

壹、閱讀下述文章，然後用中文回答問題。（須標題號）（25分）（第1至7題每題3分；第8題4分）

**Comparisons between the sand tray world assessment technique
and the Rorschach Inkblot Test
by Wright, Dorothy A.,**

Projective assessment techniques have frequently been used with children to provide insight into the child's personality functioning. The sand tray world assessment technique, originally developed by Lowenfeld, was one of the earliest projective play assessment techniques.

A review of the literature concluded that the utility of the sand tray world assessment technique has been limited by a lack of standardized and consistent interpretive procedures. Grubbs (2005) developed the Sandplay Categorical Checklist (SCC) to provide a comprehensive approach to the analysis of the sand tray world. Since the sand tray world assessment technique has been and is currently being used diagnostically (Johnson, 1997), it is essential that reliability and validity be established for this technique. The Rorschach Inkblot Test, developed by Herman Rorschach, is the quintessential projective assessment technique and has a long history of application with children both clinically and in research. The Rorschach is a well-established projective assessment technique with thematic and theoretical similarities from which comparisons to the sand tray world assessment technique can be made.

Therefore, the current study utilized both quantitative and qualitative analyses through grounded theory to assess the clinical utility of the sand tray world assessment technique as a diagnostic tool. The quantitative results yielded inconsistent and poor inter-rater reliability coefficients. The qualitative results found agreement in the interpretive statements that were made from the SCC and the Rorschach in the core areas of cognitive processing, reality testing, problem solving, and interpersonal relationships. Despite the overlap, the study concluded that the sand tray world assessment technique should not be used diagnostically until further research substantiates the reliability and validity of the technique. However, qualitative results moderately support that the technique could be used to provide further understanding of children's functioning in the four core areas listed above.

1. 本研究之問題背景為何？
2. 本研究之目的為何？
3. 本研究中所用的兩個工具，研究者指出其有何相似性？
4. 本研究用了什麼分析方法？
5. 本研究用什麼方法評估信度？結果如何？

本 試 題 採
雙 面 印 刷

第 1 頁 共 4 頁

6. 本研究在評估兒童功能時包含那些領域？
7. 本研究結論為何？
8. 根據本研究結果，你對後續研究有何建議？

貳、閱讀下述文章，然後用中文回答問題。（須標題號）（25 分）（第 1 至 7 題每題 3 分；第 8 題 4 分）

**Developing a measure and an understanding of the individual
experience of happiness at work**

by Albano, Joseph F., Jr.,

The purpose of this study was to define and assess workplace happiness by developing the Workplace Happiness Index (WHI), a new measure of the worker-work relationship. The WHI was used to identify and then interview high- and low-workplace happiness individuals in order to gain a deeper understanding of what it means to have a high or low level of this attribute.

In this study, a theoretical basis for workplace happiness was developed based on Aristotle's notion of eudemonic (完善論) happiness, Waterman's model of identity formation, and Ryff and Keyes' study of psychological well-being. Workplace happiness measures the degree to which the workplace supports the psychological needs and civic aspirations of the worker with respect to six dimensions: (a) meaning, (b) autonomy, (c) behavioral norms, (d) feedback, (e) supportive relations, and (f) personal growth. This approach was in contrast to extant measures that focus on the degree to which worker behavior supports the goals of the organization.

The WHI was developed by constructing a Likert-type response, web-based instrument based on the theoretical model of workplace happiness developed from my review of the literature. Rasch measurement techniques were used to calibrate (N = 86) and then verify (N = 67) a valid, interval-scaled measure of workplace happiness. Based on this measure, participants were selected (N = 8) to take part in telephone interviews conducted to develop a description of the experience of high and low levels of workplace happiness. Rasch analysis of participant data demonstrated the reliability of the WHI, and the telephone interviews provided evidence to support its content and construct validity.

Workplace happiness is a theory-based, empirically validated measure of dimensions of the worker-workplace interaction that is anchored in a different theoretical basis than extant measures such as job satisfaction. This perspective provides an alternate framework for examining individuals' experiences of the workplace and can serve as a platform for further research into the impact of the workplace on workers.

本 試 題 採
雙 面 印 刷

系所組：心理輔導學系碩士班

日期節次：99 年 3 月 13 日第 2 節 11:00 -12:30

科目：輔導研究法 (含心理測驗與統計)

1. 本研究之目的為何？
2. 本研究依據的理論基礎為何？
3. 本研究所發展之工具名稱為何？其型式及作答方式為何？
4. 本研究所發展之工具包含什麼向度？
5. 本研究用何方法考驗信度？用何方法考驗效度？
6. 本研究取徑和既存之測量工具最大不同點為何？
7. 本研究結論為何？
8. 你對本研究有何評論？

參、某學者想探討兒童觀看暴力電視與否和其對衝突處理方式是否有關？乃進行統計檢定結果如表一至表三，請回答下列問題：(須標題號) (10 分)
(每格 1 分)

表一：兒童觀看暴力電視與否和其對衝突處理方式的交叉表

觀看暴力電視		衝突處理方式		總和
		講理	攻擊	
是	N	6	14	20
	%	30.0%	70.0%	100%
否	N	16	4	20
	%	80.0%	20.0%	100%
總和	N	22	18	40
	%	55.0%	45.0%	100.0%

表二：Chi-Square Test

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	10.10	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	40		

表三：Symmetric Measure

	Value	Approx. Sig.
Nominal by Phi		.001
N of Valid Cases		

本 試 題 採
雙 面 印 刷

系所組：心理輔導學系碩士班

日期節次：99 年 3 月 13 日第 2 節 11:00-12:30

科目：輔導研究法（含心理測驗與統計）

1. 本研究統計假設如何寫？_____
2. 表二顯示使用何種統計檢定？_____
3. 表二統計檢定值是多少？_____ 是否達顯著水準？_____
4. 使用此種統計檢定的資料類別為何？_____
5. 由表三中顯示使用何種檢定？_____
6. 由表三中統計檢定值是多少？_____ 是否達顯著水準？_____
7. 由表一及表二，本研究統計考驗結果，其結論為何？_____
8. 由表三，本研究統計考驗結果，其結論為何？_____

肆、Answer the following questions. (Write in Chinese) (20 分)

1. What is ANOVA (Analysis of variance)? _____ (5 分)
2. What is the formula of F test? _____ (5 分)
3. Describe the reasons why the ANOVA can be used to test whether the group means differ significantly or not? (10 分)

伍、What is the meaning of culture bias in tests? How to check the culture bias in tests? (Write in Chinese) (10 分)

陸、The following five terms of references are not correct in terms of the APA style. Please check and write out why they are incorrect on your answer sheet. (10 分) (每題 2 分)

1. 林文達 (民 81)。教育行政學。臺北市：三民。

修正：

2. 吳靜吉 (1978)。談心理劇。幼獅月刊，48，53-56。

修正：

3. 鍾才元 (民 90)。生涯規劃：新手老師的就業準備與珍視須知。載於黃正傑、張芬 (主編)，學為良師 (425-457 頁)。臺北市：師大書苑。

修正：

4. Barnard, C. I. (1971). The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

修正：

5. Powers, J. M., & Cookson, P. W. Jr. (1999). The Politics of School Choice Research. Educational Policy, 13(1), 104-122.

修正：

本 試 題 採
雙 面 印 刷

第 4 頁 共 4 頁