

華人的學業成就目標與儒家倫理觀：兼回應「台灣青少年是否認為努力與學業成就關乎道德？」一文

符碧真¹、陳舜文²、危芷芬³、王秀槐¹

國立台灣大學師資培育中心¹

國立清華大學教育心理與諮商學系²

臺北市立大學心理與諮商學系³

「台灣青少年是否認為努力與學業成就關乎道德？」（以下簡稱「台」文）一文（張泰銓、雷庚玲，2018），針對 Fwu 等人（2014）、Chen 等人（2009）與 Hwang（2012）提出努力的道德性及努力是無條件的積極義務之論點，提出質疑。「台」文採用「社會—認知範疇理論」，透過直接詢問台灣高中生與大學生的看法，得到結論：努力具道德性非台灣青少年的共識。為了深化學術對話，本文先闡述華人學業成就目標與儒家倫理觀之特性，及相關研究結果，接著進一步針對「台」文之論點提出回應。首先，在理論上，「台」文所採用的理論基礎與基於儒家倫理觀所建構的理論有極大差異，概念也無法對比。其次，在方法上，「台」文的量表題目未呼應其所採用「社會—認知範疇理論」道德範疇的前提，而且在方法論上也帶有素樸實證主義的根本問題。最後，在結果的解釋上，「台」文未說明其研究參與者對於孝道、努力、學業成就之判斷不同的原因，但從儒家倫理觀所建構的理論反而可以解釋這樣的結果。

關鍵字：努力、社會—認知範疇理論、儒家倫理觀、學業成就目標

貴刊「台灣青少年是否認為努力與學業成就關乎道德？」（以下簡稱「台」文）一文（張泰銓、雷庚玲，2018），針對 Fwu 等人（2014）、Chen 等人（2009）及 Hwang（2012）提出努力的道德性及努力是無條件的積極義務之論點，提出質疑。本文係對「台」文的回應文，期能增進學術界對此議題健康、良性的對話。全文分成以下四部分：（一）說明 Fwu 等人的系列研究，包括理論架構及實徵研究結果，以了解全貌；（二）簡述「台」文對 Fwu 等人研究的質疑及「台」文的研究結果；（三）Fwu 等人對「台」文質疑的回應，包括理論、研究方法、研究結果的詮釋等問題；（四）結語。

Fwu 等人的系列研究

（一）緣起與目的

過去研究顯示，儒家文化圈的國家與地區（如日本、韓國、新加坡、香港及台灣）多次在國際學術評比 TIMSS（Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study）及 PISA（Programme for International Student Assessment）表現優異（Mullis, et al., 2016a, 2016b; Mullis, et al., 2020; OECD, 2018; Schleicher, 2019），而西方的心理學理論往往難以解釋東亞學生的學習動機與表現（Hau & Ho, 2010; King & McInerney, 2016），茲舉犖犖大者說明如下。Deci 與 Ryan（1985）提出「自

初稿收件：2019/06/18；一修：2019/11/28；二修：2020/03/28；正式接受：2020/04/29

通訊作者：符碧真（E-mail: janefu@ntu.edu.tw）10617 臺北市羅斯福路四段一號 國立台灣大學師資培育中心新聞研究所 403 室

致謝：本研究感謝科技部經費資助（計畫編號：MOST 110-2410-H-002-080-SS3）。

我決定論」(self-determination theory)指出,源自於個人自由(主)選擇的目標,就會產生內在動機,愈有內在動機者表現愈好。但實徵研究指出,在儒家社會,社會價值與外在壓力正向預測學生的學習投入與表現,取悅父母及老師的學生有比較高的學習動機,顯示內在興趣與動機並非東亞學生表現優異的關鍵(Cheng & Lam, 2013; D'Ailly, 2003; OECD, 2003),與自我決定論不符。其次, Bandura (1997) 提出「自我效能理論」(self-efficacy theory)。自我概念愈強或愈相信自己有能力把工作做好者,學習動機較強,學習投入愈高,持續力較久,學業表現也較好(Pintrich & Schunk, 2002; Schunk & Pajares, 2009)。然研究顯示,香港及新加坡學生在TIMSS的表現遠高過西方學生,但卻明顯地缺乏自信(Leung, 2002);華人學生不論自我效能感是高或低,學習投入都差不多(D'Ailly, 2003),與自我效能理論不合。再者, Dweck 與 Leggett (1988) 的「成就目標理論」(achievement goal theory)指出,持「精熟目標」者認為學習過程中的挫敗在所難免,傾向享受學習的過程,樂於學習新策略,即使遭受挫折,仍持續不懈,以發展自己的知能。持「表現目標」者想要藉由贏過他人,證明自己的能力,留給別人好印象。持這種目標但欠缺自信心者,會視挫敗為自己能力差的證明,情緒焦慮,不願投入心力,想要逃避挑戰,終將不利於學習(Dweck, 1986)。但在華人社會,「精熟目標」與「表現目標」都對學業成就有正向影響(Chan et al., 2005; Ho & Hau, 2008; Ho et al., 2007)。同時,香港學生在國際評比中表現優異,但較多學生採取「表現目標」,而非「精熟目標」(Salili & Lai, 2003),這些結果都與「成就目標理論」不合。上述實徵研究凸顯出既有理論的侷限性,而有必要提出新理論加以解釋。

更廣地看,近年來許多心理學學者對於以西方理論馬首是瞻的作法提出質疑。Arnett (2008) 指出,美國心理學界研究的樣本只占全球人口的5%。Henrich 等人(2010)呼應 Arnett 的說法,指出2003-2007年間全世界頂尖期刊發表的心理學的研究,96%的樣本來自於西方(Western)、受過教育(Educated)、工業化(Industrialized)、富裕(Rich)、民主(Democratic)社會的樣本,但是這種「怪異樣本」(WEIRD)的人口,卻只占全世界人口數的12%。另外, Raffaelli 等人(2013)亦指出,大多數青少年居住在「開發中國家」的「多數世界」(majority world),但是大多數青少年理論卻來自於「西方工業國」的「少數世界」(minority world)。這些學者均指出,西方社會建構的理論能否

解釋非西方國家的現象令人懷疑。將西方「少數世界」以「怪異樣本」發展出來的研究典範,盲目移植到非西方國家,獲得的研究結果對於瞭解非西方人們的心態常是不相干、不契合的(黃光國, 2009)。科學哲學家波普爾(1972/1989)指出,當理論與觀察現象或實驗結果不一致時,即是異例(anomalies)。一個理論如果遭遇太多異例,這時科學家便應針對問題,提出試探性的理論或解決方案(tentative solution),來消弭理論與觀察現象間的不一致。

基於上述原因, Fwu 等人(2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021)、Chen 等人(2009, 2016, 2019; 王冠樺、陳舜文, 2020; 陳舜文、魏嘉瑩, 2013)、Wang 與 Lin (2020) 從儒家倫理觀(Confucian ethics)的立場,提出了含攝文化(culture-inclusive)的成就動機理論。同時以系列實徵研究加以驗證,希望為既有心理學理論無法解釋東亞學生的學習動機與表現的困境,找出新的出路。

(二) 華人成就目標理論架構

在儒家文化價值觀中,個人努力追求社會期許的目標常是為善盡其在倫理關係中的角色義務(role obligations),如此可彰顯個人的德行,並增進個人的內在道德修養(黃光國, 2009; Fwu et al., 2021)。人自出生即置身於各種人際關係的網絡之中,與網絡中情感性「對偶關係」(dyad relationship)的「重要他人」建立緊密關係,並對重要他人扮演適當的角色與應盡的角色義務。人際關係中最重要的是「五倫」關係,每個人須善盡「十義」的角色義務:父慈、子孝、兄良、弟悌、夫義、婦聽、長惠、幼順、君仁、臣忠。從社會層次來看,先秦儒家文化的理想是,如果每個人在對偶關係中扮演適當的角色,盡到該角色應盡的義務,便能維持人際關係的和諧,就會建立一個和諧的社會。從個人層次來看,盡到角色義務者,一方面維持人體內部的均衡和諧,對得起自己,另一方面維持人際關係的均衡和諧,對得起重要他人。對得起自己及重要他人,便會感到心安理得,最終達到心理社會均衡的狀態(psychosocial homeostasis)(Hsu, 1971)。

