more even/two-way than it was.

Family members know young children in their families better than anyone. They also know what sorts of interactions and activities are appropriate and indeed possible within their homes and communities. Teachers, academics and policy planners know the research literature relating to the support of early literacy learning and can identify major factors contributing to the building of strong literacy foundations. In successful partnerships the special knowledge of both partners is recognised and validated and the partners can work out strategies to incorporate support for children’s early literacy learning within a range of home and community settings. One of the challenges is how to share information in such a way that both parties see their own expertise as valued and valuable and in which both parties are willing to adapt their own practices.
in response to this acceptance, i.e., schools must be ready for children as well as children being ready for schools.

The voices of children are often missing from discussions of home-school partnerships. However, recent initiatives (see, for example, Yeo & Clarke, 2005; Makin & Whiteman, 2005; Clark & Moss, 2001) are beginning to address this gap. Individual differences, gender, peer relationships, ethnicity, socio-economic status, and family composition all influence children’s growing sense of identity. As part of this growing sense of identity, children begin to develop a sense of themselves as learners (e.g., clever or not clever) and become more or less disposed to engage in particular practices, in specific contexts, and with relevant individuals in their home and community settings. Partnerships with families must include recognition and validation of all children’s literacy experiences, for example, in various languages and dialects, and in a range of home and community settings outside educational institutions. Much work in literacy over the past decade has focused on the notion of ‘cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1991), and demonstrated how the literacy experiences of some children mean that their transition from home to educational settings is either easier or more problematic than the transitions of other children because not all children’s social capital is validated within educational settings, for example, non-dominant languages and dialects and technological expertise may be undervalued in many early childhood settings.

Promoting engagement in literacy learning
An important role of adults in children’s early literacy learning - whether those adults are family members or teachers - is to ensure that children enjoy their early literacy experiences, see these experiences as interesting and useful, see themselves as competent learners, and develop the desire to engage in more such experiences. It is not enough to know how to do something - children need to want to do it. Razfar and Gutierrez (2003, p. 38) define early literacy learning as ‘a multi-dimensional and mutually engaging process between adults and children’, a definition that foregrounds both the diversity of literacy experiences in today’s world and children’s agency in the learning process.

Current theoretical perspectives on literacy tend to reflect either a developmental framework coming out of psychology and psycholinguistics (see, for example, Teale & Sulzby, 1986) or a sociocultural framework coming out of sociology and sociolinguistics (see, for example, Heath, 1983; Luke, 1992). For many people, these two perspectives are antithetical. However, they can also be seen as complementary, offering different lenses to see different aspects of the process of literacy learning and hence promote children’s engagement in the process.

It is too late to leave planning for literacy learning until the first years of school or even until children enter preschool. In relation to reading, the Australian Language and Literacy Council stated in 1995 (p. 34) that ‘The likelihood that children will succeed in learning to read when they enter the formal K-12 schooling world depends, above all else, on how much they have already learned about reading and writing before they enter Kindergarten’. This view is confirmed by the recent Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) (Mullis et al., 2003), which found that successful readers in the 35 countries involved in the study had engaged in many early literacy activities prior to school entry. In literacy, as in other areas, Birth to three matters (Sure Start, n.d.). So do parents, other family members, and early childhood teachers. A major focus on very young children and their families will improve literacy outcomes for all young learners. However, there are many potential dangers and pitfalls which must be considered if children’s early literacy is to be optimally supported during major transition periods.

Supporting transitions
As Kennedy and Surman (2006 in press) point out, children may experience many discontinuities as they move from home to an early childhood setting and from a prior to school setting to a school setting. These discontinuities can be in curriculum content and organization and pedagogy, and in the theoretical
perspectives affecting decisions about how, what and when children should learn. There are also discontinuities in interpersonal relationships, for example those relating to adult-child ratios, level of formality between teachers and children, and the roles expected of parents (e.g., helping with homework); and in the features of the educational settings such as furniture arrangement and personal autonomy and free choice of activities and of time spent on various activities.

Such discontinuities have consequences for children. For example, differences in literacy pedagogy can mean children may not be able to demonstrate what they know (Strickland, 1990). The value attributed to various social and cultural practices will disadvantage some children and advantage others. The role of parents and other family educators as their children’s first educators reduces as children progress through the educational system and, in some cases, children from minority linguistic and cultural groups may reject the literacies of their homes and communities in their desire to join the mainstream and be accepted by their peers. There can thus be psychological as well as educational dangers.

How, then, can continuity in literacy learning between the early childhood settings of home, preschool/daycare and the first years of school be increased and the shock of transitions lessened, especially in cases in which there are significant cultural, linguistic and socioeconomic differences? One important key would seem to be the development of shared understandings between families and early childhood practitioners, both in prior to school settings and in the first years of school.

**Developing shared understandings in literacy learning**

Many studies (see, for example, Mcleod, 1996; Raban, 2003; Reese & Gallimore, 2000) indicate that families are generally keen for their children to succeed in school. Successful literacy, as judged by the school, is a key indicator of this. The onus for adaptation to the point at which shared understandings are reached resides both in the family and in the educational setting. Let us look at each of the partners in turn.

**Families**

It is common for family literacy programs and early intervention programs to focus on the need for parents to change their practices and increase their knowledge so that they can meet the expectations of schools. Many early interventions and family literacy programs aim at preparing children for school and/or encouraging parents to act as teachers - a different concept than one of parents as first educators within the everyday contexts of home and community life.

Sometimes less coaching by parents is seen as necessary, in response to studies indicating that low income parents may be more likely to emphasize rote skills than middle class parents, who are seen as generally adopting a more holistic approach. Sometimes more interaction around literacy is advocated. Reading frequently to children has received much attention in the last few years (see, for example, Fox, 2001), to the point where it is considered by some as a ‘magic bullet’, almost certainly guaranteeing successful school reading.

In the popular media, blame is often laid on mothers who work or who allow their children to watch too much television. It is interesting to note that the role of fathers is seldom emphasized in the research literature, although, with increasing evidence from international comparative studies such as PIRLS (Mullis et al., 2003) that boys are behind girls in reading and writing, the role of male models is increasingly considered.

Many parents may have minimal knowledge of children’s developmental trajectories, and many have unrealistically high expectations of their children’s literacy learning. Acceptance of errors as developmental pointers is difficult for some parents, who are concerned that their children should learn to read and write ‘properly’. On the other hand, some parents may see literacy as solely the responsibility of the school. The home language environment has received attention in recent years (see, for example,
Burgess, Hecht, & Lonigan (2002) with emphasis placed on the importance of adult-child interactions around literacy, literacy resources, and recognition by parents of their important role in early literacy learning.

**Early childhood educational settings**

There is great variation in approaches to early literacy in early childhood settings for young children, which include both prior to school settings such as preschool and daycare, and the first years of school. In some settings, literacy is seen as the role of the school, with the role of preschool being primarily to develop social skills. At the other extreme, in some preschool settings, there is a strong focus on school readiness, with the introduction of formal academic teaching through the use of worksheets and whole group study. Differences arise from national or regional regulations, with the guidance for teachers offered by the UK’s Foundation Stage being at one extreme, and the independence of Hong Kong kindergartens to determine their own curriculum at the other.

In general terms, literacy teaching becomes more formal and less contextualized. There is increasing emphasis on helping children attain the standards of literacy expected within the school and its local and national contexts. The curriculum is often very full and learning is more compartmentalized. Play usually becomes something children can engage in to relax following completion of set work, rather than as a central learning strategy.

