

## 回應〈儒家倫理與華人教育觀：哲學反思、理論建構與實徵研究〉

馮丰儀\*

### 摘要

符教授在〈儒家倫理與華人教育觀：哲學反思、理論建構與實徵研究〉一文中分享深耕「華人教育觀」以解釋東亞學生學習現象的心路歷程與研究成果。針對其文章，本文就選擇「含攝文化理論」之文化、研究概念切入視角、近似真理的有效性及理論解釋力提問討論，並試著提出另一種對華人教育觀的解釋，與作者對話，以更理解作者的研究思維，並提供有志從事華人教育研究者參考。

**關鍵詞：** 儒家倫理、華人教育觀、角色義務理論

馮丰儀\* 暨南國際大學教育政策與行政學系（fyfeng@mail.ncnu.edu.tw）

## 壹、 引言

長久以來，本土化一直是臺灣社會科學領域追求的目標，教育學術界仍是將西方理論擺在首位（黃騰，2009）。有關教育理論本土化，林秀珍（1999）指出有三項重點：研究者本身的文化自覺與專業能力的充實；我國社會文化與教育問題，作為研究取材與釋的基礎；對於國外重要的教育理論加以反省批判，以便適當的定位。本人有幸拜讀符碧真教授的大作，此篇文章分享了她長期深耕「華人教育觀」的心路歷程，她基於西方理論無法完整解釋東亞學生學習，從儒家文化系統建構適用解釋個人追求社會期許目標之修養角色義務理論，說明華人教育觀，以努力義務觀與努力增進觀為主軸，應用於一系列的實徵研究，探討東亞學生重視努力的理由、努力對其而言是否為雙面刃及舒緩負面結果的心理機制、學業失敗後持續努力的心理歷程與兩難困境、教師給予表現欠佳學生之回饋及對其學習動機之影響，以及檢視 Covington 成就動機模式在儒家社會的適用性等問題，累積了有系統的研究成果，並指陳與西方現象和理論的差異，突顯學術主體性，對我國追求本土化的教育研究貢獻良多，十年磨一劍的投入與展現的學術熱忱和堅持令人敬佩，也為後輩樹立了良好的研究典範。

## 貳、 回應

閱讀靶子論文，得以對符教授從事本土心理學研究的歷程，從哲學反思、理論建構至實徵研究有較詳細的理解，受益匪淺。藉由此撰寫回應文的機會，提出以下幾個問題請教符教授，期更對其研究思維能知其所以然，有更深入的學習，同時提供有志投入華人教育研究者參考。

### 一、「含攝文化理論」之文化如何決定？

鑑於西方心理學理論未必適用於解釋華人社會的現象，本土心理學須建構能說明特定文化中人類心態（*mentalities in particular cultures*）的「含攝文化的理論」，最終目標是以儒家文化為基底，吸納西方近代文明的菁華（黃光國，2014）。「含攝文化」的文化如何決定？符教授以儒家的修養角色義務論為基底發展華人教育觀，探究東亞學生的學習現象，然而儒家主義有關教育的主張頗多，為何選擇闡述華人教育觀時選擇從修養角色義務論，而非其他的儒家教育思想？其次，符教授文中似乎是將華人視為一個集合體，是儒家文化圈（如台、港、日、韓、新加坡、大陸）或東亞國家的華人？其選擇儒家文化為基底的依據為何？從多元文化系統的觀點來看，以台灣為例，台灣的文化包括了儒、道、釋等多樣的文化系統，台灣社會的價值觀可能是個體、環境與不同文化系統

交互作用的產物，文化具多樣性與複雜性。再者，文化是流動的概念，全球化及社會變遷影響下，華人的雙文化取向日益明顯，而上述黃光國教授主張亦指陳出文化的變動性必需納入理論建構的考量。另外，基於對西方心理學為國際研究的主流批判，採取律則式的解釋模式，以儒家文化統攝華人文化，雖有助建構華人特有的理論，與西方學術對話，然而同樣地探討華人心理學是否也會出現儒家文化成為主流，落入以儒家文化概括所有現象之狀況產生？