基於華人文化的特性,Chen 等人(2009)針對人們追求成就目標之形式與動機,提出「華人成就目標理論架構」(framework of Chinese achievement goals)。此理論架構認為:華人在建構成就目標時,除了考量個人的興趣之外,還會考慮重要他人之期許。因此,華

人的成就目標包含兩種類型：「個人目標」(personal goals)與「縱向目標」(vertical goals)。「個人目標」是指：個人依據自主興趣所選擇的目標，與社會價值或社會期許關連不大；而「縱向目標」是指：具有高度社會價值，符合重要他人所期望之目標。「縱向目標」與社會角色義務有關，其內容與標準通常無法由個人選擇。過去西方主流成就動機理論，未重視社會期許對於華人追求學業目標之心理與行為的影響，也不瞭解致力於縱向目標與彰顯個人德行在華人文化中的關聯，因此便往往無法妥適地理解華人學生努力投入學業成就的現象。

對於華人而言，致力於達成角色義務往往與道德修養有所關聯。這是因為，在儒家倫理觀念中，對個人的理想期待是透過善盡社會角色義務，不斷地修養與提升自己的德行，以臻至善(self-perfection)(Chan, 2014)。更清楚地說，儒家思想傾向以個人對於角色義務的努力程度，做為評斷個人德行或道德修養的重要標準，而受到社會期許的縱向目標又常與角色義務有關。因此，個人愈是致力於達成縱向目標，善盡角色義務，便愈能彰顯自身的德行以及道德修養。簡言之，其中的關聯是「努力追求縱向目標——善盡角色義務——彰顯個人德行——增進內在道德修養」。反之，個體若未能努力於縱向目標，便很可能被認為未盡到角色義務，不但難獲得良好的名聲，甚至可能感到愧對自己及重要他人。

在華人社會中，學業目標常被賦予高度社會價值，建構於社會期許之上，成為學生的角色義務。子女有義務努力在學業的縱向「成就金字塔」(achievement pyramid)往上攀爬，以滿足父母的期望。換言之，學業成就是華人社會普遍重視的「縱向目標」，不但帶有高度社會期許，而且人們在追求學業成就時，極為強調努力的重要性。這是因為華人學生在追求學業目標時，一方面可能傾向將努力本身視為應盡的義務，另一方面也常相信努力能使自己進步，如此才能促使自己更加努力(王冠樺、陳舜文，2020；陳舜文、魏嘉瑩，2013；Chen et al., 2016, 2019; Tao & Hong, 2014)。

(三) 實徵研究結果

根據儒家的角色義務觀以及「華人成就目標理論架構」(Chen et al., 2009)，可做出以下推論與假設。首先，在華人社會中，個體追求社會期許的縱向目標(例如學業目標)，會牽涉到角色義務；但是追求基於

個別興趣的個人目標，則不涉及角色義務，兩者影響不同。因此，學生在追求學業目標或個人目標時，努力所具有的道德評價、美德性以及受到的獎懲皆可能不同。其次，由於縱向目標與角色義務相扣連，因此學生在學業目標失敗時，產生的歸因模式、情緒與行為都與西方既有研究不同。Fwu 等人(2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021)、Chen 等人(2009, 2016, 2019；王冠樺、陳舜文，2020；陳舜文、魏嘉瑩，2013)、Wang 與 Lin(2020)進行了系列實徵研究支持上述推論。主要研究發現包括：

1. 追求縱向目標如學業表現時，不論成敗，愈努力的學生愈被家長及教師視為盡到角色義務，是盡本分、負責任的好孩子，亦即具有道德形象(moral image)，同時也被認為是具有認真、勤勉、堅毅、投入、腳踏實地等學習美德(learning virtues)。但是追求個人興趣的目標時，努力與不努力者的道德形象與學習美德差異較小。此外，愈重視努力是義務的中學教師，在教學時愈喜歡努力學習但表現普通的學生(即具學習美德之學生)，而愈不喜歡未努力但表現優異的學生。這些都與 Li(2002, 2005, 2012)的研究指出，西方視學習為「心智取向」(mind-oriented)，而東亞社會視學習為「美德取向」(virtue-oriented)相互呼應。
2. 追求縱向目標成功時，努力的學生因盡到角色義務，比不努力者具有更高的道德形象，故獲得更多家長與教師的獎勵；追求縱向目標失敗時，不努力因未盡到角色義務，比努力者欠缺道德形象，故受到更多家長與教師的懲罰。但是追求個人興趣的目標時，努力與不努力者的道德形象與學習美德差異較小。這樣的結果顯示，在縱向目標上，努力帶有很強的道德價值，故努力成功者因「天道酬勤」而受到讚賞，但不努力成功者因「不勞而獲」而較少受到稱讚。相反地，努力失敗者因「已經盡己」，具有道德形象，家長與教師不忍苛責，而受到較少的懲罰。這與西方對於道德與成就事件的「獎懲不對稱」論點(Fuller, 1977; Weiner & Peter, 1973)不同。該論點認為道德規範為行為的底線，遵行者不受獎勵，但違者受罰。在成就事件上，鼓勵人們發揮潛能，成功者給予獎勵，對失敗者較少懲罰(Hamilton et al., 1988; Hamilton et al., 1990; Lourenco, 1994)。換言之，成功時的獎勵重「結果」。但在儒家社會，在縱向目標上，獎懲時不只看「成敗」的結果，還考慮「努力」的過程，兼顧

「結果」與「過程」。

3. 大學生對於學業成敗的歸因，傾向「努力」模式（effort model），亦即將失敗歸因到自己努力不足，而非能力、運氣或難度。這很可能是因為，華人學生傾向將追求學業目標視為角色義務，也傾向相信努力用功能使自己進步。許多跨文化研究亦顯示：東、西方人們對於學習成就的自我歸因具有文化差異。美國的父母與兒童傾向將學習成就歸因於個人的「能力」，而華人家長與學生較傾向歸因至學習過程中的「努力」（Li, 2002, 2012; Stevenson et al., 1990; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992）。
4. 視努力追求縱向目標為盡到角色義務者，面對學業失敗時，反求諸己後，產生因未盡到角色義務而愧對父母及愧對自己的情緒感受。為跳出愧疚感的負面情緒，遂激發繼續努力追求成功的動力。這樣的研究結果不同於北美學生在成功事件上繼續投入心力，但失敗時傾向放棄，卻能解釋東亞學生在學業失敗後仍傾向持續堅持、鍥而不捨的現象（Heine et al., 2001; Zhang & Cross, 2011）。

「台」文對 Fwu 等人研究的質疑及「台」文的研究結果

「台」文針對 Fwu 等人研究結果，努力的道德性及努力是無條件的積極義務之論點，提出質疑。在理論上，「台」文指出：Fwu 等人研究以「儒家文化角色義務」為基礎的道德觀，可能將「努力」與「學業成就」視為學子應盡的道德義務；「台」文從「社會—認知範疇理論」（Social-cognitive domain theory），則視盡義務與否僅代表社會成規議題，而非道德議題（頁 151）。同時「台」文認為：根據 Helwig 與 Turiel (2011) 的觀點，某行為是否視為具道德性質或僅屬社會成規的範疇，端視「此行為是否會對他人造成影響」的判斷（頁 155）。在方法上，「台」文要求台灣高中生及大學生在 6 點 Likert-type 量尺上評定「不孝順」、「不努力」或「學業成就不佳」的人是否「應該要覺得這樣是不道德的」（即道德議題），以及行為者是否「應該要覺得這樣是不對的、不可以、不應該的」（即社會成規議題）。又「台」文指出，當參與者評分的平均數超過 3.50 分，即表示該行為背離道德或社會成規（見頁 158）。在結果上，「台」文認為：努力被視為「社會成規」，但是其道德性未被認可，也不具備無條件