Increased classroom sizes and curriculum pressures, particularly in the areas of literacy and numeracy may leave little time for the development of parent partnerships and an increased need for teachers to expect parents to help the school fulfill the learning outcomes that have been identified for children at different stages or ages.

**Towards shared understandings**

It is evident from the above summaries that much effort is needed on both sides if productive, supportive partnerships in early literacy are to be developed. Yet, because the research literature is unequivocal in emphasizing the benefits of such partnerships, their development must be seriously considered. The following guiding principles reflect research into the formation of partnerships (Mcleod, 1996; Cairney, 1997; Makin & Spedding, 2001; Powell, 1996; McCaleb, 1994; Serpel, 1997):

- A philosophical commitment to the development of shared understandings and parent-teacher partnerships must be implemented in ways that recognize both the time-consuming nature and the value of going beyond set curriculum documents to identify children’s experiences and knowledge. This enables teachers to link existing and new knowledge and experiences in ways that are meaningful to the children.

- A philosophical commitment must be supported with practical strategies that enable early childhood educators to learn more about children’s home and community literacy practices without unreasonably extending their work. A key strategy is some relief from classroom work to provide time for interviews, home visits, community engagement, informal conversations, disposable cameras, an open-door approach, and so on. Which of these are appropriate will differ from community to community and from family to family, so negotiation and discussion are necessary.

- Opportunities should be available within the educational setting for extended discussions with parents, and for workshops on areas of interest, e.g., television and literacy, gender and literacy that not only present research findings but discuss their relevance in terms of children’s lives. A room set aside for parents with comfortable seating and a welcoming atmosphere can facilitate this greatly. The ‘Schools as Community Centres’ initiative in New South Wales, Australia extends this idea to providing, where possible, a small cottage on school grounds which is the site of many community-based initiatives, including early literacy programs such as the ‘Support at Home for Early
Language and Literacies’ (SHELLS) program (Makin & Spedding, 2001).
• ‘The emphasis should be on doing things with parents rather than doing things to them’ (Mcleod, 1996, p. 129). This reminder is particularly important in areas or communities in which parents may have had either little or negative interactions with schools in their own childhood.

Conclusion
Dockett and Perry (1999) suggest that the way in which transitions are managed affects children’s attitudes towards future transitions and challenges. Transitions in literacy learning are supported through the development of shared understandings and strong partnerships that include children, their families and their teachers.
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Abstract
This study considered similarities and differences between preschool and Primary 1 in (i) mathematics curriculum guidelines; and (ii) in mathematics instruction. An analysis of curriculum guidelines indicated that there were clear differences in the mathematical competencies expected of preschool and Primary 1 children but similar approaches to instruction were recommended across the early years. In order to consider instructional differences between preschools and Primary 1, three lower kindergarten, upper kindergarten and Primary 1 classrooms were observed. Three consecutive lessons on the teaching of addition were videotaped resulting in a total of 27 lessons, with an equal number of classes for each age group. Observations focused on mathematics content and instructional strategies adopted. Results indicated that official guidelines were followed and that number and addition concepts were introduced sequentially. Claims that the Primary 1 curriculum was being followed in pre-primary schools were not substantiated by the observations and there did not seem to be a ‘push down effect’ of the Primary 1 curriculum in the preschool classes observed. However, there were differences in instructional approaches adopted by pre-primary and primary school teachers. Although the drill-and-practice approach was not common in Primary 1 classes, instruction was more formal and subject-based at the primary level whereas mathematics was taught through more informal and play-based approaches in the preschools. Reasons for these findings are discussed.

摘要
本文旨在探讨学前及小一在数学课程及教学两方面的差异。课程指引显示学前及小一在数学内容学习上有明显分别，而早期数学教学取向则甚为一致。作者选择了一个低幼、高幼及小一各三位教师任教班级连续三课共27节的加法教学，观察重於数学教学内容及其策略。结果显示各阶段教学内容均跟从官方指引，数字与加法概念深浅循序递增；然而学前及小小的教学策略则有差异，机械式的操练不普遍，但小一较为正规，强调科目为本，本文并讨论其中原因。

Introduction
Literature suggested that smooth and successful transition from pre-primary institutes to primary schools might enhance children’s performance in primary school (Daniels, 1995; Peisner-Feinberg, Burchinal, Clifford, Culkin, Howes, Kagan, & Yazejian, 2001; Taiwo & Tyolo, 2002; Yeboah, 2002)

1 Note for article: This article is based on research conducted by the author, in partial fulfillment of a Ph.D. degree, under the supervision of Dr Nirmala Rao. Portions of the research were presented at the 18th biennial meeting of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development in Ghent, Belgium in 2004. Thanks are expressed to Mr. Francis Lopez-Real and the staff and children associated with participating schools. Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to NG Sui Ngan Sharon, Department of Early Childhood Education, Hong Kong Institute of Education, 10 Lo Ping Road, N.T., Hong Kong. Electronic mail may be sent to suiang@ied.edu.hk.
and even at subsequent levels of education (Prince, Hare, & Howard, 2001; Ramey & Ramey, 1998). Nevertheless, the transition process might be difficult for some children.

In Hong Kong, official curriculum guides highlighted the natural continuity between pre-primary and primary studies. However, it was reported that there is “downward pressure” on kindergartens to adopt a formal academic curriculum in order to prepare children for the teacher-oriented and knowledge-transmission approaches of teaching commonly found in primary schools (Chan & Chan, 2002, 2003; Rao & Koong, 2000). Actually, there are continual debates over child-centered and academic oriented philosophy in Asian countries. Parents, administrators, policy-makers are exerting pressures on the implementation of developmentally appropriate practice in pre-primary programs. As a result, the mode of pre-primary schools learning is similar to that in primary schools (Mayfield, 2003).

Based on the previous writing (Ng & Rao, 2005), this paper focuses on discussing the similarities and differences between preschool and Primary 1 in mathematics curriculum guidelines and in mathematics instruction.

Children learning addition

There is a general consensus that number concepts are the foundation upon which higher mathematical competencies can develop (Rensnick, 1989). Addition of whole number was selected for it is included in both pre-primary and primary curricula.

Studies in infant arithmetic have revealed that concepts of addition and subtraction can be traced back to infancy (Sophian & Adams, 1987; Wynn, 1992). Early research in 1960s and 1970s revealed that pre-primary school children might have an understanding of the effect of addition and subtraction on numerosity: addition increases numerosity and subtraction decreases numerosity (Starkey & Gelman, 1982). Three to 4-year-olds demonstrate some understanding of very simple cardinal addition and subtraction, usually involving small numbers with addends less than 3. Normally, addition is considered as “getting some more” and subtraction is viewed as “losing some” (Fuson, 1992). Between 4 to 6 years, children are able to add larger numbers (Fuson, 1992).

Research conducted in Britain and the United States has shown that when children start school at the age of 5, they have considerable ability in simple addition and subtraction, provided that the numbers involved are small and elicited by clear concrete problems involving specific objects, people or events. Children start adding with direct representation of quantities by physical objects. Then, children solve problems with sums less than 10 and then move on to sums between 10 and 20 (Carpenter & Moser, 1982). Moreover, most 5-year-olds learn to compare the size of two numbers, and spontaneously combine their counting and comparing skills to invent strategies for solving simple addition problems (Bruer, 1993).

