MASARYK UNIVERSITY

Faculty of Arts

Factors that Influence Cultural Diversity in Cultural-Comparative Psychological Research

Habilitation Thesis

Content

Abstract

Psychology has long struggled with how to deal with the study of culturally specific phenomena. This thesis consists of commentary and nine published journal articles, which, from different points of view, describe various issues that influence how psychology studies culture. The focus is on East Asian cultures. This introductory commentary contains a brief description of the matter and the nine articles. The first six articles describe factors that influence cultural diversity and the quality of cross-cultural comparative psychological research, including the generalization of results for too large populations, the lack of researcher's experience with the specific culture, trust for researchers without proper experience, the lack of introspection in research, research organization according to an algorithm for the quantitative approach instead of experience with the phenomenon, employment of researchers with primarily English-based cross-cultural experience, and the omission of indigenous groups due to their ignorance by the majority society. The other two articles describe Chinese and Korean indigenous psychologies as examples of research that is based on the indigenous cultural phenomena. The last article introduces a method to use information stored in the current scientometric databases to reward scholars who investigate local cultures and, therefore, conduct research that investigates indigenous phenomena.

Commentary to habilitation thesis

Introduction

This habilitation thesis is a collection of journal articles connected by the reason, why they were written: to show the lack of cultural diversity in cross-cultural psychological research, the reasons that this lack of diversity might prevail, the societal practices that support it, and provide the alternatives that support more cultural diversity.

I started to write these articles during my studies in East Asia. After several years of study in Seoul, Taipei, and Wuhan, I wanted to conduct cross-cultural research to compare Taiwan and Korea. I realized that it was hard to find a basis for my research because the theories that underlie the published research were usually of Western origin. Also, cross-cultural research nearly always examined the differences between an East Asian country and a Western country, but rarely the differences between two East Asian countries. Finally, I decided that, in the current state of affairs, it was more important to focus on theoretical papers that showed these pitfalls within cross-cultural research. Some of the resulting papers are included in this collection.

The first part of this commentary describes the characteristics of the investigated matter: how psychology researches human cultures, how diverse its coverage of world cultures is, what influences this cultural diversity, and what might help to increase it. The second part of this commentary contains descriptions of the ideas and logic behind each of the included articles and their brief content. Regarding the methodological approach, this thesis is predominantly theoretical: one of the included articles employs interviews as its research method; one employs journal content analysis and is partially theoretical; one introduces a new algorithm; two are review articles; and four are theoretical. As is common in the discipline of theoretical psychology (see journals *Theory & Psychology* or *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science* for reference), their research method is to describe the logic behind the functioning of some part of psychological science. The results of these articles differ according to the approach. For articles that employed interviews, content analysis, or a literature review the result is the description of the phenomenon, the description of the journal content, or the description of current literature in the field. One article offers an algorithm that can be programmed into scientometric databases. The results of the four theoretical articles are the descriptions of various issues, including the usage of authority in psychological science, the importance of introspection in research preparation, the questionability of the legitimacy of the quantitative approach, the pitfalls associated with the cross-cultural experimental method, and the general problems faced in cross-cultural research.

The articles included in this collection can be divided into three sections. The first, which contains Articles Nos. 1-6, describes various factors and problems that influence cultural diversity in psychological research that involves culture. The second section, which contains Articles Nos. 7 and 8, reviews the examples of good practice in this research – indigenous psychologies that anchor their terminology in local cultures. Finally, the third

section includes Article No. 9 and offers a possible way to improve the position of culturally-rooted scientific disciplines, including psychology, by adjusting bibliometric measures to benefit researchers who base their research on culturally diverse sources. Three articles were originally published in Czech. Original versions of these articles are followed by their English translation.

Psychology and Cultural Diversity

Psychology in the first half of the 20th Century developed as a science that did not concern culture, despite the call of Wilhelm Wundt to study cultural processes (Ellis & Stam, 2015; Sinha, 2002). Psychologists conducted experiments that assumed that their results were valid for the whole of humanity and did not differ across cultures. That changed in the second half of the century with the establishments of scientific societies, like the *International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology* (IACCP), and specialized journals, like the *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Nevertheless, even if some contemporary research does not assume that its results are culturally universal, the majority of psychological research still does. This prevailing point of view prevents the better understanding of culturally specific phenomena (Ellis & Stam, 2015).