積極義務的特性（頁 161）。其次，「台」文發現：從「努力」、「孝順」或「學業成就」三個範疇的比較來看，「孝順」符合道德或社會成規議題的程度高於「努力」及「學業成就」（頁 159 表 1）。簡言之，「台」文結論是：努力僅被青少年視為必須遵守的社會成規（頁 161），且努力具道德性非台灣青少年的共識（見頁 151）。

對「台」文質疑的回應

本文認為「台」文在理論、研究方法與研究結果的解釋三方面，皆有需要進一步審視之處。因此本文對「台」文的回應亦分為三部分，可摘要如下：（1）台文所採用的理論基礎與基於儒家倫理觀所建構的理論有極大差異，概念也無法對比；（2）台文的測量方法與其所引用的理論概念有差異，而且在方法論（methodology）上也具有根本問題；（3）台文的測量結果反而可以從儒家倫理觀以及「華人成就目標理論架構」（Chen et al., 2009）加以解釋。

必須說明的是，雖然「台」文在理論、方法與結果三層面的問題可獨立討論，但是這三項問題之間具有關聯。更清楚地說，正因為「台」文同時具有（1）和（2）的問題，本文才提出（3）的可能性。而如果「台」文只有理論的問題，測量方式和方法論卻沒問題（也就是「台」文雖然理論類比有誤，但其結果支持其引述的理論），則可能較難套用其他觀點解釋其結果。以下就三部分問題分別詳述之。

（一）理論問題

「台」文詢問的問題是：「努力與成就的道德性：『努力』為道德？『成就』為道德？兩者皆為道德？」（頁 153）以及「義務即為道德？」（頁 154）。上述問題試圖將努力直接連結於道德，亦即是問「努力是否符合道德標準」。「台」文表示這是從「社會—認知範疇理論」（Helwig & Turiel, 2011; Turiel, 1983）提出詢問。但「社會—認知範疇理論」與儒家倫理觀兩者在倫理學基本觀點上有相當大的差異，有必要在理論上加以釐清。為了清楚說明此點，本文將先從倫理學的角度，簡要分析與比較西方倫理學與儒家倫理觀。

1. 德行倫理學與儒家倫理觀之異同

西方哲學中，規範倫理學（normative ethics）探

討的是人們日常生活之道德行為所遵守的規則。整體而言，在規範倫理學中有三大主要論點：效益論（utilitarianism）、義務論（deontology）和德行倫理學（virtue ethics）。這三種論點分別強調道德的三個層面：行為後果、行為本身、行為主體。簡言之，「效益論」強調的是行為的後果，認為行為的對錯需視後果的好壞而定，倡導此論點的重要學者包括 Jeremy Bentham（1748-1832）、John Mill（1806-1873）等；「義務論」聚焦於行為本身與動機，行為自身的特性決定了行為的對錯，此論點主要奠基於 Immanuel Kant（1724-1804）的倫理學；「德行倫理學」主要關注的是道德主體（即行為者）的品格或美德特質，此觀點在西方倫理學中可追溯到古希臘的 Aristotle（384-322 BC）（參見 Stewart, 2009）。

雖然東方的各種倫理思想有其起源與發展，但從內涵來看，儒家的倫理觀常被認為屬於或近似德行倫理學（Ames, 2011; Angle & Slote, 2013; Chan, 2014）。儒家倫理觀與西方德行倫理學的主要相似處在於：探討道德時，都重視行為主體的美德、道德德行（moral virtues）或品格（virtue of character）。再者，儒家思想與西方德行倫理學都認為個體可透過學習或修鍊，在實踐中完善自身的德行，而道德的標準主要取決於有德者在特定情境中的睿智判斷（Ames, 2011; Chan, 2014; Stewart, 2009）。

然而儒家倫理觀與西方德行倫理學仍有些差別，可從兩個角度來看。首先，如本文第一節所言，儒家倫理觀十分重視人際之間的「角色義務」。個體修養自身德行的重要目的與過程即在於履行角色義務（Hwang, 1999, 2012）。其次，「努力」是履行角色義務的手段與方法。儒家思想是以個人努力盡其角色義務的程度，做為評斷個人德行的重要標準，且德行能夠彰顯個人的道德修養（Ames, 2011; Angle & Slote, 2013; Chan, 2014; Fwu et al., 2017a, 2018）。

實徵研究顯示，比起追求個人目標，大學生認為努力追求縱向目標（如學業）更能對父母盡孝，也更能履行子女做為學生的角色義務（陳世益，2008）。Fwu 等人（2017b）的實徵研究也顯示，愈努力於學業者愈認為自己已經盡到角色義務，進而愈認為自己具有認真、勤勉、堅毅、投入、腳踏實地、良好的學習態度等學習美德。

2. 儒家倫理觀與「社會—認知範疇理論」之差異

儒家倫理觀與西方德行倫理學的觀點雖不完全相同，或許還可比擬，但儒家倫理觀與「台」文對「道德」之界定差異就更大。「台」文根據 Turiel 等人（Helwig & Turiel, 2011; Turiel, 1983）提出的「社會—認知範疇理論」認為：「努力」與「學業成就」即使被視為子女或學生的角色義務，亦不足以推論其應歸類屬於道德範疇，而可能僅屬於社會成規（social conventional）的範疇（頁 154）。然而 Turiel 等人所提出的「社會—認知範疇理論」乃源自於 Kohlberg 的道德心理學理論，以及上文提及的 Kant 學派「義務論」倫理學（Campbell & Christopher, 1996）。

Kant 主張的義務論專注的是普遍主義（universalism）意義下的「義務」，亦即每個理性存有者在各種情境中都應盡到的義務。行為的對錯依靠的是可普遍化原則，重點在於行為本身的特性。Kant 倫理學中的道德律令不但與個體具備的德行無關，更不涉及社會角色關係（MacKinnon & Fiala, 2017; Stewart, 2009）。但儒家「角色義務倫理觀」則不然，其所重視的角色義務多是針對特定關係對象（例如對父母盡孝），不具有普遍性，而且儒家倫理觀非常重視個人的品格或德行（Ames, 2011; Angle & Slote, 2013; Chan, 2014; Hwang, 1999, 2012）。綜合上述，西方規範倫理學各學派與儒家倫理觀的主要差異，可大致整理如表 1。

表 1
西方規範倫理學與儒家倫理觀主要差異

理論觀	關注焦點	道德判斷標準
效益論	行為後果之效益	極大化最多數人的最大利益
Kant 義務論	行為自身之性質	行為可普遍化原則
德行倫理學	行為者之德行	有德者之智慧
儒家倫理觀	行為者之德行與社會角色	有德者之智慧與履行角色義務

由上可知，儒家的「角色義務倫理觀」與「普遍主義式義務論」對於道德的定義、關注焦點與判斷標準，皆不完全相同。雖然「台」文亦提及「角色義務」之概念：「角色義務是依個體在社會網絡或社會關係中所扮演的角色所定義……僅有當這樣的角色義務被評判者認為對他人造成了影響，該角色義務才會從社會成規範轉為道德範疇」（頁 155），但文中並未詳述此命題之意涵。一種可能解讀是：「台」文是將對角色義務的理解置於個人主觀認知的脈絡之中。然而，這樣的觀點仍與儒家倫理觀有所差異，因為在儒家倫理觀中，「角色義務」或「道德範疇」並非僅由個人主觀性來界定，而是含有社會建構的意義。若只從個體主觀性來界定「道德範疇」，將忽視華人文化中對於道德或倫理觀的結構理路與特性。進一步而言，任何道德價值系統都不是脫離社會脈絡的個人認知，而是由特定社會文化與歷史脈絡建構之社會表徵（social representations）（Moscovici, 2000）。因此，對於一般大眾所抱持的道德信念，仍需要從所處之社會文化脈絡進行分析，才可能有較整全的理解。