Pre-primary curriculum guide and the primary mathematics syllabus

This paper discusses curricular continuity across levels (Mayfield, 2003). In Hong Kong, there is recommended mathematics curriculum for primary schools while pre-primary schools are only provided with general curriculum guidelines.

The Guide to the Pre-primary Curriculum (Education Department, 1996) provided basic guidance, principles of teaching, and suggested activities for pre-primary school teachers. Although not a syllabus, the guide did provide basic references on the number and addition concepts introduced in pre-primary levels. No additional suggestion on curriculum content was included in the recent consultation document (Curriculum Development Council, 2006).

There is a clear, systematic mathematics curriculum for primary schools and the curriculum has been revised from time to time. In view of the recent drastic changes in schools, society and technology, a new syllabus was proposed. Based on the former Primary Mathematics Syllabus (Curriculum Development Council, 1983) and the
TOC Programme of Study of Mathematics (Curriculum Development Council, 1995), the existing Primary Mathematics Syllabus was put into implementation in September 2002.

The number and addition concepts that the present study focused on were included in the two curriculum guides. According to the guide\(^2\) (Education Department, 1996), it suggested to teach children how to count to 20. The writing of numbers would be taught in classes of 4-year-olds, and taught according to the individual ability of children. The combination and computation of numbers within 10 could be introduced after children mastered the concepts of numbers. It recommended that children learn addition and subtraction concepts from concrete experience and compute with real objects. Arithmetic problems should be avoided but simple and direct verbal computation using objects related to children’s daily life experiences could be introduced. The Guide disapproved the introduction of complicated computation, such as consecutive addition and mixed computation at the pre-primary stage. There is no clear recommendation on the mathematics concepts to be introduced to preschoolers of different year groups.

In the first term of Primary 1, numbers to 20, basic addition and subtraction within 18 would be introduced. In the second term, numbers to 100, addition within two places and subtraction within two places excluding decomposition were included. Daily life application, high-order thinking skills and fostering positive values and attitudes were emphasized (Curriculum Development Council, 2000b). Specifically on the concept of number and addition, issue of continuity is observed. In addition, early mathematics curriculum in pre-primary schools is assumed to anticipate a natural continuity with the primary curriculum as no pre-requisite academic knowledge was expected for children on their admission to Primary 1 (Education Department, 1993).

Nevertheless, literature revealed that the transition from pre-primary to primary education was neglected (Rao, 2002). There were cases of “formal treatment” in mathematics teaching resulting in continuity problems (Curriculum Development Council, 1999, p.5). It was claimed that the pre-primary schools implemented the Primary 1 syllabus to the 5-year-olds classes, leading to an overlapping in mathematics curricula at pre-primary and Primary 1 levels (Curriculum Development Council, 1999; Kwan, 2000; Rao, 2002).

Early mathematics instructions
Thematic Approach is currently the prevalent curriculum model adopted to allow flexible curriculum integration in pre-primary education. Stress is laid on the importance of play in promoting initiative, independence and creativity. Flexibility in scheduling daily learning activities is recommended to allow effective use of available resources, increasing children’s concentration and promoting learning through personal experience. Various forms of learning activities, such as whole-class learning, small group learning and individual learning, could be adopted (Curriculum Development Council, 1999; Education Department, 1996). The play-based approach of learning still prevails, as the recent consultation document proposed (Curriculum Development Council, 2006).

In the primary sector, ideas like child-centeredness and learning through meaningful and purposeful activities have meant reorganization of the school curriculum into an integrated and coherent whole, which is identical to the pre-primary school teaching philosophies (Education Department, 1996). The White Paper on Primary Education and Pre-primary Services published in 1981 recommended the development of the Activity Approach, particularly in Primary 1 to Primary 3 (Hong Kong Government, 1981). The Activity Approach aims at “promoting active and self-

---

\(^2\) The part on suggested number and addition concepts to be introduced in pre-primary schools was removed from the 2006 consultation document (Curriculum Development Council, 2006).
initiated learning, and encourages ‘learning by doing’ through purposeful, carefully designed activities. The emphasis is placed on learning by pupils rather than on instruction by the teacher.” (Education Department, 1993, p. 4). Flexible approaches as individual, class and group activities are recommended. A variety of learning methods such as group discussions, reading, visits, role plays, games, experimentation, and practical activities could be selected. The heuristic learner-centered approach is favored (Education Department, 1993). The content of the revised primary mathematics curricula has been decreased by about 15% to create more space for teachers (Curriculum Development Council, 2000b). The main focus is on how mathematics is learnt.

Official documents revealed that philosophical continuity is observed as activities, play and all-round development of the child are emphasized at both pre-primary and primary levels. However, statistics show that only about one-third of the primary schools have adopted the less formal Activity Approach that is rooted in the same child-centered philosophy (Education Commission, 1990). Therefore, pre-primary school teachers are concerned about the issue of adjustment when children entering primary schools (Rao & Koong, 2003). In addition, there are studies and reports showing that children in Hong Kong’s pre-primary and primary schools are expected to learn mathematical concepts through pencil and paper exercises, and curriculum is academic, teacher-centered, and driven by competitive, norm-referenced examinations (Ma, 1984; Morris, 1999). Wong (2000) also pointed out that the teaching approaches in the two sectors of schooling are quite different. The lack of resources, the high teacher-student ratio and the limited classroom space restrict the implementation of Activity Approach and the Target Oriented Curriculum (TOC) in primary schools. In addition, teachers are not adopting teaching methods that are considered developmentally appropriate. Teachers in both pre-primary schools and primary schools stress the 3Rs. Therefore, there appear to be differences and contradictions between the written official documents and actual practices.

**Method**

**Participants**

Teachers and children of three pre-primary and three primary schools in Hong Kong participated in the study. The sample schools are judged to be best serve the purposes of the study (Monette, Sullivan, & DeJong, 2002), information-rich (Patton, 2002). Two of the sampled pre-primary schools (School Category A and B) are non-profit making schools run by voluntary organizations, which are among the 60% of pre-primary schools in Hong Kong (Hong Kong Government, 2001a). The remaining primary school (School Category C) is privately run and is considered as being part of the “elite” group of schools. All sampled primary schools belong to the non-profit making, aided or government primary schools which 91% of the children in Hong Kong attend (Hong Kong Government, 2001b). Primary school belonged to School Category C is judged according to its location and education professionals. Another basic criterion for selection of the study participants are the establishment of the school. The schools are up to current standard with criteria such as standard class size and qualified teachers (Hong Kong Government, 2001a; Hong Kong Government, 2001b). Therefore, teachers involved in the study should be at least QKT and certificated primary school teachers. As diversity of teacher beliefs could be due to teacher preparation (Spodek, 1988),

---

3 “3Rs” in general refers to reading, writing and arithmetic.
4 There are no official definition and statistics on “elite” schools in Hong Kong. The “elite” pre-primary school in the present study is privately run. Whereas as majority of primary schools are aided or government primary schools, the “elite” primary school is judged according to the location and judgment of education professionals (such as ex-teacher of the school, primary school principal, lecturers of tertiary educational institutes).
5 QKT refers to Qualified Kindergarten Teacher. By September 2004, all new recruitment in pre-primary institutes should have QKT qualifications.
teachers should have gone through the survival stage in their teaching career, with at least two years of teaching experiences.