Various authors have shown that psychological research is too culturally homogenous in terms of both who is being researched and who is conducting the research. Arnett (2008) analyzed major journals published by the American Psychological Association in 2003-07 and found that only 2% of the first authors were based outside of English-speaking countries (ESC) and Europe. He also reported that, if American samples were analyzed in these journals in 2007, only 23% were other than European or American. In more recent research, Ningxi Li (2022) has examined the current diversity of journal editors and authors in the first decile of psychological journals, according to their impact factors in Web of Science. Of the total of 68 journals, 73% of the editors-in-chief in 2021 were affiliated with US-based institutions, 10% with UK institutions, 5% with Canadian institutions, and the rest with institutions based in Western and Southern Continental Europe. The affiliations of the authors who published in these journals in 2017 show the same prevalence for Western and English-speaking countries.

Authors based in the US contributed 44% of the articles and 10% were based in the UK. Germany, Canada, Australia, and the Netherlands were strongly represented with more than 5%.

Cultural-comparative issues are not common topics for psychological research. Smith and Bond (2022) assessed articles published by three mainstream journals in 2020 to see how many could be considered good cross-cultural studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* had 2 out of 131 studies, *Journal of Personality* had 5 out of 84, and *Journal of International Business Studies* had 3 out of 83. Hartmann et al. (2013) analyzed English-written, peer-reviewed publications in the PsycInfo database and found that only 2% of the publications addressed cross-cultural diversity and 4% addressed ethnic minority issues. The small amount of coverage for culture-related issues also applies to introductory psychological textbooks – Walter Lonner (2016) stated that in the English-speaking environment "it is surprising that no IPT (introductory psychological text) has ever been published that contained a full-blown chapter that focused *entirely* on culture and its myriad influences" (p. 10, emphasis by the author).

Gabrenya and Glazer (2022) asked an interesting question about the groups of researchers who were represented in the IACCP during its existence. They conducted a co-citation network analysis of long-term IACCP members and found three clusters. The first group, which included Geert Hofstede and Shalom Schwartz, studied cultural dimensions. The second group, which included Steven Heine and Hazel Rose Markus, was interested in cultural psychological themes. And the third group, which included John W. Berry and Colleen Ward, researched themes that concerned acculturation and well-being.

A critique of the small cultural diversity of the samples used in psychological research was most famously formulated by Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan (2010). They stated that populations studied by psychologists are mostly WEIRD, an acronym for Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic countries. Researchers assume that findings found on such a limited sample can be generalized to all cultural groups throughout the world – "one adult sample is pretty much the same as the next" (p. 63). In the view of Heinrich et al., this assumption might be justified if WEIRD samples "would be in the vicinity of the central tendency of our species" (p. 64). However, this is not the case. Authors show numerous examples where WEIRD samples do not represent the average of the human population and, rather, the outliers. This means that the majority of psychological research conducted with WEIRD samples might be wrong in the application to the whole human population (e.g.,

Sundararajan & Raina, 2015). More importantly, relying on WEIRD samples may limit the variability of the research questions studied by researchers. Current cross-cultural psychologists (Smith & Bond, 2022) require 20 different cultural samples in order to be considered good. They also recommend to study non-national cultural samples and use methods translated to local languages with established measurement equivalences.

Yet, cultural diversity in psychological research samples is not enough. The usage of Western measures in less wealthy countries is seen, by some authors, as a practice that is similar to that of colonialism. As Dhar and Dixit formulate (2022): "Psychology and capitalism have similar modes of operation since they both thrive respectively on new markets and concepts to sustain themselves; without these they would falter" (p. 127). The usage of Western methods do not allow local people to develop their own approaches and let their voices be heard. Some indigenous psychologies went so far as to refuse classical research epistemologies and state that each culture has the right to have its own epistemologies. In the case of African psychology, this is summarized by Nwoye (2015, p. 107): "These epistemologies include: the observationist, the narrativist, the proverbial, the sage, the generational, the hermeneutic, the Kamukunji, the Revelationist, the Dialogical, the Propositional, the Instrumentalist, the Dream-related, the Rationalist, and the Mythical/Metaphorical epistemologies."