## 二、研究概念切入視角如何選擇？

華人教育觀為何選擇從孩子的視角來回推？而非由父母或者師長的角度來探討？研究概念切入視角如何選擇？從父母的教育觀去解釋孩子為什麼努力這件事情，有一個基本前提是父母的信念可以有效傳達給孩子，使願意接受並且落實。修養的角色義務理論，將子女努力追求父母的期許目標連結至倫理與道德，是為了盡孝的角色義務及增進道德修養，若反求諸己未盡到義務，便覺得愧對自己與父母。這個理論框架確實有助理解部分孩子為何努力學習的原因，不過其似乎也預設了孩子基於義務或者道德而自發努力學習的特定框架，可能忽略了孩子自發努力學習的其他因素，或者當前許多子女被迫努力學習的現象。從功績主義的角度看，有些華人子女努力追求社會期許的目標是因為相信可以出頭天，靠教育翻轉未來。其次，不管中西方都強調個體能依其社會角色盡到該盡的義務，如學生的角色就是要努力學習，也主張子女經由受教育的歷程接受或者內化父母師長強調的價值觀念，然而事實上子女有其主體性，不見得會全盤接受。再者，現今社會對於道德的看法可能與以往不同，盡到義務在現在可能被認知為盡本分，不見得會連結到與道德修養有關。子女知覺與父母所持的教育觀可能就會有所差距。

## 三、近似真理的有效性及理論解釋力如何判別？

符教授採後實證科學哲學，主張學者都可發揮創造力，提出針對東方學生學習的近似真理，彰顯其主體性。然而近似真理的有效性及理論解釋力如何判別？有無客觀的標準？她依據儒家理論推論出努力義務觀與增進觀的假設，進而收集資料驗證假設，以研究結果來驗證推論的妥適性。若理論是一種猜測的知識，每個研究者都在盡自己的努力對同樣的問題建構著近似真理，有沒有可能出現眾聲喧嘩的現象？當研究者在建構嘗試性的理論時，影響其對問題的理解與解方猜測絕對不是空穴來風，有可能受其個人的經驗、背景與對現象的觀察視角所影響，然若只重視研究者的主體性，忽略被研究對象的聲音，那麼可能導致研究者以自身文化觀點為「他人」發聲。楊國樞教授（1982）曾說：「人類的知識既不在真空中產生，也不在真空中應用，而是在特定的社會脈絡中衍發與

運作。」社會科學與自然科學不同在於社會是作為行動主體的個人互動組成的，人亦無法擺脫社會影響，那麼理論是否有必要透過觀察歸納與演繹等方法對身為行動主體的想法及社會現象進行理解而來呢？另外，理論的提供亦代表從特定的視角看待問題，尤其若化約成研究變項，亦可能忽略及無法反映真實現象的複雜性。

#### 四、另一種解釋？

家庭主義下的華人支持與控制是一體兩面，傳統孝道觀念強調父母的權威及子女對父母的順從義務，現在台灣家庭形態、社會價值轉變，抑己順親與護親榮親的孝道觀念在民眾心中大符降低，有一半以上的父母與子女相處亦逐漸朝向類平輩，尤其是教育程度高的父母（林文瑛、王震武，1995；葉光輝，2009）。然而少子化的影響下，父母仍然擔心孩子未來。徐美雯、魏希聖（2015）研究發現六成的父母認為子女應該順從父母。許多父母以愛之名保護、限制，並強加個人特定價值觀於子女身上，剝奪其施展自由的權利（陳延興，2010）。林文瑛、王震武（1995）研究發現家訓傳統會影響父母的教育觀，尤其是嚴教觀、磨練觀、尊卑觀，父母在教育手法的選擇上大多為外控、他律的教育觀。兒童福利聯盟（2023）「2023年臺灣兒少學習狀況調查報告」指出：台灣國高中生有近六成的兒少要課後補習，五成二的學生一週考試（含補習班考試）超過四天；近四成家長會拿課業與他人比較，超過五分之一的家長關心課業表現勝過其他生活裡的事；六成的兒少擔心成績跟不上同學；而近六成國高中生已出現學習疲勞（含中等及過量程度）狀況，與2017年相比，「因為課業壓力而有自我傷害或一死了之的念頭」之學生比例上升約7%，此反映出為考試成績而讀書的學習文化仍然存在。

楊國樞（1982）指出華人想將事情做好以符合父母、老師等重要他人或團體標準，係為了獲得讚賞及避罰，維持人際和諧，使別人對自己有好印象。基此，倘若東亞學生的努力是因為想與父母維持和諧關係，避免衝突與責罰；而父母的教育觀可能隱含著磨鍊觀，傳遞孩子要有美好的未來就需努力追求縱向成就目標，吃得苦中苦方為人上人，給予大量的學習支持（如送補習班）使與他人競爭，搭配獎懲機制使孩子服從與努力。