**Tools and Procedure**

Three consecutive lessons on the teaching of addition were videotaped resulting in a total of 27 lessons, with an equal number from lower kindergarten (4-year-olds in K2 level), upper kindergarten (5-year-olds in K3 level) and Primary 1 (6-year-olds) classrooms. To fit the schedules of the schools, videotaping of K3 and P1 classes fell in semester 1 of the school year whereas the K2 classes fell in semester 2. Questionnaires were dispatched to teachers to collect information on lesson planning and teachers’ views on mathematics instructions. Teachers were interviewed, in individual sessions, after videotaping in their classes was completed. Semi-structured interviews schedules were developed. A set of video clips including three levels of teaching (K2, K3 and P1) were chosen to help teachers see how the same topic was tackled by teachers dealing with children of varying ages. Teachers were guided to talk about views on teaching content, teaching approaches, teaching aids, learning environment, grouping, class size and time arrangements. Interview data were transcribed and were categorized with codes. Different sources of data were analyzed together and were used to countercheck one another. Both data source and data type triangulation was adopted.

**Results**

Study showed that the number and addition concepts presented were in line with the official curriculum guide. Both similarities and differences in instructional strategies were identified from pre-primary and primary schools. In general, recommended instructional strategies of the guidelines were followed.

**Number and addition concepts**

Based on the observations from the videos and teachers’ written instructional goals, the addition concepts introduced in the sampled lessons have been summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 showed that children in different levels were proceeding in learning addition and subtraction concepts involving small numbers (less than 5) in the 4 year age-group, towards learning of concepts involving numbers larger than 10, but less than 18, in the 6 year age-group. This is in line with the suggestions of official documents (Curriculum Development Council, 1995, 2000; Education Department, 1996) and the belief that the size of numbers involved in addition should increase as children mature (Fuson, 1988).

Video images further illustrated that there was an increase in difficulties of the addition concepts introduced. Whereas addition concepts involving binary concepts were introduced in primary schools, concepts introduced in pre-primary schools tended to be more straightforward and focused on unary concepts of addition only. The concepts of commutativity were identified in the classes of 5-year-olds and 6-year-olds but not in the classes of 4-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Category A</th>
<th>K2</th>
<th>K3</th>
<th>P1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counting,</td>
<td>Combinations of 6, 7 &amp; 8,</td>
<td>Combinations of 11 &amp; 12,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combinations of 3</td>
<td>addition within 8</td>
<td>addition and subtraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(binary operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Category B</td>
<td>Addition within 5</td>
<td>Combinations of 9,</td>
<td>Addition within 18,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>addition within 9</td>
<td>concepts of combination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and incremental, solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>word problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Category C</td>
<td>Addition and subtraction</td>
<td>Combinations of 10,</td>
<td>Addition and subtraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>within 5 (unary operations)</td>
<td>addition within 10</td>
<td>within 18, solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>word problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Binary concepts indicated that addition and subtraction operations that are performed on two quantities.*
year-olds. Children in pre-primary schools were guided to solve verbal problems, whereas children at the primary level had to solve both verbal problems, as well as word problems written in textbooks or exercise books. In addition, strategies in counting and addition were found to be different in pre-primary and primary schools. Pre-primary school children were adopting the “counting all” procedures (Case, 1982; Geary, 1994) while Primary 1 children were beginning to use the “counting on” and “counting backward” strategies (Case, 1982).

According to the teaching of concepts of addition, the present study found that the pre-primary schools were not implementing the Primary 1 syllabus in the 5-year-old classes. The overlapping of the mathematics curricula was not identified and the “push down” effect was not substantial. However, whether there is any overlapping of teaching content in other areas is not evident in the present study.

Teachers’ instructional strategies in different levels
This section investigates whether instructional strategies and learning activities were constructed according to children’s abilities in different levels, as the curriculum guides suggested.

In line with the Guide (Education Department, 1996), mathematics learning for both K2 and K3 levels in the sample pre-schools were integrated with the holistic curriculum (Ng & Rao, 2005) and regarded as a sense-making activity, relating to children’s familiar world. Different kinds of learning activities as large group, small group or free plays were adopted to facilitate concept acquisition and consolidation. Activities like counting animals, role play or story telling were frequently adopted to relate number or addition concepts with children’s daily life experiences in the sample schools.

K2 teachers were found teaching according to children’s abilities most of the time but would overestimate their abilities at the same time. For example, K2 children were challenged to play a “car racing” game with only symbolic representation, involving addition and subtraction within 5. Without the help of concrete manipulatives, many of the children could not get the correct answers mentally. Children start adding with direct representation of quantities by physical objects and pictorial representation (Carpenter & Moser, 1982). The activity indicated that the 4-year-olds were not ready to calculate symbolically without the presence of concrete materials or visual aids and were not yet ready for mental counting even though the numbers involved were small.

K3 teachers guided children to make use of concrete or semi-concrete materials in addition. As the curriculum guide suggested, verbal addition problems were presented in relationship to daily life situations or the prevailing themes. Children were expected to write the arithmetic operations representing these situations. For example, a K3 teachers guided the children to list out the “combinations of 8” by separating eight magnetic monkeys into two groups. K3 children demonstrated their abilities in counting with breakable chains when asked to solve addition arithmetic operations with the help of various manipulatives in another preschool. As the numbers involved were smaller than 10 and physical objects were available as aids, children were found to have little problem in counting, addition and writing the prescribed arithmetic operations either on the whiteboard or on their worksheets. This pre-operational stage is also marked by the emergence of the ability of the child to think symbolically and the emergence of mental calculation with the absence of external manipulation. Video images illustrated that some of the 5-year-olds were already beginning to handle numbers without the assistance of concrete objects. Although individual differences were identified from videos, most of the children were successful in finishing their assigned mathematics tasks.

Most pre-primary teachers were introducing simple arithmetic problems through direct verbal computation using objects related to children’s daily life experiences, as curriculum guide suggested. However, at the same time, teachers were not sure of whether mathematics concepts introduced met children’s abilities. As teachers said,
I think it is too early for 4-year-olds to learn combinations of numbers when they cannot even manage to count ... They don’t understand what is meant by addition and subtraction ... cannot master the symbol for addition ... However, the school has scheduled it; I have no choice but to teach. (K2 Teacher)

We teachers have to follow the schedule planned by the school. In my view, it is not necessary to teach some advanced concepts in pre-primary schools but I have to teach according to the set schedule, because children will be assessed on it. Although I have my stand point, I have to comply with the schedule. (K3 Teacher)

With the absence of mathematics syllabus in pre-primary schools, teachers were not sure of whether mathematics curriculum scheduled by individual schools meet the abilities of children.

In primary schools, there are no themes and mathematics lessons were isolated from other subjects (Ng & Rao, 2005). Nevertheless, as the curriculum guide suggested, addition concepts were conveyed through the adoption of real life examples. There were few concrete manipulatives were available in Primary 1 classrooms. Primary 1 children were proceeding to count with the use of physical objects to mental representation of objects (Fayol, 1992; Geary, 1994), learning aids were progressively changing from concrete to semi-concrete materials. For example, a primary school teacher was helping children to revise addition and subtraction within 18, by drawing pictures.

In general, primary mathematics lessons were subject-based and mainly directed by the teachers. However, primary school teachers were aware of the current trends in mathematics teaching and aligning strategies were followed. It was especially apparent for teachers implementing the 2002 primary mathematics syllabus. Although they reported that they were not often attending seminars or read articles or journals, they were aware of the changes implemented through various means. First, the new textbooks provided them with certain information about the changes.