The representation of various cultural groups in psychological research might change if psychology, as a scientific field, changes its practices. Syed and Kathawalla (2022) think that such a change would be the employment of the practices of open science. The open science movement's press to acquire many samples might make it easier for a researcher from a less wealthy area to join a large collaborative team and conduct research that would otherwise be too expensive. Pre-registration allows researchers to conduct and publish only one study at a time. Without this, they would need to conduct more studies until they find something. This makes research cheaper and more accessible for researchers from less wealthy areas. Syed and Kathawalla also mention that the larger representation of underrepresented cultural groups might be reached if grants for funding are selected randomly in grant lotteries from pre-registered studies that fit the criteria.

The psychological study of culture developed into three disciplines – cross-cultural psychology, cultural psychology, and indigenous psychology (IP). Cross-cultural psychology maintains that universal psychological terminology exists and that it is possible to compare how measures developed in order to capture how these universal terms differ across cultures.

It employs mostly quantitative methods. Cultural psychology is based on the understanding that phenomenon and cultural context cannot be separated, so it is not meaningful to compare phenomena across cultures. Therefore, qualitative methods are the first choice for psychologists who study culture. Indigenous psychologies aim to emancipate themselves from the influence of Western psychology and study local cultures with their own terminologies and measures. To reach this goal they employ both qualitative and quantitative approaches (Cerha, 2013, 2015).

The most important aspect for acquiring knowledge about a phenomenon that is specific to a local population might be within the purview of indigenous psychologies (IP). The founders of IPs felt that it was necessary for psychological science to be conducted from the cultural points of view of the local populations – and not from the North American/Western population point of view that assumes that the results found in the west are valid for all cultures. These people studied at universities in English-speaking countries and, when they returned to their home countries, realized that their knowledge did not completely apply to their local cultures. As a result, they developed psychologies related to their cultures (for the story of Kuo-Shu Yang, see Yeh, 2020). The indigenization of psychology is seen as one of the ways to conduct decolonization in Asian, African, and American societies (Adams et al., 2015). Some IPs went so far that they "can be termed nationalistic indigenous psychologies" (Allwood, 2019:95).

Indigenous psychologies face critiques about their ability to provide a coherent description for the local psychological phenomena. Jahoda (2016) thinks that no actual IP exists, and there are only IP approximations in Asian countries. Even the most developed IP – Filipino psychology – lacks a theoretical system that might be necessary to be considered a true scientific discipline. Hwang (in press) concludes the same for the Chinese IP that was developed in Taiwan – even if the researchers within the Chinese IP movement seek to look for indigenous theories, the majority of their research only "tends to confirm or disconfirm the relevance of Western research paradigms" (p. 9). This lack of success might be caused by ontological and epistemological relativism and the absence of attempts to build a coherent discipline for the IP, as expressed by Long (2019). Contrary to Jahoda's (2016) critique, Yeh and Sundararajan (2019) think that the IP was successful, because its new terminology "opens up a new horizon of meaning making" (p. 4) and it "plays an increasingly important role in shaping the psychology of tomorrow" (p. 5). However, they do not provide sufficient evidence for these claims.

Indigenous psychologists often think of ways to improve the state of their discipline. Sundararajan (2019) considers that it is crucial that IPs balance between the local and the global, engage in social critique, be intellectually independent, and employ self-reflexivity in their research. By employing local perspectives, IPs might help in the development of their societies and allow psychologists from other societies to become more culturally competent (Oppong, in press). The plan to develop IPs has faced several threats since the 2000s due to the larger importance of citations in the evaluation of research in some countries (like Korea). As Liu (2020) summarizes: "The emphasis on impact factor and English language publications has turned the tide against Indigenized Psychology (which I will refer to as IP) in Taiwan… if IP and citations are taken as the measure of success, then IP will be marginalized" (p. 179). The survival of IPs, therefore, requires the development of new measures to determine academic success.