#### 參考文獻

兒童福利聯盟（2023）。**2023年臺灣兒少學習狀況調查報告**。

[https://www.children.org.tw/publication\\_research/research\\_report/2655](https://www.children.org.tw/publication_research/research_report/2655)

林文瑛、王震武（1995）。中國父母的教養觀：嚴教觀或打罵觀？**本土心理學研究**，3，2-92。<https://doi.org/10.6254/1995.3.2>

- 林秀珍（1999）。教育理論本土化的省思。**教育研究集刊**，42，1-15。  
[https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.199901\\_\(42\).0001](https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.199901_(42).0001)
- 徐美雯、魏希聖（2015）。華人文化教養信念、教養行為對青少年憂鬱及偏差行為之影響。**家庭教育與諮商學刊**，18，35-63。
- 陳延興（2010）。為了誰的教育？學生作為教育主體之探討。**教育資料與研究雙月刊**，96，71-94。
- 黃光國（2014）。論「含攝文化的積極心理學」。**台灣心理諮商季刊**，6（2），36-47。
- 黃騰（2009）。教育研究本土化的再省思—困境與可能。**教育研究集刊**，55（3），1-28。  
[https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.200909\\_\(55-3\).0001](https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.200909_(55-3).0001)
- 楊國樞（1982）。心理學研究的中國化：層次與方向。**中央研究院民族學研究所專刊**，乙種之 10，153-187。
- 葉光輝（2009）。華人孝道雙元模型研究的回顧與前瞻。**本土心理學研究**，32，101-148。  
<https://doi.org/10.6254/2009.32.101>

## **A Response to " Confucian Ethics and Chinese Views on Education: Philosophical Reflection, Theoretical Construction, and Empirical Research"**

Feng-I Feng\*

### **Abstract**

In her article “Confucian Ethics and Chinese views on Education: Philosophical Reflection, Theoretical Construction, and Empirical Research”, Prof. Fwu shares her research journey and empirical research results on how she has been working on Chinese views on education in order to explain the phenomenon of student learning in East Asia. This response paper ask questions and discusses how to determine the culture of the “Culture Inclusive Theory”, select perspectives for research concepts, and assess the validity of approximate truths and the explanatory power of theory. It also attempts to propose an alternative explanation of Chinese views on education, hoping to engage in dialogue with the author to better understand her research thinking and provide reference for aspiring researchers of Chinese education.

*Keywords: Chinese views on education, Confucian ethics, role obligation theory*

---

Feng-I Feng \*

Department of Educational Policy and Administration, National Chi Nan  
University (fyfeng@mail.ncnu.edu.tw)

## **I. Introduction**

For a long time, localization has been the goal pursued in the field of social sciences in Taiwan, yet the educational academic community still prioritizes Western theories (Huang, 2009). Regarding the localization of educational theory, Lin (1999) identified three key points: the cultural awareness and professional abilities of researchers; the social culture and educational issues of our country as the foundation for research materials and interpretation; and the reflection and critique of significant foreign educational theories to properly place them.

I have the honor of reading Professor Bih-Jen Fwu's masterpiece. This article shares her extensive experience in the "Chinese Views on Education." Recognizing that Western theories cannot fully explain East Asian students' learning, she developed a theory of self-cultivation role obligations from the Confucian cultural system to articulate the Chinese Views on Education. Using the concepts of effort obligation and effort enhancement as the main framework, she applies it to a series of empirical studies that explore why East Asian students value effort, whether effort serves as a double-edged sword for them, the psychological mechanisms that alleviate negative consequences, the psychological processes and dilemmas of persisting after academic failure, the feedback provided by teachers to low-performing students and its impact on their learning motivation, and the applicability of Covington's achievement motivation model in Confucian society. She has amassed systematic research results and highlighted the differences with Western phenomena and theories, emphasizing academic subjectivity and making significant contributions to our country's pursuit of localized educational research. The investment of ten years in honing one's craft, along with the academic enthusiasm and persistence displayed, is admirable and sets a commendable research example for future generations.

## **II. Response**

After reading the target paper, I gained a more detailed understanding of Professor Fwu's research on indigenous psychology, which encompasses philosophical reflection, theoretical construction, and empirical research. This has greatly benefited me. In writing this response, I would like to pose the following questions to Professor Fwu, with the hope of gaining a clearer understanding of her research thinking. This, in turn, will enable me to conduct a deeper study and serve as a reference for those interested in Chinese education research.