Textbooks have been revised, with more emphasis on the building of concepts. I think it is better. For example, I now use magnets or concrete manipulatives to allow children to have first hand experiences. I also allow children to visualize the pictures of combination. I think it is better for students to construct [learning] by themselves. (P1 Teacher)

Second, the teachers’ guide gives teachers hints in organizing lessons, and in initiating related activities for children. Third, the seminars or workshops conducted by commercial publishers for promoting the new textbooks were useful in updating teachers’ knowledge on the current trends in mathematics education. Fourth, the new textbooks are accompanied by a set of learning aids for children. According to teachers, the presence of concrete learning materials substantially helped in changing the mode of instruction. Therefore, although there were differences in instructional approaches adopted by pre-primary and primary school teachers, traditional teaching mode emphasis on mechanically drill-and-practice was on the whole not common.

Apart from acquiring basic mathematics concepts during the early years, children are also expected to learn basic skills like problem-solving, communication, reasoning or using and applying mathematics. It was found that both pre-primary and primary school children were seldom guided to discuss or explore, and were children given the opportunity to communicate using mathematics. Implementation of curriculum guides in these aspects was not substantially identified. Children were instead guided to finish pencil and paper work with “correct answers” expected, both in pre-primary and primary levels (Ng & Rao, 2005).

Discussion
Official guidelines were followed and a progression
of number and addition concepts was introduced to children at different levels. The study showed that older children performed better than younger ones, and teachers were trying to adopt different strategies in teaching. Observations indicated that the 4-year-olds were able to learn mathematics through manipulation of physical objects but the older ones were able to learn through visual objects or abstract symbols. Although not all children were learning at the same speed, children were found to have made significant progress in mastering larger and more complicated number operations, as they grew and proceeded from one level to the other. If there were noticeable qualitative differences between 5-year-olds and 6-year-olds (Bee, 1999), children were expected to experience some differences that probably corresponded to their growth and development. Nevertheless, not all teachers were responding to the developmental characteristics of the children. The problem was more evident among pre-primary school teachers. The present study did not confirm claims that downward pressure from primary to pre-primary schools has resulted in the overlapping of mathematics curriculum. However, the study did not investigate whether the whole pre-primary mathematics curriculum geared towards the primary mathematics curriculum especially in the last year of study in pre-primary schools. Further study in this aspect is recommended.

Despite differences identified between pre-primary and primary schools, early mathematics teaching in general was no longer stuck in the traditional mode characterized by mechanical drilling of abstract symbols. Many of the instructional strategies recommended by curriculum guides and syllabus were followed and implemented. Mathematics concepts were introduced through themes or daily life examples, and with activity-based consolidation work. The importance of understanding before memorization was recognized. Notwithstanding this, looking for “correct” answers, writing arithmetic operations with standard formats, and helping children to gain “good” academic results in forms of marks, were prevalent. Learning through exploration or group activity was scarce. The present study revealed that early mathematics teaching in Hong Kong left much to be desired. Reform ideas were there but had just reached halfway to realizing the ultimate goal.

The presence of the syllabus appeared to have contradictory ramifications. With the absence of subject syllabus for preschools, teachers claimed that they were not sure of the appropriateness of the mathematics concepts introduced. However, it appeared that pre-primary schools had more flexibility in handling teaching approaches in the absence of a prescribed curriculum (Ng & Rao, 2005). Therefore, observation indicated that child-centered learning was more flexibly implemented at the pre-primary than at the primary level. On the other hand, the introduction of the new syllabus in primary schools had brought about substantial changes in implementation at the classroom level. The revised student textbooks and the accompanying teachers’ guide were providing notable help to primary school teachers. Primary school teachers appeared to be “well-supported”. The situation seemed to be paradoxical. On one hand, primary school teachers appeared to have less autonomy in following the syllabus, on the other hand, teachers found themselves orientating their teaching according to the ideas of current mathematics education. Therefore, the importance of the provision of official guidelines, in determining the actual implementation of recommended ideas, is highlighted.

The study also revealed that children in pre-primary schools were already learning basic addition concepts less than 10 while Primary 1 children were learning addition concepts larger than 10. It was a natural continuity in terms of size of numbers involved, and the complexities in using numbers. However, it appeared that pre-primary school children were already acquiring a certain amount of knowledge before entering primary schools. As “preliminary activities” have been deleted from the 2002 new primary mathematics syllabus, the addition concept is introduced early at the commencement of the first term of the school year. The question that can be asked is whether children would experience difficulties in mathematics learning if
they have had no pre-primary school mathematics learning background.

Conclusion
This paper revealed how early mathematics teaching was implemented in early childhood settings in Hong Kong. Official guidelines were followed and a progression in difficulties of mathematics concepts was introduced to children in different levels. Although children were likely experiencing differences in curriculum, physical environment, and teaching approaches when they moved from pre-primary to primary school, the change was not abrupt and, in general, did not go beyond children’s abilities. It was a challenge to children, but the transition was smooth with regard to children’s development. Early mathematics instruction was found staying away from traditional mode emphasized solely on drill-and-practice, changes were already on its way although appeared to be slow-moving. Primary school teachers were well-supported in the process of change with the provision of official curriculum guide.
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小一適應問題：焦慮、壓力與應對方法

Children’s Fear, Stress and Coping during Transition from Kindergarten to School

黃 敏 胡婉媔
香港教育學院 幼兒教育學系

摘要
本文闡述在香港進行的一項研究，旨在分析小一適應期所面對的焦慮、壓力與應對方法。研究對象是 113 位於 2005 年 9 月升讀小一的六歲兒童的家長。透過問卷調查方式，請家長描述兒童在升讀小一後三個月所面臨的困難、問題及其應對策略。研究顯示學校生活可以是兒童在適應期的主要壓力來源。研究結果也顯示兒童會運用不同的應對方法來處理焦慮和壓力。本文後部分提出家長和任教小一的老師們可以如何協助兒童適應學校新環境和面對不同的壓力。

Abstract
The aim of this study is to analyse children's stress and coping during transition from kindergarten to school. The sample consisted of parents of 113 six-year-old children who started primary school in September, 2005. Questionnaires were sent to parents and asked them to describe the types of difficulties and problems that children encountered at school during the first three months of the school year. Parents were also asked to report how their children had coped with those problems. This study showed that school could be a major source of stress for many children during the transition period. The results showed how children coped with different problems. At the end of this paper, we discuss how parents and primary school teachers can help children cope with different stress at school and adapt to the new school environment.

