

Reflections on Academic Evaluation and Academic Production: Taking Economic Sciences as Example

反思學術評鑑與學術生產：以經濟學學門為例

2004-12-01 / Taiwan News, Staff Reporter /

Chu Wan-wen Sun Yat-sen Institute for Social Sciences and Philosophy, Academia Sinica

瞿宛文 中央研究院 中山人文社會科學研究所

Academic evaluation should aim to foster academic development and raise the quality of academic production. Evaluation criteria and methods, however, will directly affect the outcome of academic production. Over the past decade, the evaluation methods and standards for the humanities and social sciences in Taiwan have undergone considerable change. Their impact on the outcome of research has also begun to surface, so that it should be about time to examine and assess these evaluation criteria and their influence.

學術評鑑的目的應該是為了促進學術的發展，提高學術生產的品質，而評鑑的方式以及所用的準則，會直接影響到學術生產的成果。近十多年來，台灣人文社會學科的評鑑方式與標準經歷了相當大的變革，對研究成果的影響也已經逐步呈現，該是時候來檢討評估一下這些評鑑標準及影響。

The significance of evaluation criteria

評鑑標準的意涵

Before assessing results, we should first examine the criteria of present academic evaluation and probe into their implicit values and goals. Aside from peer review, currently volume criteria and SSCI (Social Sciences Citation Index) criteria (or should we say whether or not an article has been included in the SSCI) are increasingly being applied. In his fundraising letter of 2003, the president of National Taiwan University, for instance, described the research achievements of the university's teachers by pointing to the number of articles they had published in SCI (Science Citation Index) and SSCI publications during that year.

在評估成果之前，我們應該先要檢討目前學術評鑑的準則，探究其中所隱含的價值與目的為何。目前，除了同儕審查之外，數量標準以及 SSCI 的標準（或應說被 SSCI 收錄與否）越來越被採用。譬如，台大校長在 2003 年的募款信函中，對該校教師研究成果的描述，主要是用當年內教師們所發表的 SCI 以及 SSCI 的論文篇數來表達。

Since we concur that we need to learn from the experiences of the West and agree that the international academic level is higher than that in Taiwan, it is evident that we need to improve our ability to be able to qualify for participation in international (academic) production. But the problem is that improving our "ability" should not be our

ultimate or sole target. Our final goal should be contributions in academia per se!

既然我們同意要向西方取經，同意國際學術水準高於國內，則具有參與國際生產的能力，顯然是一種能力的提升。但問題是「能力」的提升不應該是我們終極或唯一的目標，我們最終的目標應該是學術上的貢獻本身！

Very obviously these international evaluation criteria do not attach importance to the functional goal of “serving the needs of the local society.” The problems that international journals are concerned about, their problem awareness, is led by the European and North American (it would be more accurate to say the U.S.) academic circles. While these concerns also have their universal significance, they do not necessarily have a lot of overlap with the immediate concerns of Taiwan and any other region.

很顯然，這些國際評鑑標準並不重視「服務本地社會需要」的功能目的。國際期刊所關切的問題，它們的問題意識，是由歐美（更精確些是美國）學術圈所主導，這其中雖有其普世的意義，但是不必然和台灣或任何其他地區的立即關切有太密切的重疊。

Furthermore, if our academic circles want to be able to make special contributions to international academia in the long-term, our “niche” certainly would be research that is related to our own experiences. It would mean taking experiences that are special to our society and using advanced theory and language that is able to communicate with the international community to highlight our achievements and make contributions to the world. This also pertains to catching-up countries’ problem of deploying scarce resources. In catching-up economies high-level research personnel is scarce. The needs of the local society should be more appropriately matched, if such resources are used to research our own experiences, or we could also say (for the society) the return on investment would be higher.

再則，就長期來看，如果我們學術圈要能夠在國際學術社群中做出特殊的貢獻，我們的「利基」必然會是和我們自身經驗有關的研究，將我們社會獨特的經驗，以先進的、能夠與國際社會溝通的理論語言，將我們的成果呈現，進而對世界做出貢獻。這也牽涉到後進國家稀少資源配置的問題。後進國家的高等研究人力必然是稀少資源，這資源若用來研究本身的經驗，應比較符合本地社會的需要，或說（對社會而言）投資報酬率比較高。再則，就長期來看，如果我們學術圈要能夠在國際學術社群中做出特殊的貢獻，我們的「利基」必然會是和我們自身經驗有關的研究，將我們社會獨特的經驗，以先進的、能夠與國際社會溝通的理論語言，將我們的成果呈現，進而對世界做出貢獻。這也牽涉到後進國家稀少資源配置的問題。後進國家的高等研究人力必然是稀少資源，這資源若用來研究本身的經驗，應比較符合本地社會的需要，或說（對社會而言）投資報酬率比較高。

However, within the operating mechanism of our academic circles “serving the needs of the local society” has not become an important goal. Therefore it has not been seriously considered in the process of establishing evaluation criteria. Goals that are seen as more important instead are modernization and catching-up with the West. Initially this mainly meant the demands that catching-up countries must catch-up with the West and that they must modernize. In recent times, however, this has turned into the demand of “being competitive amid globalization.”