綜言之，從倫理學的角度來看，普遍主義式義務論與儒家倫理觀對於「道德」的關注焦點並不相同，兩者對於道德判斷標準的認定也不相同。然而，「台」文在批評過去研究時，未能對 Fwu 等人（2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021）與 Chen 等人（2009, 2016, 2019；王冠樺、陳舜文，2020；陳舜文、魏嘉瑩，2013）之理論脈絡有正確且完整的認識，而且也未釐清其自身所引用的「社會—認知範疇理論」之背景脈絡與概念意涵，更未分析比較「普遍主義式義務論」與「儒家倫理觀」的重大差異。簡言之，「台」文於理論上的基本問題在於：未清楚說明何以能夠用基於「普遍主義式義務論」的「社會—認知範疇理論」，來解釋針對特定關係對象，以「角色義務」為基礎的「儒家倫理觀」之研究結果。

（二）研究方法的問題

「台」文在研究方法上的問題可以分為兩方面：第一，「台」文的測量方式與「社會—認知範疇理論」的測量方式不符；第二，「台」文詢問道德的量表題目用詞模糊，而且在方法論上採取了素樸的實證主義（naive positivism），因而過度簡化了社會實在（social reality）、理論建構與經驗現象之間的關聯（黃光國，2018；Benton & Craib, 2010；Godfrey-Smith, 2003）。以

下分別說明之。

1. 測量內容與「社會—認知範疇理論」之差異

「台」文聲稱採用 Turiel 的「社會—認知範疇理論」，但測量內容也與該理論對於「道德」的測量方式不符。Turiel 等人（1991）的研究設計仿效 Kohlberg 的測量方法。首先提供各種社會議題的故事，然後藉由結構化訪談得到的反應，將這些議題區分為道德議題、社會習俗及個人選擇事務。這些研究者提出道德推理的兩個向度：衡量標準和正當性。衡量標準是指個人用以定義和區分不同領域的特徵，包括對行為的評估（該行為對或錯、是否被允許）、規則或權威人物的依存性（是否應該有規則或法律、該行為在沒有規則或法律的情況下是對或錯）、個人管轄權（行為適切性取決於個人選擇或傾向）、共識性（行為評估應當由團體同意或文化標準所決定）及宗教習俗（宗教教義是否可決定行為評估）。

換言之，Turiel 等研究者並非如「台」文一般，直接詢問參與者「某特定行為是否屬於道德」，而是根據「社會—認知範疇理論」所界定的特徵，驗證參與者的反應是否符合該理論的預測。「台」文引用 Helwig 與 Turiel（2011）對於社會成規與道德的區隔，認為道德要考慮的是「是否對他人造成影響」。然而在「台」文的研究量表中，各項「道德分量表」的題目包括：「當一個人不努力唸書的時候，我認為他應該要覺得這樣是不道德的」、「當一個人功課不好的時候，我認為他應該要覺得這樣是不道德的」、「當一個人不孝順父母的時候，我認為他應該要覺得這樣是不道德的」等，皆未納入「是否對他人造成影響」的敘述。簡言之，「台」文的測量內容與其所根據的「社會—認知範疇理論」並不一致。一般而言，實徵研究之測量或操作必須切合理論構念之定義，例如 Fwu 等人（2014）將努力於學業視為角色義務，即是因為學業目標符合「華人成就目標理論架構」（Chen et al., 2009）所界定之華人社會縱向目標。

2. 測量構念模糊與方法論的根本問題

「台」文採用量表直接詢問受試者某種行為是否不道德，並表示該研究之優勢為「直接讓被要求努力與成績的當事人（台灣青少年）對關乎社會成規與道德規範以及無條件積極義務的敘述進行判定」（頁 161）。然而，無論是在日常生活或學術用語中，「道德」一詞其實具有多重意涵。受試者對道德的解讀，可能來自許多

不同脈絡。大部分人在直覺判斷時，可能也無法仔細區辨或分析「道德」一詞在前述不同倫理學系統中的諸多意涵。因此，在研究相關議題時，如果直接詢問一般大眾「某種行為是否屬於道德」，而未深究其倫理學的脈絡，恐怕難以釐清研究結果的意義。

更清楚地說，儒家倫理觀或道德觀的文化特性在於重視美德與角色義務。「學生努力用功」與「子女孝順父母」都是屬於美德與角色義務，也都受到儒家思想所重視。因此，如果要探討儒家倫理觀的文化特性，問卷題目更適當的問法可能是「子女孝順父母是否為美德（或盡到角色義務）」、「學生努力用功是否為美德（或盡到角色義務）」等。

再者，「台」文對於 Fwu 等人過去研究的批評是：「過往對於努力之道德性的探討…僅依據受訪者對故事主角是否符合學生或子女的角色義務之應然性或對錯好壞便進行推論，與道德的本質仍有落差」（頁 160），然而文中所謂「道德本質」一詞意義相當模糊。如果「台」文欲探討「道德本質」，必須先釐清「道德本質」在倫理學中的意義為何？也需要說明「道德本質」是否可純然視為是參與者對道德之主觀認知？或者是由社會文化所建構的價值系統，具有相對客觀的社會屬性？「台」文並未清楚說明其所謂「道德本質」一詞的意義，不過從研究方法來看，「台」文似乎是直接將參與者的回應視為是「道德本質」。

在當代科學哲學中，直接將實徵資料視為是「本質」的觀點，屬於素樸的實證主義科學觀，這樣的觀點過度簡化了社會實在，且混淆了理論與經驗的關係（黃光國，2018; Benton & Craib, 2010; Godfrey-Smith, 2003）。從道德心理學的角度來看，這種做法也混淆了道德論述的多重理路，而將社會文化層次與個體心理層次簡化融接，或甚至化約為個人層次的主觀認知（陳舜文、邱振訓，2011; Archer, 1995）。更清楚地說，直接將被研究者的反應視為是「道德本質」，是混淆了社會科學研究的「一度詮釋」（first-degree interpretation）與「二度詮釋」（second-degree interpretation）之區分。所謂「一度詮釋」是「以被研究者本身的認識或意識動機作為研究的依歸與判準」，「二度詮釋」則是「具主導性之優勢文化歷史脈絡對人們引發行動所可能具有的社會（而非個人心理）意義」，而不是日常行動者的自我解釋（即「一度詮釋」）（葉啓政，1997; Schutz, 1962）。換言之，社會科學研究者必須建構顧及文化脈絡的理論，來說明行動者在其生活世界的所作所為，才可能貼切地掌握主導心理與行為的脈絡結構，並且啓

發「一般人所未能思及者」（葉啓政，1997; 黃光國，2017）。

因此，在方法論的層次上，本文並不同意「台」文直接將參與者的回應視為是「道德本質」。積極的建議是，如果要探討特定文化社會中人們的道德觀，研究者必須先針對欲探討的價值系統提出清楚合理的理論架構，並瞭解該理論架構的社會文化脈絡，才可能釐清構念的意涵以及構念之間的關係，並做出有意義的提問與研究假設，然後才可能設想適切的研究方法。進一步而言，現實世界中的道德規範皆含有社會建構的性質，不能只是簡單地化約為個體的主觀認知。因此在研究方法上，研究者不能只是記錄與比較一般大眾的「一度詮釋」經驗資料，還必須考慮社會文化之脈絡與特性，將「一度詮釋」的經驗資料放在理論脈絡中進行「二度詮釋」的理解與分析。