根據不同的學者之研究顯示，兒童會運用不同的應對方法來處理焦慮和壓力。第一種方法是嘗試改變困境。如考試失敗後，努力讀書以避免再次面對失敗的困境 (Fallin et al., 2001)。第二種方法是以行動積極解決問題。如當遺失了物品時，會主動尋找。第三種方法是思考及分析問題，包括改變觀點或自我開解。如用別人的角度...
去分析他們的做法 (Sorensen, 1993)。第四種方法是嘗試使自己感覺好些，暫時忘記不愉快的事，做一些令人開心的事或把負面情緒抒發出來。如與人玩耍，暫時忘記不愉快的事，放聲大叫或哭一場（Atkins, 1991; Britt, 1995; Dickey et al., 1989; Sorensen, 1993)。第五種方法是尋找別人的支持，包括家長、朋友或老師的幫助 (Sorensen, 1993)。此外，兒童面對壓力時或會採取一些消極的方法，如迴避問題，傷害人或自己，表現不服從，責怪他人，甚至感到無助 (Sorensen, 1993)。


由於本地的研究較少分析小一升學對兒童的情緒影響及兒童的應對策略，因此本研究集中分析香港小一兒童在適應期的焦慮、壓力與應對方法。本研究向200位2005-6學年升讀小學之兒童的家長發問，詢問有關兒童在校內，學期初的三個月所遇到的適應問題、情緒表現和兒童的應對策略。問卷內容是参照 Ona Monkeviciene (2005) 有關小一適應期的問題，問卷的第一部分請家長描述兒童於學期初的三個月內有否出現以下的問題（可選擇多選一項）：

1. 擾亂基本的生理需要（進食問題、睡眠行為）
2. 適當的情緒反應（發怒及侵略行為或退縮及情緒低落）
3. 擾亂社交關係（不專注、依附行為）
4. 擾亂自我照顧技巧（拒絕自我照顧）
5. 擾亂遊戲活動（利用玩具進行破壞性行為、侵略性遊戲）

問卷的第二部分請家長描述一些有關兒童在學期初的三個月內所遇到的困難、問題或一些不好的感受，並請家長列出兒童所有曾嘗試過的解決方法。

結果有113位 (56.5%) 家長填寫問卷。研究結果顯示，有 30% 受訪的家長表示在學期初時兒童有進食或睡眠的問題；22% 的家長表示兒童有不適當的情緒反應，如發怒及侵略行為或退縮及情緒低落等；14% 的家長表示兒童的不專注或依附行為多了；10% 的家長表示兒童利用玩具進行破壞性行為或侵略性遊戲。

小一新生於學期初的三個月內，常常懷念幼稚園的生活和老師。兒童在適應期會有負面的情緒表現，包括發脾氣、不開心、不高興、緊張、驚慌及孤獨。以下是一些家長的描述。

小一升學對個別兒童的情緒影響

發脾氣，焦慮
「第一天不願起床，不想吃早餐和坐立不安，直至捉起書包（沒有書本在裡面）那一刻，他突然發脾氣說書包好重，不想背起和不想上學。我看他因為將要到陌生的環境而感到很焦慮不安，但不懂用言語表達。」

驚慌，害怕
「組長推擠人，他初時很驚，說不想上學。」

「害怕因忘記帶功課而要記名或被罰沒有小息。」
孤獨
「最初的兩個星期，因為連一個認識的同學也沒有，所以覺得很孤獨。個多月後，老師調了位，坐在前面的同學常在上堂及小息時欺負他。」

緊張
「因他沒有幼稚園的同學升上這所小學，所以在第一個月他的情緒比較緊張，會咬鉛筆及將毛巾、衣著塞進口裡，而且還會和新同學打架。」

自責
「自責因四時未能在第二天交回學校，怕老師責問。」

小一適應問題
本研究參照 Griebel 與 Nisesel (2002) 以及 Macrae (1990) 的研究，將家長描述的兒童適應小一的問題分為六大類，包括有關校規、同學關係、教師和學習、傳遞信息、學校環境及校園欺凌事件等適應問題。55.8% 的家長表示兒童的適應問題與校規有關，47.8% 的適應問題和教師及學習有關，37.2% 是有關同學關係的問題，15.9% 是傳遞信息的問題，14.2% 的家長表示兒童被同學欺凌，只有 8% 的適應問題與學校環境有關。

23.9% 的家長表示兒童有一種適應問題，53.1% 的家長表示兒童有二至三種適應問題，7.1% 的家長表示兒童同時面對四至五項問題，而 15.9% 的家長則表示兒童沒有適應問題。

(一) 有關校規、規律的適應問題
根據家長的描述，兒童較難適應小學的規律。開學初期，不懂遵守校規，如上堂及轉堂時說話或未懂說話前先舉手。面對多學科、不同科目的老師，兒童不知道要準備什麼，何時把物件帶回家？何時交還？兒童在適應小學初期常會遺失物件，如課本、餐盒、餐具或文具等，又常忘記帶手冊回家。上了小學，老師對兒童的自我照顧能力要求會有所提高，但很多兒童於學期初三個月仍未能做到完全自我照顧；因而產生焦慮。

「我的孩子上學初期不能正確抄寫家課冊，功課有時忘記做。每天不能自己收拾書包，又忘記將書本帶回家。參加課外活動時，自己不能去指定課室，要由導師帶去。」

「我的孩子不患病得將小息分配時間，他說如果去了洗手間就沒有時間吃小食和喝水，若先吃東西，又沒有時間去洗手間，他回到課室又不敘告訴老師，結果自有強忍。」

兒童於小一學期初，較難適應學習模式的改變。根據家長的報告，部分兒童向家長表示不喜歡上小學，因小學比幼稚園較少運用遊戲進行活動。而有些兒童因為在學校吃飯慢，所以在午餐後，沒有時間休息或玩耍。

(二) 有關教師及學習的適應問題
本研究結果顯示，兒童於學期初的三個月內的適應問題多與學習有關。包括功課上的困難，默書、考試及名次排名所產生的壓力。以下是一些例子。
有一次他說『上堂有壓力，好似把頭壓下來一樣』，後來問他有什麼『壓力』，他說上堂老師教得快，課本深，掛住爸爸媽媽。」

「我的孩子在小學生活不高興，因很多事情都要計分，如：考試，班與班比較上課表現等。他對計分的科目有懶懶感。」

(三) 有關同學關係的適當問題
在學期初的三個月，兒童對如何認識新朋友和建立朋友關係，感到困難。有些兒童小息時沒有朋友一起吃茶點，有些兒童較不太習慣與不同年齡的人交往。

「她被老師選做班長，負責維持秩序，她因記了同學的過犯而破壞了朋友關係，之後她說不想再做班長了。」

(四) 有關傳遞信息的適當問題
有些兒童初升小一，不會主動向父母講述校園情況；上課時又不敢發問或向老師表達需求，結果影響了個人的學習，老師和家長也難明白他們的需要。

「我的孩子不是很懶，不敢舉手發問或答問題，對上課不太投入，但仍交到朋友，他告訴我有兩個好朋友。但一切都很不動，尤其是上課面對老師時。」

(五) 校園欺凌事件
本研究的問卷調查記錄了一些校園欺凌事件，包括身體的傷害、語言的傷害、威嚇和強搶他人物品（如零食）等，對小一新生造成壓力。

「有一天，他說給同學惡意推撞，他的手和腳都有損傷，他當時有哭。他說這位同學還挖苦他說：『好痛呀！哎呀，好痛哦！』他說當時不是班主任上堂，故沒有說給老師聽，但會把這事告知班主任。」

(六) 有關學校環境的適當問題
新生對適應學校新環境也同樣感到困難。

「我的孩子難以適應新環境，包括學校，老師和同學，因而產生懶懶，抗拒上學，不願起床，會哭。」

「她說自己如厕不太方便，因為她覺得不衛生。」

適應小一生活的應對策略
本研究也邀請家長在問卷中描述兒童嘗試了什麼方法來解決以上種種問題。結果顯示，大部分的兒童會運用不同的方法來適應小一生活，包括積極解決問題，改變困境及尋求別人的支持。44.2% 的兒童會積極解決問題，43.4% 的兒童嘗試改變困境，3.5% 的兒童會做一些使自己覺得好一點的事情，44.2% 的兒童尋求家長、朋友或老師的支持。只有 1.8% 的兒童用消極的方法處理問題。

另外，33.6% 的兒童用了一種解決方法，32.7% 的兒童用了兩種方法，12.4% 的兒童用了三種或以上的解法。21.2% 的家長沒有在問卷中描述兒童曾嘗試的應對策略。