## **1. How is the Culture of " Culture Inclusive Theory" Determined?**

Given that Western psychological theories may not be applicable in explaining phenomena in Chinese society, indigenous psychology must construct a "culture-inclusive theory" that clarifies the mentalities within specific cultures. The ultimate goal is to absorb the essence of Western modern civilization based on Confucian culture (Hwang, 2014). How is the culture of "inclusive culture" determined? Professor Fwu developed the Chinese views on education based on the Confucian theory of self-cultivation and obligation, exploring the learning phenomena of East Asian students. However, Confucianism presents numerous propositions on education. Why did she choose to start with the theory of self-cultivation and obligation when explaining the Chinese views on education, instead of from other Confucian educational thoughts? Secondly, Professor Fwu appears to regard the Chinese as a collective in her article, whether referring to those in the Confucian cultural circle (such as Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, and mainland China) or individuals in East Asian countries. What is the basis for choosing Confucian culture as the foundation? From the perspective of multicultural systems, taking Taiwan as an example, Taiwan's culture comprises various cultural systems, including Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. The values of Taiwanese society may arise from the interaction between individuals, environments, and diverse cultural systems. Culture is diverse and complex. Furthermore, culture is a fluid concept. Under the influence of globalization and social change, the Chinese people's bicultural orientation is becoming increasingly evident. Professor Kwang-Kuo Hwang's proposition indicates that the variability of culture must be considered in theoretical construction. In addition, based on criticisms of Western psychology as the mainstream in international research, adopting a law-based interpretation model and using Confucian culture to govern Chinese culture will aid in constructing Chinese-specific theories and engaging in dialogue with Western academics. However, will Chinese psychology also see Confucian culture become the mainstream, risking the generalization of all phenomena with Confucian culture?

## **2. How Should One Choose the Research Concept Entry Perspective?**

Why do Chinese views on education opt to focus on the perspective of children rather than exploring the viewpoints of parents or teachers? How should one choose the research concept entry standpoint? To explain why children work hard from the perspective of parental education, there is a fundamental premise that parents' beliefs can be effectively communicated



to children, making them willing to accept and implement those beliefs. The role obligation theory of self-cultivation connects children's efforts to meet their parents' expectations with ethics and morality, enabling them to fulfill their filial obligations and enhance their moral development. If they fail to meet these obligations, they may feel guilt towards themselves and their parents.

While this theoretical framework aids in understanding why some children study hard, it appears to assume a specific context in which children study diligently based on obligations or morality, potentially overlooking other factors that prompt children to study hard independently, or the current reality that many children are compelled to study intensely. From a meritocratic perspective, some Chinese children strive to achieve societal expectations because they believe that education can help them gain recognition and transform their futures. Moreover, both in China and the West, there is an emphasis on individuals fulfilling their obligations according to their social roles. For instance, students are expected to study diligently. It is also encouraged that children adopt or internalize the values emphasized by their parents and teachers throughout the educational process. However, in reality, children possess their own subjectivity and may not fully accept these values. Additionally, societal views on morality may have shifted from the past. Fulfilling obligations might now be seen as merely meeting one's duty, without a connection to moral development. Consequently, there may be a disconnect between children's perceptions and the educational beliefs held by their parents.

### **3. How Can We Evaluate the Validity of Approximate Truth and Theoretical Explanatory Power?**

Professor Fwu adopts the philosophy of post-positivism in science and advocates that scholars can fully exercise their creativity to propose approximate truths that allow Eastern students to demonstrate their subjectivity. However, how can we evaluate the validity of approximate truth and theoretical explanatory power? Is there an objective standard? Based on Confucian theory, she deduced the hypothesis of the duty of effort and the promotion of progress, then collected data to verify the hypothesis, using the research results to confirm the appropriateness of the inference. If theory is a form of conjectural knowledge, and each researcher strives to construct an approximate truth for the same problem, could there be a phenomenon of many voices? When researchers construct tentative theories, the guesses that influence their understanding of the problem and the solution are certainly not baseless. They may be shaped by their personal experiences, backgrounds, and perspectives on the

phenomenon. However, if they focus solely on the subjectivity of the researcher while overlooking the voice of the research object, it may result in the researcher speaking for "others" using their own cultural perspectives. Professor Guo-Shu Yang (1982) once said: "Human knowledge is neither generated nor applied in a vacuum, but is derived and operated in a specific social context." The difference between social science and natural science is that society consists of individual interactions as acting subjects, and people cannot escape the influences of society. Therefore, is it necessary for theory to understand the thoughts and social phenomena of acting subjects through observation, induction, and deduction? Additionally, the provision of theory also implies examining the problem from a specific perspective; especially if it is reduced to research variables, it may overlook or fail to reflect the complexity of real phenomena.

