

國立嘉義大學九十三年學年度 國民教育研究所博士班招生考試試題

科目：英文

I. Read the following paragraph carefully, then

1. Summarize the text from English into Chinese (20%)
2. Comment on the main arguments in English. (20%)

Morphogenetic analysis, in contrast to the three approaches which are downwards conflation, upwards conflation and central conflation, accords time a central place in social theory. By working in terms of its three-part cycles composed of (a) structural conditioning, (b) social interaction and (c) structural elaboration, time is incorporated as sequential tracts and phases rather than simply as a medium through which events take place. For the very occurrence of events, like the progressive structuring of an educational system, necessitates our theorizing about the temporal interplay between structure and agency. What is crucial then is that the morphogenetic perspective maintains that structure and action operate over different time periods – an assertion which is based on its two simple propositions: that structure necessarily predates the actions which transform it; and that structural elaboration necessarily post-dates those actions.

Archer (1995)

II. 根據下列文章內容，以中文簡要回答下列三問題

1. 作者提出那一種研究方法？請簡單解釋之。(20%)
2. 作者贊同歸納邏輯嗎？為什麼？(20%)
3. 何謂“不對稱原則”？請簡單解釋之。(20%)

The criterion of demarcation inherent in inductive logic – that is, the positivistic dogma of meaning – is equivalent to the requirement that all the

statements of empirical science (or all ‘meaningful’ statements) must be capable of being finally decided, with respect to their truth and falsity; we shall say that they must be ‘conclusively decidable’. This means that their form must be such that to verify them and to falsify them must both be logically possible. Thus Schlick says: ‘...a genuine statement must be capable of conclusive verification’; and Waismann says still more clearly: ‘If there is no possible way to determine whether a statement is true then that statement has no meaning whatsoever. For the meaning of a statement is the method of its verification.’

Now in my view there is no such thing as induction. Thus inference to theories, from singular statements which are ‘verified by experience’ (whatever that may mean), is logically inadmissible. Theories are, therefore, never empirically verifiable. If we wish to avoid the positivist’s mistake of eliminating, but our criterion of demarcation, the theoretical systems of natural science, then we must choose a criterion which allows us to admit to the domain of empirical science even statements which cannot be verified.

But I shall certainly admit a system as empirical or scientific only if it is capable of being tested by experience. These considerations suggest that not the verifiability but the falsifiability of a system is to be taken as a criterion of demarcation. In other words: I shall not require of a scientific system that shall be capable of being singled out, once and for all, in a positive sense; but I shall require that its logical form shall be such that it can be singled out, but means of empirical tests, in a negative sense; it must be possible for an empirical scientific system to be refuted by experience.

My proposal is based upon an asymmetry between verifiability and falsifiability; an asymmetry which results from the logical form of universal statements. For these are never derivable from singular statements, but can be contradicted by singular statements. Consequently it is possible by means of purely deductive inferences (with the help of the modus tollens of classical logic) to argue from the truth of singular statements to the falsity of universal statements. Such an argument to the falsity of universal statements is the only strictly deductive kind of inference that proceeds, as it were, in the ‘inductive direction’; that is, from singular to universal statements.

Popper (1971)