一位家長表示兒童會以他人的角度去分析問題（「我的孩子有時會用老師的角度去看他們的作法，雖然她的分析並不十分深入；但她會接受及明白給予分數為一個機制去評估事物」）。

本研究也發現適應問題與應對策略有關連。兒童以積極解決問題的方法去處理有關教師及學
(四) 家長、朋友或老師的支持

本研究結果顯示，家長、朋友或老師的支持可幫助兒童較理想地適應小一的生活。

「問題已經解決了。當我知道問題後，心平氣和地與小兒談話，了解原因分析後果，教他解決的方法，而且我亦去學校做義工家長，讓他知道父母是關心及支持他，使他有安全感。」

「他及時解決以上問題。當他知道認識新的同學後，便沒有感到孤獨。另外，他將欺負他的同學的惡行告訴老師，讓老師懲罰他。」

(五) 消極的方法

根據家長的描述，部分兒童會以消極的方法去面對初入學的壓力，包括發脾氣，抗拒與家長或老師合作，拒絕遵守校規，不願談及學校的事等。

「他是乘校車去學的，校車早到或我們遲到他會大哭。」

「我的兒子有兩次沒有帶功課回校，他回家便責怪他的媽媽我，但我堅持他自己有的責任的。」

如何協助兒童解決升學過渡期的困境?

有研究顯示，缺乏父母或朋友支持的兒童較易在初入學的適應期產生焦慮 (Christie & Toomey, 1990)。本研究結果顯示，家長在學期初兒童有進食、睡眠或情緒問題，對家長的依附行為也多了。因此父母必須多與子女溝通，瞭解他們在升入小學過渡期的適應問題及情緒變化。父母須耐心聆聽子女的話，與子女共同尋找解決困境的方法。

父母可向兒童提供多種應對策略，如讓兒童明白在遇到困難時，可積極尋找解決方法 (Ericsson & Larsen, 2002)。本研究與 Wong (2003) 的研究同様顯示家長或老師的支持能有效地幫助兒童適應小一生活。入小學前，家長可引用本文的個案，與孩子一起討論遇到困難時的應對策略。最重要的
的是讓兒童明白，每個人在適應新環境時，遇到困難是很平常的事，並強調家長要與兒童一起面對及處理困難。研究顯示父母的支持，對兒童適應小學生活十分重要。因此老師必須幫助小一學童建立友誼，並培育友愛互助的精神。家長及老師亦需保持溝通，交流／互通兒童在家及校內的情緒表現及有關適應問題的情況，以便更有效的協助兒童適應小一的生活。

本研究結果顯示，兒童於學期初的三個月內的適應問題，多與學習有關。在幼稚園，兒童透過遊戲中學習，但升上小學後兒童要應付不同的考試測驗，因此而產生壓力。老師在學校能否有效幫助學生面對日常壓力及困難實在扮演非常重要的角色。Wong (2003) 的研究顯示老師關心兒童在初小的學習問題，如寫字筆順的掌握，英語學習表現等。老師也認同父母角色在兒童適應小一方面很重要。本研究顯示兒童如面對校規、規律的適應問題增多，他們在有關教師及學習的適應問題也會增多；因此小學老師除了幫助學生學習上的問題，幫助兒童盡快適應校規和校園規律也很重要。本研究也肯定了家長的重要角色。但本研究也發現兒童如能以他人的角度去分析問題及積極解決問題，可有效幫助個人適應小一生活。

給小學老師在協助兒童面對及處理壓力、困難的一些建議

任教小一的教師之角色在兒童適應小一方面很重要。由於大部分的壓力直接來自學校環境並影響著學生的表現及行為 (Fallin, Wallinga, & Coleman, 2001)，老師要考慮培養學生應對壓力及課業壓力的能力。有關壓力的課題和應對策略宜統整於日常活動及課堂中，透過不同學科範疇認識和學習面對壓力、困難。

老師可嘗試採用下列一些方法來提升兒童對壓力的辨識：

> 利用書本、信件讓兒童書寫或繪畫以表達所遇到的壓力，留意每位兒童是獨特個體，對不同壓力也會有不同的反應和影響；

> 與兒童進行大班討論，鼓勵透過與同伴的分享和互動，讓他們明白及互相支持，建立和諧的學校氣氛；

> 老師日常多作觀察，留意找出兒童是否正面對一些壓力及困難而受著不同程度的影響，如身體出現經常性的疼痛，即頭痛、肚痛等，有需要宜作立刻跟進並與父母聯絡和處理；

> 對於辨識兒童已出現了的壓力表徵，老師宜作即時協助，鼓勵兒童正面對待，與他共同處理和適切地作改變；

> 老師可與兒童運用角色扮演的處理方法，讓兒童置身情景中，以試改變他們對一些壓力及困難的觀感及態度；

> 日常多作小組討論，與兒童傾談有關壓力的問題，並提出不同或新的應對策略，老師協助他們評估和使用有效的解決方法，期許兒童能有較好的感覺，過程中亦可提出一些面對及處理壓力的規條。

Wong (2003) 的研究顯示，兒童升讀小一後，渴望學習新事物，享受小息時的自由空間和與同伴交往的時刻。但Wong (2003) 的研究與本研究也發現小一升學會對兒童產生焦慮及壓力。兒童有不同的需要，面對不同的壓力，如考試、被欺凌、未能掌握校規、缺乏朋友等。要幫助兒童愉快地適應小學生活，除了老師及家長的支持，培養兒童有效的應變能力；兒童也須要發展良好的友伴關係，讓兒童在友愛互助的氛圍中積極迎接升讀小一的新挑戰。
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反思「教學質素」

Reflection on “Teaching Quality”

徐琼玉
香港教育學院 幼兒教育學系

摘要
從香港教育統籌局網頁裏，學校教育質素保證項
目中，經常提及「質素」一詞。雖然「質素」是
一個被廣泛應用的名詞，但卻帶有一定的主觀判
斷成份。不同人士對此名詞有不同的見解，同
樣地區不同教育學者對「教學質素」有不同的闡
釋。本文回顧學者對「質素」、「教學質素」的
討論，希望藉此論文來闡釋「教學質素」的概
念，從而引發幼教同工思考「教學質素」概念的
意義。

Abstract
The word “Quality” had been mentioned a number of
times in the Quality Assurance for Schools in the
webpage of the Education Manpower Bureau
(EMB), HKSAR. Though “quality” is a commonly
used word in daily life, it is value-laden and
subjective. Different persons may have different
meanings when they use the word “quality”. Likewise
education scholars have different
definitions in teaching quality. This paper reviews
and discusses “quality” and “teaching quality”. The
author intends to induce the thinking in teaching
quality among early childhood educators through
this paper discussion.