（三）研究結果的詮釋問題

1. 對「台」文研究結果的疑問

「台」文的研究量表均為連續量尺，在檢驗「努力」、「學業成就」及「孝道」是否為社會成規或是道德的標準時，是以高或低於 3.50 分（6 點量尺的中間值）為基準（頁 158）。既然 6 點量尺的同意與否並非二分選項，而是程度高低的區別，表示 3.50 分並非參與者心中「是」或「否」的分界，只是研究者為了分析而自行選擇的切分點。

然而，將連續量尺轉換為二分變項，可能減損原始資料裡較為豐富的訊息，降低結果的統計檢定力（power），並且嚴重低估組間變異程度，也可能掩蓋變項之間的非線性關係（Altman & Royston, 2006）。以連續變項進行統計分析才是更妥適的方法，可以避免上述問題。因此，「台」文認為 3.50 分以上即是行為被視為「有道德、符合成規」；3.50 分以下則「不具道德、不合成規」，此一結論並不適當，也不能據此推論參與者認為「努力」、「學業成就」及「孝道」必然屬於或不屬於道德或成規。換言之，「台」文的結果或許能顯示，參與者判斷「努力」、「學業成就」及「孝道」這三個領域符合參與者心目中「道德」意涵的程度，然而並不能依此否定 Fwu 等人（2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021）與 Chen 等人（2009, 2016, 2019; 王冠樺、陳舜文，2020; 陳舜文、魏嘉瑩，2013）的研究結果，亦即「努力」及「學業成就」與角色義務有關的論點。

2. 從儒家倫理觀解釋「台」文的研究結果

「台」文比較「努力」、「孝順」或「學業成就」三個範疇後表示，「孝順」符合道德或社會成規議題的程度高於「努力」及「學業成就」。然而從本文前述的理論和方法評析來看，「台」文對於何以「孝順」符合道德或社會成規議題的程度高於「努力」及「學業成就」，並未提出適切的解釋。相反地，若從儒家倫理觀以及「華人成就目標理論架構」的相關研究（王冠樺、陳舜文，2020；陳舜文、魏嘉瑩，2013；Chen et al., 2009, 2016, 2019；Fwu et al., 2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021），卻可以對「台」文的結果提出解釋：由於孝道直接涉及儒家社會極為重視的角色義務，因此「不孝順」被認為最不符合道德；其次，努力於學業是盡到角色義務的方法與手段，因此「不努力」也會被認為是不符道德，但其強度不及「不孝順」；最後，學業成就雖與努力有關，但也涉及努力之外的因素（例如運氣），努力僅為達到優良學業成就的原因之一，因此「學業表現不好」與道德意涵的關聯最弱。換言之，「台」文結果也可以間接支持 Fwu 等人之論點：即使在現代華人社會裡，儒家倫理觀依然顯現於華人的認知及行為中。

結語

Fwu 等人（2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021）、Chen 等人（2009, 2016, 2019；王冠樺、陳舜文，2020；陳舜文、魏嘉瑩，2013）、Wang 與 Lin（2020）的系列研究是在儒家倫理觀的脈絡下，主張努力的道德性及努力是無條件的積極義務，並探討其中的社會文化心理機制。「台」文則依據「社會一認知範疇理論」，從西方義務論的角度界定道德意涵，並質疑前述論點為間接推論，故其研究直接詢問受試者「不努力用功是否不道德」，據以表示「努力具道德性」非台灣青少年的共識。然本文指出，在理論上，「台」文未區辨「儒家倫理觀」與「社會一認知範疇理論」之差異，因此不適合以「社會一認知範疇理論」對比從儒家倫理觀切入的研究觀念。其次，在研究方法上，「台」文的量表題目無法細究倫理學的脈絡，量表題目亦未呼應其「社會一認知範疇理論」道德範疇的前提，而且在方法論上帶有素樸實證主義的根本問題，因此恐怕難以依據其理論，釐清研究結果的意義。最後，在研究結果的解釋上，「台」文未說明其研究參與者對於孝道、努力、學業成就之判斷不同的原因，但從儒家倫理觀所建構的

理論反而可以解釋「台」文的結果。

本文在回應「台」文的同時也要指出，從多元文化系統的觀點來看，華人文化其實也包含儒家以外之思想傳統，而且現代台灣社會亦受到西方文化之影響。在不同文化脈絡與價值系統之中，「道德」一詞可能具有不同意涵。一般人在生活世界中，可能只是自動與片面地使用或吸收各種意涵，但不一定意識到個別概念背後的整體脈絡與系統差異。因此未來可進一步探討，在不同情境脈絡下，人們之道德觀與其所展現的學習動機或行為之關聯。再者，亦可探討人們對道德範疇的看法，是否會隨著時代變遷而產生不同面貌。例如：台灣社會中，人們的道德觀是否有別於儒家傳統的角色義務觀？或是傳統觀念與西方文化融合形成新的道德觀？這樣的探討應可為未來華人學習動機與成就領域，帶出更深入且豐富的研究方向。最後，吾人期待「台」文與本文間的對話，能創造良性學術對話的空間，激盪出新的迴響，進一步活化台灣在地研究的動力。

參考文獻

- 王冠樺、陳舜文（2020）：〈父母努力信念對兒童學習投入之預測效果：以兒童知覺父母與自身努力信念為中介〉。《本土心理學研究》，54，63-111。 [Wang, K. H. & Chen, S. W. (2020). The predictive effects of parents' beliefs about effort on their children's learning engagement: Two mediated models. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 54, 63-111.] [http://doi.org/10.6254/IPRCS.202012_\(54\).0002](http://doi.org/10.6254/IPRCS.202012_(54).0002)
- 波普爾（1989）：《客觀知識》（程實定譯）。結構群。（原著出版年：1972） [Popper, K. (1989). *Objective knowledge: An evolutionary approach* (S.-T. Cheng, Trans.). JieGou Qun. (Original work published 1972)]
- 張泰銓、雷庚玲（2018）：〈台灣青少年是否認為努力與學業成就關乎道德？〉。《中華心理學刊》，60，151-172。 [Chang, T. C., & Lay, K. L. (2018). Do Taiwanese adolescents believe in the moral significance of effort and school performance? *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 60, 151-172.] <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203522653>
- 陳世益（2008）：《華人社會中孝道與努力信念的關連》（未出版碩士論文）。中原大學。 [Chen, S. Y.