Therefore, the goal derived from that is to use English as the medium of instruction at universities, to attract foreign students, and to turn education into a commodity for competition in the international market.

不過，在我們學術界的運作機制中，「服務本地社會需要」並沒有成為一個重要的目的，因此在建立評鑑標準過程中，並沒有被嚴肅的對待。比較被重視的目標反而是：現代化、趕上西方。原先，這主要是後進國家要追趕西方、要求現代化的要求，近來則是要求「在全球化之下有競爭力」。因此，隨之而來的目標是，大學教學用英語、吸引外籍生，教育做為商品要在全球市場競爭。

Where de facto are our niches if we want to be competitive in the global education market as a catching-up country? If we don't have any niches, then we depend on handing out scholarships to attract students, which can only be considered foreign diplomacy and cannot be construed as "being competitive"! Speaking for the humanities and social sciences, the main fields where we could attract foreign scholars to visit for exchanges are Chinese language, Sinology, as well as East Asian empiric research. As for East Asian empiric research our achievements are extremely limited and there is nothing to speak of us being competitive. To ask Taiwan's universities against this backdrop to use English as medium of instruction and to attract foreign students to compete in the global market can only be called an erroneous market positioning.

事實上，做為後進國家，要在全球教育市場上有競爭力，我們的利基何在？沒有利基，就靠給獎學金吸引學生，只能算是作外交，談不上「有競爭力」！其實，至今為止，自費來台的外籍生以學中文為絕大多數。就人文社會學科而言，會吸引外國學者來訪問交流的領域，主要是中文、漢學、以及東亞經驗研究。而就東亞自身經驗研究的成果而言，我們成果極有限，談不上有競爭力。在此情況下，要求台灣的大學教學用英語、吸引外籍生，以此在全球市場競爭，只能說是錯誤的市場定位。

Taking economic sciences in Taiwan as example

以台灣經濟學門為例

Amid Taiwan's social sciences the economic sciences developed rather early and it is the academic field with the highest number of scholars, who obtained a doctorate in the U.S. We could say economics are the social science that learned best from the West. If we count the number of articles that have been listed in the SSCI database, then economics for sure has a lead over all other social sciences in Taiwan.

經濟學在台灣的社會科學學門中發展較早，留美博士數目最多，可以說是向西方學習成果最好的一門社會學科。如果以刊登於 SSCI 資料庫的論文篇數計算，那經濟學門也絕對領先台灣其他社科學門。

At the same time there is a higher degree of consensus within the field of economics, as the majority of local economic scientists accept that EconLit (Bibliography of Economic Literature)/SSCI publications are superior to domestic ones. In academic circles the highest criterion for public acknowledgement of performance is the publication of articles in a few international top economic journals. People very seldom ask "What kind of research

are you doing,” but will ask “Do you have enough credits for promotion,” and they will eulogize certain people who have released articles in top international publications (regardless of the articles’ content or merit).

同時，經濟學門的共識程度也最高，多數人都接受 EconLit/SSCI 相對於本土刊物的優越性。在學界之中，公認的表現最高標準，即是在國際最好的幾個經濟期刊發表文章。大家互相很少會問「你在作什麼研究」，但是會問「你升等點數夠了沒」，更會傳頌某人在某頂級國際期刊發表了一篇論文（不管內容是什麼、貢獻是什麼）。

If we take as reference a performance evaluation report of academic units, which the National Science Council commissioned to an economics department, we can discover that even within the more advanced social sciences still only a very small number of people publish in English-language international publications. According to (2001) statistics by (National Taiwan University Professor) Wu Ho-mou, Taiwanese researchers have not published a lot of articles in the seven leading international economic journals. There were two articles between 1981 and 1985, five between 1986 and 1990, four between 1991 and 1995, four between 1996 and 2000, which makes for a total of 15 published articles in seven journals over a period of 20 years. Moreover there is no visible upward trend. If publication in the top journals amounts to participation in the mainstream development of economics, then Taiwan’ s economic science circles will find it “extremely difficult to influence the international academic mainstream.”