引言
現今「自評」、「外評」這些用語對教育工
作者來說並不陌生，從教育統籌局網頁裏，學校
教育質素保證項目中，提及一系列名稱，包括
「質素保證架構的特點」、「優質學校教育」、
「質素保證視學」、「學校自我評估」、「質素
保證視學周年報告」、「個別幼稚園質素保證視
學周年報告」等等，這些項目都包含「質素」一
詞，不同人士對此名詞有不同的見解，同樣地
不同教育學者對「教學質素」有不同的闡釋。本
人作為教育工作者的一份子，師資培訓的一員，
希望藉此論文來闡釋「質素」、「教學質素」的
概念，從而反思這些概念的意義。

質素概念化 (Conceptualization of Quality)
「質素」(Quality) 是一個被廣泛應用的有趣
名詞。「質素」的概念有不同含義。Pirsig (1976)
把「質素」一語與希臘文的 ἀρέτη 聯繫，意指「功
能的卓越」。在《新牛津英文字典》(New Oxford
些東西與其他類似的東西一同量度的標準。兩個
重要的意思會用作測量：某些東西的卓越程度；
一人物或物所具有的特殊的特性或特徵。根據
《維斯特第三版新國際字典》(Webster’s Third
New International Dictionary, 1981, p. 1858)，質素定義作「基本的品質，一個特殊的內在特徵，
卓越的程度，符合標準的程度，內在的卓越品
質」。從《美國傳統英語字典》(American Heri-
itage Dictionary, 1992, p. 1479)，質素被指為一個
「內在或有區別的特徵，個人的特徵，基本的品
質，同類的優越，卓越的程度，高尚的社會地
位。它的同義字為財產，特性，性格或特徴。」

不同人士對「質素」有不同的解法，可能有些
人用這個詞語去形容的物件與實際精確程度相
距之遠。以「鞋」，一個為人所熟悉的物品作例
子：甚麼是一對有質素的鞋呢？縱然或會有些共
同的要點，我們仍會從四方八面聽到不同的答
案。我們可以說一對「有質素的鞋」是一對時尚
的鞋款。其他人或許會說，穿著起來很舒適，才
是「有質素的鞋」；但另一些人會說它們是耐用
的。答案可以繼續舉例下去，永無止境。從這個角
度看來，「質素」是一個主觀的名詞，並有價值
取向的。鞋的例子闡明了以「質素」一詞去確切
形容某些東西所遇到的問題。當用「質素」去形
容一些比鞋更複雜的在事（如教學）時，問題會
更加複雜。
教學質素 (Quality of Teaching) 
縱然「英國白皮書教學質素」 (UK White Paper Teaching Quality) (教育及科學系, 1983) 沒有明確地指明「教學質素」確切的意思，但它指出教學的影響力是「教育質素的主要單一的決定因素」。雖然文件中所用的「教學」和「質素」的概念是「很多時是簡單而天真」(more frequently simplistic and naïve) (Carr, 1989, p. 2)。但這白皮書引起教育學者注意到如何在這事情上解說和發展成就 (Stones, 1994)。甚麼是「教學質素」？從以上所舉的鞋的例子，這個問題有很多可能的答案。教育學家對教學質素沒有一定的看法。學者 (Doherty, 1994) 主張「我們不能定義它，但當我們看到它的時候，我們便會知道它。」學者 (Ellis, 1993) 提議「質素本身是一個有點含糊的名詞，因它有標準 (standard) 和卓越的內涵 (excellence)」。其中一個困難，似乎是談及「標準」時，即會引起「真實」(truth)、「善良」(goodness) 和「美麗」(beauty) 等問題。「質素」應傳遞一些好的價值觀並可量度的。學者 (Stone, 1997, p. 3) 提議「一個高質素的服務至少能符合兩個非常不同的情況：它應經驗到提供服務以滿足顧客的需求和需要」。其他學者 (Doherty, 1994) 更強調對教學質素並沒有定義的看法或定義。教學質素是一個有價值取向的名詞 (value-laden term) 並從屬於教育的目的、過程和標準 (Ashcroft, 1995)，正如學者 (Loder et al., 1989) 指出我們不可能用它來評判教學質素，因為這種判斷是主觀的。

學者 (Travers, 1981; Biggs & Moore, 1993; Biggs, 1999) 回顧上世紀「良好的教學」(good teaching) 的不同準則。總結到不同時代盛行不同的「良好」概念。很多時候，教學質素通常與教學成效 (teaching effectiveness) 和良好教學 (good teaching) 有密切關係。在七十年代初，研究員開始研究所謂課堂教學的「過程和成果」，其定義為在課堂上教師的教學行為 (過程) 與學生的學習 (成果) 之間的關係。以前，學者 (Rosenshine & Furst, 1971) 關於教學成效的研究確認五個重要的變數：表現的清晰度、老師的熱忱，活動的多樣化，任務的本質和商業性的教師行為，以及班級所涵蓋的內容；英語教育部教學質素評估報告 (Ofsted, 1995; 1997) 中明確指出評學員基於下列七項指令：學習目的，提供學習空間，引發學生課堂興趣，課堂切合學生能力及學習需要，提升學生語言發展 (包括老師提問技巧)，多樣化活動，有效課堂組織。近年幼教師資對成效的教學也有共同取向 (兒童為本)，涵蓋下列範疇：教師的教學行為，幼兒的學習行為，師生互動，兒童間的互動等 (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997；簡楚瑛，2005；陳淑敏，2001)。從教學成效這一關注點看，它單純集中以一個標準去評估教學過程。換句話說，教學成效集中在教學過程的「技術性」事情，如學者 Kyriacou (1998) 指出課程序列、教學策略、教學資源、課堂組織等技術性事情，但這些並沒有觸及教育的價值觀。

驗、互動參與、有意義內容、學習切合其生活經驗、顧及其學習興趣和需要、照顧幼兒課堂反應、尊重其學習過程所得經驗過於成果、兼顧幼兒個別差異的學習、促進幼兒全面發展、發展其終身學習能力等，這些正是當前幼兒教育重要的價值取向。學者們（Carr, 1989; 1996; Tinning, Kirk, & Evans, 1993）指出確認教學質素需要明確地指出確認的準則是從內在（intrinsic）或作用性的價值觀（instrumental value）所得出的來的。在某一定程度視自己為專業的教育者的教師和與其他直接基於教育的人士，會視教學的質素是其教學過程中一個有用的內在價值。從這個角度看，有「質素」的教學應視為帶教育性的教學，多於一個「被動培訓的過程」。

總括而言，我認為學生應透過教學過程，培育成為有智慧、有價值以及一個對社會負責任的成員。教學是一個複雜的過程，我們不應單單著重於它的成效而漠視其價值，但也不應只集中教育的價值而忽略知識的元素、能力和技巧。忽略教育價值，教學會淪為一個活動的帶領者，一個學校的技術員，多於一個教育工作者。有「成效」的教學並非經常等同教學質素，在最理想的情況下，它是一個教學質素的元素。

但是我們不能摒棄「技術性」在教學過程中的重要性。若果教學成效不足的話，教師就教不了學生甚麼，因此，教學應包括技巧的元素和教育的價值。

結語

總結以上討論，「質素」一詞是一個主觀的名詞，是有價值取向的。過往教學質素通常是教學成效和良好教學有密切關係，這些教學成效多集中在教學過程的「技術性」層面，並沒有涉及教育價值觀。不同學者提出教學質素傾向集中在內在和教育價值，這並非是一個結論，而是一個有價值的教學過程。如：主動建構、主動學習、主觀經驗、理解、互相磋商、有意義的學習、着重過程的學習等。因此，有「質素」的教學應視為帶教育性的教學，這是值得幼教同工思量。教學不應只著重教學成效而漠視教學價值，也不應忽視知識的元素、能力和技巧，我們的教學應包括教育的價值和技巧性的元素。

透過以上文獻探究及討論，盼望幼教同工都能反思「質素」和「教學質素」的概念，我們縱使要面對質素保證視學和學校自我評估，也可視作一個寶貴機會讓我們來反思和評量學校教育的質素。
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