- (2008). *The relationship of filial piety and effort belief in Chinese societies*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Chung Yuan Christian University.] <https://doi.org/10.6840/CYCU.2008.00062>
- 陳舜文、邱振訓 (2011) : 〈道德判斷的「雙重歷程模式」：認知、情緒與文化的整合觀點〉。《本土心理學研究》, 36, 33-76。[Chen, S. W., & Chiu, C. H. (2011). The dual-process model of moral judgment: An integrated viewpoint of cognition, emotion and culture. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 36, 33-76.] <https://doi.org/10.6254/2011.36.33>
- 陳舜文、魏嘉瑩 (2013) : 〈大學生學習動機之「雙因素模式」：學業認同與角色認同之功能〉。《中華心理學刊》, 55, 41-55。[Chen, S. W., & Wei, C. Y. (2013). A two-factor model of learning motivation for Chinese undergraduates: On the function of academic identity and role identity. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 55, 41-55.] <https://doi.org/10.6129/CJP.20120717>
- 黃光國 (2009) : 《儒家關係主義：哲學反思、理論建構與實徵研究》。心理出版社。[Hwang, K. K. (2009). *Relationalism: Philosophical reflection, theory construction, and empirical research*. Psychological publishing]
- 黃光國 (2017) : 《儒家文化系統的主體辯證》。五南圖書。[Hwang, K. K. (2017). *The subjective dialectics of the Confucian cultural system*. Wunan publishing]
- 黃光國 (2018) : 《社會科學的理路 (第四版 / 思源版)》。心理出版社。[Hwang, K. K. (2018). *The logic of social sciences* (4th ed.). Psychological publishing]
- 葉啓政 (1997) : 〈「本土契合性」的另類思考〉。《本土心理學研究》, 8, 121-139。[Yeh, C. J. (1997). The alternative thought on “indigenous congruence.” *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 8, 121-139.] <https://doi.org/10.6254/1997.8.121>
- Altman, D. G., & Royston, P. (2006). The cost of dichotomising continuous variables. *BMJ*, 332(7549), 1080. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.332.7549.1080>
- Ames, R. (2011). *Confucian role ethics: A vocabulary*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
- Angle, S. C., & Slote, M. (Eds.) (2013). *Virtue ethics and Confucianism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203522653>
- Archer, M. S. (1995). *Realist social theory: The morphogenetic approach*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511557675>
- Arnett, J. J. (2008). The neglected 95%: Why American psychology needs to become less American. *American Psychologist*, 63, 602-614. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Benton, T., & Craib, I. (2011). *Philosophy of Social Science: The Philosophical Foundations of Social Thought* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campbell, R. L., & Christopher, J. C. (1996). Moral development theory: A critique of its Kantian presuppositions. *Developmental Review*, 16, 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1006/drev.1996.0001>
- Chan, J. (2014). *Confucian perfectionism: A political philosophy for modern times*. Princeton University Press.
- Chan, K. W., Lai, P. Y., Leung, M. T., & Moore, P. J. (2005). Students' goal orientations, study strategies and achievement: A closer look in Hong Kong Chinese cultural context. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 14, 1-26.
- Chen, S. W., Fwu, B. J., Wei, C. F., & Wang, H. H. (2016). High-school teachers' beliefs about effort and their attitudes toward struggling and smart students in a Confucian society. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1366 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01366>
- Chen, S. W., Fwu, B. J., Wei, C. F., & Wang, H. H. (2019). Effort beliefs count: The predictive effects of effort beliefs on students' emotion, attribution, and behavior toward academic failure in a Confucian cultural context. In G. A. D. Liem & S. H. Tan (Eds.), *Asian education miracles: In search of sociocultural and psychological explanations* (pp. 207-221). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315180625-13>
- Chen, S. W., Wang, H. H., Wei, C. F., Fwu, B. J., & Hwang, K. K. (2009). Taiwanese students' self-attributions

- for two types of achievement goals. *Journal of Social Psychology, 149*, 179-193. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.149.2.179-194>
- Cheng, R. W. Y., & Lam, S. F. (2013). The interaction between social goals and self-construal on achievement motivation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 38*, 136-148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2013.01.001>
- D'Ailly, H. (2003). Children's autonomy and perceived control in learning: A model of motivation and achievement in Taiwan. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*, 84-96. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.1.84>
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivation processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41*, 1040-1048. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.41.10.1040>
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256-273. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256>
- Fuller, L. L. (1977). *The morality of law*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fwu, B. J., Chen, S. W., Wei, C. F., & Wang, H. H. (2017a). The mediating role of self-exertion on the effects of effort on learning virtues and emotional distress in academic failure in a Confucian cultural context. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7*, 2047. published: 09 January 2017 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.02047>
- Fwu, B. J., Chen, S. W., Wei, C. F., & Wang, H. H. (2018). I believe; therefore, I work harder: The significance of reflective thinking on effort-making in academic failure in a Confucian-heritage cultural context. *Thinking Skills and Creativity, 30*, 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsc.2018.01.004>
- Fwu, B. J., Wang, H. H., Chen, S. W., & Wei, C. F. (2016). Effort counts and goals matter: The effects of effort and achievement goals on moral image, approval, and disapproval in a Chinese cultural context. In R. B. King & A. B. I. Bernardo (Eds.), *Psychology of Asian learners: A festschrift in honor of David Watkins* (pp. 337-353). Singapore: Springer Asia. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-576-1_21
- Fwu, B. J., Wang, H. H., Chen, S. W., & Wei, C. F. (2017b). 'Feeling bad' or 'being bad?' The trapping effect of effort in academic failure in a Confucian cultural context. *Educational Psychology, 37*, 506-519. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2016.1152355>
- Fwu, B. J., Wei, C. F., Chen, S. W., & Wang, H. H. (2014). Effort counts: The moral significance of effort in the patterns of credit assignment on math learning in the Confucian cultural context. *International Journal of Educational Development, 39*, 167-172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2014.07.010>
- Fwu, B. J., Wei, C. F., Chen, S. W., & Wang, H. H. (2021). To work hard or not? The conflicting effects of negative emotions on persistence after academic failure in a Confucian-heritage cultural context. In J. Chen & R. B. King (Eds.), *Emotions in education: Asian insights on emotions in learning, teaching, and leadership* (pp. 3-17). New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429353581-1>
- Godfrey-Smith, P. (2003). *Theory and reality: An introduction to the philosophy of science*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hamilton, V. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., Akoh, H., & Miura, K. (1990). Credit and blame among American and Japanese children: Normative, cultural, and individual differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*, 442-451. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.3.442>
- Hamilton, V. L., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Kushler, R. H. (1988). A question of standard: Attributions of blame and credit for classroom acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 34-48. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.1.34>
- Hau, K. T., & Ho, I. T. (2010). Chinese students' motivation and achievement. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *Oxford handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp. 187-204). Oxford University Press.
- Heine, S. J., Kitayama, S., Lehman, D. R., Takata, T.,

- Ide, E., Leung, C., & Matsumoto, H. (2001). Divergent motivational consequences of success and failure in Japan and North America. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*, 599-615. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.81.4.599>
- Helwig, C. C., & Turiel, E. (2011). Children's social and moral reasoning. In P. K. Smith & C. H. Hart (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell handbook of childhood social development* (2nd ed.). (pp. 567-583). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444390933.ch30>
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*, 61-83. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Ho, I. T., & Hau, K. T. (2008). Academic achievement in the Chinese context: The role of goals, strategies, and effort. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*, 892-897. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207590701836323>
- Ho, I. T., Hau, K. T., & Salili, F. (2007). Expectancy and value as predictors of Chinese students' achievement goal orientation. In F. Salili & R. Hoosain (Eds.), *Culture, learning, and motivation: A multicultural perspective* (pp. 69-90). Charlotte, NC: Information age.
- Hsu, F. L. (1971). Psychosocial homeostasis and jen: Conceptual tools for advancing psychological anthropology. *American Anthropologist, 73*, 23-44. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1971.73.1.02a00030>
- Hwang, K. K. (1999). Filial piety and loyalty: Two types of social identification in Confucianism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 2*, 163-183. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00031>
- Hwang, K. K. (2012). *Foundations of Chinese psychology: Confucian social relations*. Springer.
- King, R. B., & McInerney, D. M. (2016). Culture and motivation: The road travelled and the way ahead. In K. R. Wentzel & D. B. Miele (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (2nd ed.). (pp. 275-299). Routledge.
- Leung, F. K. S. (2002). Behind the high achievement of East Asian students. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 8*, 87-108. <https://doi.org/10.1076/edre.8.1.87.6920>
- Li, J. (2002). A cultural model of learning: Chinese "heart and mind for wanting to learn." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 33*, 248-269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022102033003003>
- Li, J. (2005). Mind or virtue: Western and Chinese beliefs about learning. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 14*, 190-194. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0963-7214.2005.00362.x>
- Li, J. (2012). *Cultural foundations of learning*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139028400>
- Lourenco, O. M. (1994). Portuguese children's judgments of moral, prosocial, and academic norms: duty of aspiration? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 17*, 367-381. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016502549401700208>
- MacKinnon, B., & Fiala, A. (2017). *Ethics: Theory and contemporary issues* (9th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Moscovici, S. (2000). *Social representations*. Polity Press.
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Hooper, M. (2016a). *TIMSS 2015 international results in mathematics*. Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. <http://ssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2015/international-results/wp-content/uploads/filebase/full%20pdfs/T15-International-Results-in-Mathematics.pdf>
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., & Hooper, M. (2016b). *TIMSS 2015 international results in science*. Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. <http://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2015/international-results/wp-content/uploads/filebase/full%20pdfs/T15-International-Results-in-Science.pdf>
- Mullis, I. V. S., Martin, M. O., Foy, P., Kelly, D. L., & Fishbein, B. (2020). *TIMSS 2019 International Results in Mathematics and Science*. Boston College, TIMSS & PIRLS International Study Center. <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/timss2019/international-results/>
- OECD (2003). *Literacy skills for the world of tomorrow-*