若參考國科會委託經濟學門所做的學術單位表現評估報告，我們會發現即使在這比較先進的社會科學學門中，以英文在國際期刊發表，還是極少數人參與的事情。根據巫和懋(2001)的統計，若只看國際前七大經濟期刊，則台灣學者發表的篇數並不多，從 1981 年起至 1985 年為 2 篇，1986 年至 1990 年為 5 篇，1991 年至 1995 年為 4 篇，1996 年至 2000 年為 4 篇，亦即這 20 年間在七大期刊發表的論文總篇數為 15 篇，且似未有顯著上升的趨勢。若以在頂級刊物發表代表參與經濟學領域的主流發展，那台灣經濟學界「尚難影響國際學術主流」。

Actually the major publication base for the vast majority of Taiwan’s economic scholars are not the foreign publications, that make up the above mentioned EconLit, but local journals published in Taiwan. Taiwanese economic scientists have done quite a lot positivist research on Taiwan’s economic problems. But the problem is that “problem awareness” in positivist theory does not have any distinguishing features, but mostly tags along that of U.S. economic science circles. The vast majority of them makes efficiency tests their major topic and does not attach any importance to dynamic growth and structural changes. And there are very few, who make policy concerns the starting point of their research.

其實，台灣絕大多數的經濟學者的主要發表園地，不是上述被 EconLit 收錄的非本土刊物，而是台灣發行的本土刊物。台灣經濟學者也對台灣經濟問題進行不少實證研究，但問題在於，實證論文中的「問題意識」沒有特色，其問題意識多為追隨美國經濟學界，以效率檢驗為主題者佔絕大多數，而不重視動態成長以及結構變遷的問題，至於以政策關懷為出發點的相關研究則更在少數。

Judging Taiwan’ s economic science circles based on whether they have established distinct features and used

their own niches, their achievements are not at all good. Internationally there is great interest in the development of the East Asian economies. Be it the testing of relevant economic theories, or economic policies that can serve as reference, these are all areas where Taiwanese economic scientists can make their contributions by conducting research based on Taiwan's own development and experience. But we do very little research to that regard.

如果從建立特色、利用自身利基來看，則台灣經濟學界的成績並不好。國際間對東亞經濟發展興趣甚高，無論是對相關經濟理論的檢驗，或是可參照的經濟政策，都是台灣經濟學界可以從台灣自身發展經驗進行研究做出貢獻之處，但我們在這方面做的很少。

If we look at Taiwanese economists' achievements in terms of "serving the needs of local society," they also don't do well. If we look back over the past ten years or so we can see that Taiwan underwent several major structural changes such as economic transformation, industrial upgrading, domestic market liberalization, globalization, daily closer cross-strait relations, a fiscal crisis, democratization and so on. These are all important topics, which do not only have actual meaning, but are also significant for theory and policy. But our entire economic science world does very little research on these problems. The major information gathering work is done by think tanks, while its significance for academia waits yet to be developed.

再從「服務本土社會需要」的角度來看，則台灣經濟學界的成績也不能算好。譬如，若我們回顧一下，台灣近十多年來，發生諸多重大結構變革，經濟轉型、產業升級、國內市場自由化、全球化、兩岸關係日漸密切、財稅危機、民主化之影響等等，這些都是很重要的議題，有現實意義也有理論與政策意涵，但是我們經濟學界整體對這些問題的研究很少，主要的資料累積工作多由智庫進行，而其學術衍生意義則多待開發。

Overall, the road that our economic scientists take is that of participating in the international division of labor as individuals. Then their individual EconLit/SSCI publication performance is summed up to represent Taiwan's achievements, while the criteria for measuring their performance put emphasis on the standing of the journals in which an article appears as well as the number of articles published. Since this is the mainstream consensus of our academia, virtually all incentives and reward mechanisms are based on these criteria.

總之，我們台灣經濟學界所走的道路，是個別人員各自參與世界分工的路徑，然後以各自在 EconLit/SSCI 發表的成績加總作為我們的成果，同時這成績的標準著重在論文刊登的期刊之地位以及論文篇數。這是我們學界的主流共識，因此幾乎所有的誘因獎懲機制，都是奠基於此標準上。

Diverse work, diverse criteria

多種工作、多種標準

Within the economic sciences there are actually many kinds of different research. Such research work includes time-consuming, exhausting data collection and sorting, long-term database maintenance, and aside from quantifying data also means research of relevant domestic and international system transitions, historic analyses,

economic policy research etc. These are all very necessary undertakings and they all have their own value. Nonetheless, in our current system the research work that precedes publication is seen as worthless, if that research does not make it to the final step, namely inclusion in the EconLit/SSCI. As a result, the system does not provide any incentives for the kind of research work mentioned above.