#### **4. Another Explanation?**

Chinese support and control under familism are two sides of the same coin. The traditional concept of filial piety emphasizes the authority of parents and the obligation of children to obey them. As Taiwan's family structure and social values have evolved, the notions of self-restraint and obedience to parents, along with the ideals of protecting and honoring them, have significantly diminished in the hearts of the people. More than half of parents and children are increasingly interacting as peers, especially among parents with higher education levels (Yeh, 2009; Lin & Wang, 1995). However, influenced by the declining birth rate, parents remain anxious about their children's futures. Hsu and Wei (2015) found that 60% of parents believe children should obey their parents. Many parents protect, limit, and impose their specific values on their children in the name of love, depriving them of their freedom (Chen, 2010). Lin and Wang (1995) found that the tradition of family precepts affects parents' educational perspectives, particularly regarding strict education, discipline, and notions of respect and inferiority. Parents predominantly choose educational methods characterized by external control and heteronomy. Child Welfare League Foundation (2023) "2023 Taiwan Children and Adolescents Learning Status Survey Report" pointed out: Nearly 60% of Taiwan's junior and senior high school students require after-school tutoring, and 52% of students have exams (including cram school exams) more than four days a week; almost 40% of parents compare their children's homework with others, and over one-fifth of parents prioritize academic performance above other life aspects; 60% of children and adolescents are concerned that their grades will not match those of their classmates; and nearly 60% of junior and senior high school

students have already experienced learning fatigue (including moderate and excessive levels). Compared to 2017, the proportion of students who have "thoughts of self-harm or suicide due to academic pressure" has increased by about 7%, highlighting the ongoing prevalence of a learning culture centered around test scores.

Guo-Shu Yang (1982) pointed out that Chinese people strive to meet the expectations of parents, teachers, and other significant individuals or groups to earn praise and avoid punishment, maintain interpersonal harmony, and leave a positive impression on others. Based on this perspective, East Asian students may work hard to preserve a harmonious relationship with their parents and avoid conflicts and penalties. Additionally, parents' educational views often imply the concept of perseverance, emphasizing that children must work hard to achieve vertical goals for a promising future, and that only those who endure hardships can achieve success. They offer substantial learning support, such as enrolling their children in cram schools, to encourage competition with peers, and they implement reward and punishment mechanisms to ensure that children comply and put forth effort.

## Reference

- Chen, Y.-H. (2010). Education for whom? A discussion on students as subjects in education. *Bimonthly Journal of Educational Resources and Research*, 96, 71–94. (In Chinese)
- Child Welfare League Foundation. (2023). *2023 survey report on the learning status of children and adolescents in Taiwan*.  
[https://www.children.org.tw/publication\\_research/research\\_report/2655](https://www.children.org.tw/publication_research/research_report/2655). (In Chinese)
- Hsu, M.-W., & Wei, H.-S. (2015). The influence of Chinese cultural parenting beliefs and practices on adolescent depression and deviant behavior. *Journal of Family Education and Counseling*, 18, 35–63. (In Chinese)
- Huang, T. (2009). Rethinking the predicaments and possibilities of the localization of educational research. *Bulletin of Educational Research*, 55(3), 1–28.  
[https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.200909\\_\(55-3\).0001](https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.200909_(55-3).0001) (In Chinese)
- Hwuang, K.-K. (2014). On culture-inclusive theories of positive psychology. *Taiwan Counseling Quarterly*, 6(2), 36–47. (In Chinese)
- Lin, H.-C. (1999). Reflections on the indigenization of educational theory. *Bulletin of Educational Research*, 42, 1–15. [https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.199901\\_\(42\).0001](https://doi.org/10.6910/BER.199901_(42).0001) (In Chinese)

- Lin, W.-Y., & Wang, C.-W. (1995). Chinese parental beliefs on child discipline: Belief in strictness or physical punishment? *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 3, 2–92. <https://doi.org/10.6254/1995.3.2> (In Chinese)
- Yang, K.-S. (1982). The sinicization of scientific research: Levels and directions. *Special Publication of the Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica, Series B*, 10, 153–187. (In Chinese)
- Yeh, K.-H. (2009). A review and prospect of the dual filial piety model in Chinese societies. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 32, 101-148 ° <https://doi.org/10.6254/2009.32.101> (In Chinese)