- Further results from PISA 2000*. Paris: Author.
- OECD/UNESCO Institute for Statistics (2003). *Literacy skills for the world of tomorrow: Further results from PISA 2000*. Author. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264102873-en>
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation is education: Theory, research, and applications* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Raffaelli, M., Lazarevic, V., Koller, S. H., Nsamenang, A. B., & Sharma, D. (2013). Introduction: Special issue on adolescents in the majority world. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 23, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12000>
- Salili, F., & Lai, M. K. (2003). Learning and motivation of Chinese students in Hong Kong: a longitudinal study of the contextual influences on students' achievement orientation and performance. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40, 51-70. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.10069>
- Schleicher, A., (2019). *PISA 2018: Insights and interpretations*. OECD. <https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA%202018%20Insights%20and%20Interpretations%20FINAL%20PDF.pdf>
- Schunk, D. H., & Pajares, F. (2009). Self-efficacy theory. In K. Wentzel & A. Wigfield (Eds.). *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 35-53). Routledge.
- Schutz, A. (1962). *Collected papers I: The problem of social reality*. Martinus Nijhoff.
- Stevenson, H. W., Lee, S. Y., Chen, C., & Lummis, M. (1990). Mathematics achievement of children in China and the United States. *Child Development*, 61, 1053-1066. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1130875>
- Stevenson, H. W., & Stigler, J. W. (1992). *The learning gap: Why our schools are failing and what we can learn from Japanese and Chinese education*. Touchstone Books.
- Stewart, N. (2009). *Ethics: An introduction to moral philosophy*. Polity Press.
- Tao, V., & Hong, Y. Y. (2014). When academic achievement is an obligation: Perspectives from social-oriented achievement motivation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 45, 110-136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022113490072>
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge University Press.
- Turiel, E., Hildebrandt, C., & Wainryb, C. (1991). Judging social issues: Difficulties, inconsistencies, and consistencies. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 56 (2, Serial No. 224). <https://doi.org/10.2307/1166056>
- Wang, H. H., & Lin, C. Y. (2020). Learning for duty or enjoyment: Two paths to fulfillment in learning for Taiwanese high school students in the Confucian cultural context. *Journal of Research in Education Sciences*, 65(1), 271-296. [https://doi.org/10.6209/JORIES.202003_65\(1\).0010](https://doi.org/10.6209/JORIES.202003_65(1).0010)
- Weiner, B., & Peter, N. (1973). A cognitive-developmental analysis of achievement and moral judgments. *Developmental Psychology*, 9, 290-309. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034924>
- Zhang, M., & Cross, S. E. (2011). Emotions in memories of success and failure: A cultural perspective. *Emotion*, 11, 866-880. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0024025>

Chinese Academic Achievement Goals and Confucian Ethics: A Response to “Do Taiwanese Adolescents Believe in the Moral Significance of Effort and School Performance?”

Bih-Jen Fwu¹, Shun-Wen Chen², Chih-Fen Wei³, and Hsiou-Huai Wang¹

The Center for Teacher Education, National Taiwan University¹

Department of Educational Psychology and Counseling, National Tsing Hua University²

Department of Psychology and Counseling, University of Taipei³

Chang & Lei's (2018) article entitled, “Do Taiwanese Adolescents Believe in the Moral Significance of Effort and School Performance?” took a critical stand to the perspective held by a series of research conducted by Chen et al. (2009), Hwang (2012) and Fwu et al. (2014) that effort as positive duty has moral significance. Through empirical data collection on Taiwanese high school and college students, Chang & Lei concluded that such viewpoint was not supported by Taiwanese adolescents. As an attempt to further academic dialogue, this article first explicates the characteristics of and relevant research findings based on the Chinese academic achievement goal and the Confucian ethics. Then, this article responded to Chang & Lei's (2018) claims in the following three dimensions. First, theoretically, the social-cognitive domain theory adopted by Chang & Lei was quintessentially different from the theory constructed by the authors based on the Confucian ethics, and thus the ideas and concepts developed by the two distinct theories could not be compared and contrasted. Second, methodologically, the items used in Chang & Lei's measurement scale were not accurately developed to capture the essence of morality in the theoretical context of social-cognitive domain theory, demonstrating a fundamental problem of naïve positivist approach in methodology. Lastly, Chang & Lei failed to explain the rationales used by their participants to discern filial piety, effort and academic achievement. The authors argued that, on the contrary, their findings could be better explained by the theory constructed based on the Confucian ethics.

Keywords: *Academic achievement goal, Confucian ethics, Effort, Social-cognitive domain theory*

Extended Abstract

Chang and Lei's article *Do Taiwanese Adolescents Believe in the Moral Significance of Effort and School Performance?*, published in this journal in 2018, took a critical stance toward the argument proposed in our article (Fwu et al., 2014) that effort as an unconditional duty has moral significance. The intention of this article is to advance constructive dialogue by explicating (1) the theoretical framework and empirical results of our series of studies, (2) Chang and Lei's research findings and their critique of our studies, and (3) our rebuttal of Chang and Lei's stance, which addresses the theoretical,

methodological, and interpretive problems inherent in their article.

Series of Studies by Fwu et al.

Students in countries in the East Asian Confucian circle (including Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, and Taiwan) have performed outstandingly well in international academic rankings such as the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the Program of International Student Assessment

(PISA) (Mullis, et al., 2016a, 2016b; Mullis, et al., 2020; OECD, 2018; Schleicher, 2019). However, many empirical studies have shown that mainstream Western psychological theories such as Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory, Bandura's (1997) self-efficacy theory, and Dweck and Leggett's (1988) achievement goal theory, do not explain the motivations and performances of East Asian students (Hau & Ho, 2010; King & McInerney, 2016). Thus, to better explain the phenomenon, Fwu et al. (2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021), Chen et al. (2009, 2016, 2019), Chen and Wei (2013), and Wang and Lin (2020) conducted a series of empirical studies to verify a culture-inclusive theory of achievement motivation proposed by Chen et al. (2009).

The Theoretical Framework of Chinese Achievement Goals

In a Confucian cultural context, individuals pursue socially expected goals to fulfill role obligations in a dyad relationship and thereby signal personal virtues and enhance the cultivation of inner moral development (Hwang, 2009). Chen et al. (2009) proposed a framework of Chinese achievement goals to explain the motives and forms of individuals' pursuit of such goals. Typically, when a Chinese individual constructs achievement goals, in addition to personal interest, the expectations of significant others will be taken into account. Thus, there are two types of achievement goals: personal goals and vertical goals. The former are based on personal interest, with little reference to social expectations or values, whereas the latter are related to social role obligations, the content and standards of which are of little relevance to personal choice. Mainstream Western theories of achievement motivation neither emphasize the impact of social expectations on Chinese motives and behaviors in pursuit of academic goals, nor understand the relevance of the pursuit of vertical goals and individual morality, and thus they cannot properly explain the phenomenon of Chinese students' devotion to pursuing academic goals.

In Chinese society, academic goals, which are often ascribed high social value and based on social expectations, are considered to be students' role

obligations. In other words, academic goals are "vertical" goals that are highly valued by society and effort in pursuit of such goals is always regarded as of paramount importance. As a result, students who fail academically can only attribute their failure to inadequate effort, and thus failure may prompt them to make greater effort to fulfill role obligations (Chen et al., 2009; Chen & Wei, 2013; Hwang, 2004, 2009; Tao & Hong, 2014).