事實上，在經濟學界中有許多不同的研究工作。包括費時費力的資料收集與整理，資料庫的長期維持，除了量化資料外，國內以及國際上相關的制度變遷，歷史性的分析，經濟政策的研究等，這些工作都很必要，皆有其價值。[然而]在目前的體制下，如果沒有做到最後那一步（登上 EconLit/SSCI），前面的研究工作就被認為沒有價值，對於上述這些其他工作其實沒有提供誘因。

Different units should also be positioned differently with different tasks. Most other countries discern between research universities and teaching universities, as professional teaching also must have its place. Demanding that all universities and colleges engage in research and calculate their number of SCI/SSCI articles will only result in immense pressure and wrong deployment of resources, while neglecting the more important task of basic teaching. In fact, this is a very erroneous system design.

同時，不同單位應有不同的定位與任務。其他國家多半會區分研究大學與教學大學，職業教育也應有其位置。要求所有的大專院校都要作研究，都要算得出 SCI/SSCI 的論文篇數，只會帶來無謂的壓力與資源的錯置，而忽略了更重要更基本的教學任務，實在是非常錯誤的制度設計。

The problems of (and solutions) for academic production in catching-up countries
後進國家學術生產的問題[與出路]

As far as the humanities and social sciences are concerned, the influence of the global spread of neo-liberalism is becoming evident in three major areas: First states strive for so-called international competitiveness and therefore demand that academic production contribute more toward economic competitiveness and improve its performance. Second, free market logic continues to penetrate peoples' minds. Those running universities think there is a need to use a reward framework as incentive, to establish clear evaluation criteria and to distribute resources and decide promotions based on the outcome of performance evaluations. At the same time evaluations are becoming ever more frequent amid this competition as if more evaluations would translate into progress.

就人文社會科學而言，新自由主義全球化對後進國家的影響，主要在三方面顯現，一方面國家更講求所謂的國際競爭力，因而加強要求學術生產對經濟競爭力的貢獻，加強要求效益。另一方面，自由市場的邏輯也日益深入人心，主事者皆認為要用獎懲結構做誘因，設立清楚評鑑標準，依據效益評估結果分配資源定奪升遷，同時，在競爭之下，評鑑頻率不斷提高，好似多做評鑑就會帶來進步。

Third, it is even more important that the academic community amid the trend of globalization adopts so-called "global" standards as its academic evaluation criteria. Since it is best to use clear, quantifying criteria to facilitate

frequent evaluations, citations in ready-made databases abroad (in the U.S.) have become the ready-made, frequently used standard.

第三，更重要的是學術社群在全球化風潮之下，援用所謂「全球化」的標準來作為學術評鑑的準則。既然最好用清楚的、量化的標準以便經常評鑑，因此國外（美國）現成資料庫的收錄紀錄（如 SSCI 等）竟然就成了現成的、極有用的標準。

What needs to be pointed out here is that if we continue to contrast academic production with commodity production, then our academic production will become globalized due to the competitive attitude of our academic community and not at all because the U.S. market “needs” the cheap labor of Taiwan's academic market. The globalization phenomenon of the humanities and social sciences in catching-up economies like Taiwan is not at all an “international division of labor.” Instead, under the shroud of U.S. cultural hegemony, we invoke on our own account U.S. criteria (that we affirm) as standard for mutual evaluation. This might lead to a blind following of Western theory. At the same time it might translate into the commitment of vast academic resources for the research of U.S. mainstream issues as well as the examination of local issues from an American perspective and American problem awareness.

在此要指出的是，若繼續與商品生產作對比，學術生產的全球化，並非源於美國市場「需要」台灣學術市場的廉價勞動，而是由於台灣學術社群的競爭型態所導致的結果。後進國家如台灣的人文社會科學的全球化現象，並不是一種「國際分工」，而是在美國文化霸權籠罩之下，我們自行援引（我們所認定的）美國標準來作為互相評鑑的準則，這可能導致盲目追隨西方理論，同時造成投入眾多學術資源研究美國主流議題，以及以美國的視野與問題意識來探討在地議題。

Since the humanities and social sciences are different from the natural sciences, the way for us to truly participate in “globalization” is to underline our distinct features. It goes without saying that the local humanities and social sciences should serve the needs of the local society in the first place. Our society has actually made considerable progress in many areas and should therefore make efforts to rid itself from its dependency on affirmation from the West, which is due to our lack of confidence. Our academic community should also get rid of its dependency on absolute quantification criteria, which stems from its lack of confidence. If we are not able to achieve these objectives, then there's no point talking about the “localization” of academia.

人文社會科學不同於自然科學，凸顯我們的特色是我們能真正參與「全球化」的方式。當然更不用說，在地的人文社會科學原本就應該是要服務於在地社會的需要。我們社會其實已經在各方面有長足的進步，應該要努力脫離因缺乏信心而一味依靠西方肯定的階段，我們學術社群也應該脫離因無信心，而一味的依賴絕對化數量化標準的階段。做不到這些，學術在地化也就談不上了。

Edited by Tina Lee/Translated by Susanne Ganz

編輯李美儀/英文翻譯全樹曦