Empirical Research Outcomes

Based on the Confucian concept of role obligations and the theoretical framework of Chinese achievement goals (Chen et al., 2009), Fwu et al. (2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021), Chen et al. (2009, 2016, 2019), Chen and Wei (2013), and Wang and Lin (2020) conducted a series of empirical studies and reported the following major findings in support of the framework.

- (1) In the pursuit of a vertical goal such as academic achievement, the more effort students made, irrespective of success or failure, the more parents and teachers credited them with a strong moral image and learning virtues. However, there were fewer discrepancies between the perceived moral image and learning virtues of those who made effort in pursuit of personal goals and those who did not. Moreover, teachers who considered effort to be an obligation preferred students who worked hard but whose performance was average (i.e., those with learning virtues) to students who did not work hard but performed outstandingly well. These results correspond with Li's (2002, 2005, 2012) findings that learning is virtue-oriented in East Asian societies.
- (2) Hard-working students who were successful in pursuit of a vertical goal tended to win more credit from parents and teachers due to their better moral image, whereas in cases of failure, those who did not work hard tended to receive more punishment from parents and teachers because their failure to fulfill their role obligations resulted in a worse moral image. However, in the pursuit of personal goals, the gap in the moral images of hard-working and lazy students was smaller, indicating that Chinese parents and teachers

considered both “process” and “outcome” when assigning credit or blame when their children pursued vertical goals such as academic achievement.

- (3) College students tended to adopt an “effort” model when discussing their academic success or failure. Attributing academic failure to a lack of effort may motivate students to study harder to fulfill their role obligations by achieving academic success. Such outcomes correspond to the results from a variety of cross-cultural studies that showed that Chinese parents and students tended to attribute outcomes to effort made in the process of learning (Li, 2002, 2012; Stevenson et al., 1990; Stevenson & Stigler, 1992).
- (4) Students who regarded the pursuit of vertical goals as fulfilling role obligations felt indebted toward their parents and themselves after reflecting upon their academic failure. To escape from such feelings of indebtedness, they tended to motivate themselves to work harder to achieve academic success. This finding echoes previous findings that East Asian students tended to persevere after academic failure (Heine et al., 2001; Zhang & Cross, 2011).

Chang and Lei’s Research Outcomes and Their Critique of Fwu et al.’s Studies

Chang and Lei (2018) presented three critiques of the conclusion of Fwu et al. that effort, as an unconditional positive duty, has moral value.

Theoretically, they pointed out that Fwu et al., drawing on a moral perspective predicated upon Confucian role ethics, regarded effort and academic achievement as moral obligations. They argued that from a social-cognitive domain perspective, fulfilling one’s obligations can only be viewed as a social convention, not a moral issue (p. 51). Second, they maintained that according to Helwig and Turiel (2011), the only valid criterion for judging a certain behavior as moral conduct or a social convention is whether “such behavior would affect others” (p. 155).

Methodologically, Chang and Lei asked Taiwanese high school and college students to rate on a 6-point Likert scale if a person is “immoral” (moral issue) or

“not right/should not do this” (social convention issue) if he/she “is not filial,” “did not work hard” or “had low academic performance.” They defined an average score above 3.50 as an indication of behavior deviating from moral rules or social conventions (p. 158).

Chang and Lei concluded that effort was regarded as a social convention, not a moral conduct or an unconditional positive duty (p. 161). Moreover, they found that when comparing the three domains of “effort,” “filial piety,” and “academic achievement,” filial piety had higher salience as a moral issue or social convention than either effort or academic achievement (Table 1 on p. 159).

In sum, Chang and Lei concluded that Taiwanese adolescents regarded effort as a social convention (p. 161), and that there was no consensus among these young people on the moral significance of effort (p. 151).

Response to Chang and Lei’s Critique

This article responds to Chang and Lei’s critique, considering theoretical issues, research methods, and research outcomes.

Theoretical issues

Chang and Lei attempted to make a direct link between effort and morality, i.e., to ascertain whether effort corresponds to a moral standard. Their perspective was based on social-cognitive domain theory (SCDT) (Helwig & Turiel, 2011; Turiel, 1983). However, there is a huge gap between SCDT and Confucian ethics in terms of their fundamental perspective on ethics. SCDT primarily originates from Kolberg’s theory of moral psychology and Kantian deontological theory (see review by Campbell and Christopher (1996)). Kant’s deontological ethics focuses on “duty” from the theoretical perspective of universalism, i.e., the duty to be fulfilled by each rational being. However, from the perspective of Confucian role ethics, the obligation to be fulfilled is related to specific persons in relations (e.g., a child’s filial obligations to a parent) rather than universally applied. Moreover, Confucian ethics gives higher priority to individual

character or morality (Ames, 2011; Angle & Slote, 2013; Chan, 2014; Hwang, 1999, 2012). The basic theoretical problem of Chang and Lei's article is that they did not clarify why the universalist-oriented SCDDT could be used to critique research that was primarily based on the particularist-oriented Confucian ethics of role obligations.

Methodological issues

Chang and Lei's research had three methodological problems. First, its assessment methods did not correspond to their theory. Second, the wording used in their scale items was rather vague. They asked respondents to consider if a certain behavior was "immoral" without considering that there are multiple interpretations of "morality" under different ethical systems, as mentioned above. Such questions cannot yield meaningful outcomes because each respondent may interpret "morality" very differently. Third, Chang and Lei confused "first-degree interpretation" with "second-degree interpretation" (Schutz, 1962/1992) by taking participants' direct responses to the scale items as "the essence of morality." To put it more clearly, Chang and Lei adopted an approach of naïve positivism in their research, oversimplifying the relationship between social reality, theoretical frameworks, and experiential phenomena (Benton & Craib, 2010; Hwang, 2018; Godfrey-Smith, 2003).

Interpretations of research outcomes

Chang and Lei compared "effort", "filial piety", and "academic achievement" and pointed out that Taiwanese adolescents considered "filial piety" to be more strongly a moral or social convention issue than "effort" and "academic achievement." However, they did not provide appropriate explanations for why filial piety had higher moral or social convention value. In fact, such results can be better explained by the Confucian ethical perspective and the theoretical framework of Chinese achievement goals applied by Fwu et al. Because filial piety is viewed as a cardinal duty under the Confucian ethics system,

a lack of filial piety is regarded as the most "immoral" behavior. As making effort in academic work is a way to fulfill one's role obligations, lack of effort is also regarded as immoral but is not as bad as not being filial. Although academic achievement is related to one's effort, effort is only one of the factors underlying good academic performance; thus, poor performance is regarded as the least related to morality.

Conclusions

The series of studies based on the Confucian ethical perspective conducted by Fwu et al. (2014, 2016, 2017a, 2017b, 2018, 2021), Chen et al. (2009, 2016, 2019), Chen and Wei (2013), and Wang and Lin (2020) highlighted the moral value of effort as an unconditional positive duty and explored the sociocultural psychological mechanism underlying this premise. In contrast, Chang and Lei (2018) based their research on SCDDT, defined morality from the Western perspective of deontological ethics, and suggested the findings of Fwu et al. were based on indirect inferences. They directly asked participants whether a "lack of academic effort is immoral" and concluded that there was no consensus among Taiwanese youths about the moral value of effort. This article rebuts Chang and Lei's critique by pointing out the following three problems inherent in their research. They applied a drastically different theoretical framework that the Confucian role ethics used in the original research and the concepts they adopted were not comparable to those used by Fwu et al. Methodologically, their scale items were vague, did not correspond to the premises of SCDDT theory, and were flawed by a naïve positivism. Finally, they failed to explain their participants' different ratings for filial piety, effort, and academic achievement, which could be better explained by the Confucian ethical perspective.

We hope that the critique by Chang and Lei (2018) and the rebuttal in this article will stimulate constructive dialogue among academics holding different views, and thereby generate new insights in this field of research.