Scholars involved with IPs also hesitate about how to resolve the conflicts that sometimes arise between the three psychological disciplines that study the interplay between human psyche and culture. Yang (2000) outlined a plan to unify the cross-cultural, cultural, and indigenous approaches in psychology. First, monocultural IPs should be developed, then, when local psychologists understand their cultures well enough, cross-cultural indigenous studies could be conducted where appropriate, which will lead to the establishment of a global IP. Yang's plan remains only an outline (Pe Pua, 2020) and it has never been started: "in today's global economy, there is no motivation at all to inductively build up a global psychology according to the inductive process Yang (2000) described" (Liu, 2020:185). If such a plan would be set in action and several IPs would grow and include larger populations in their region, there would be a problem when two or more of these IPs meet at some population and each of them would have their own concepts and terminology. The reconciliation of these conflicting terminologies might be difficult (Allwood, 2020).

Cultural, cross-cultural, and indigenous psychologies are considered to be distinct disciplines. Nevertheless, all three of them have the same goal – to capture the interplay between psychology and culture. It is, therefore, questionable as to whether it is meaningful to have three distinct disciplines or whether they should be considered one discipline that contains different methodological schools. Most of the articles that appear in this collection keep this idea and do not explicitly distinguish between these disciplines. I often use the term "cultural comparative psychology" instead of "cross-cultural" to avoid feeling that their content is relevant only to issues studied by the narrowly defined cross-cultural psychology.

Commentary for the Articles Included in this Collection

Article 1

Linkov, V. (2013). Comparative psychological research in East Asia: An opportunity for East Asian studies scholars. *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies*, 4 (1), 51-65. https://doi.org/10.2478/vjeas-2013-0003 [1]

Limiting cross-cultural comparisons to a small set of reference countries hinders the development of the terminology used in international research. For example, for countries that are compared according to relations between personality and political orientation, the reference standards are from the US and the UK. However, both of those countries have party systems with two dominant parties, with the US having just Republicans and Democrats (or liberals and conservatives). Using terminology and research designs that come from such a restricted party system leads to the ignorance of reality in countries with more complex party systems. Researchers from such countries might accept this two-parties terminology, report results from their country in terms of the liberal-conservative dimension, and ignore the existence of green, regionalist, and communist parties – as did Gian Vittorio Caprara in the case of Italy (Caprara et al., 2003; Caprara et al., 1999). If a researcher decides to do full-scale research of the local party system (like Linkov, 2020), there is a problem to compare it to something, because researchers from other countries with complex party systems follow the one-dimensional liberal-conservative research designs. Such problems might be diminished if the comparison would happen among different sets of countries and not predominantly with ESC.

Article 1 contains an analysis of the countries and cultures where East Asian cultures were compared within two psychological journals in 2007-11. Also analyzed was whether the results of such research are generalized just to the East Asian cultures that are examined or to the whole of East Asia. The results show that East Asian cultures were compared mostly with

---

[1] Article 1 was part of a collection of five articles for which the author received the Early Career Award from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

ESC and that there was no research that aimed to compare only East Asian cultures together. Article 1 also mentions that East Asian countries are labelled as collectivistic, but when the content of collectivist scales is examined, collectivism has different meanings in different East Asian cultures. The absence of a direct comparison between East Asian cultures allowed for generalized labels that denote them as "collectivist" or "dialectically thinking". The increased cultural diversity in the samples, which are compared without anchoring them in the ESC-derived terminology by comparison with ESC, might lead to the discovery of more accurate terminology.

Article 2

Linkov, V. (2017). Psychology is not primarily empirical science: A comparison of cultures in the lexical hypothesis tradition as a failure of introspection. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, **51(2), 285-302.** https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-016-9375-1[2]

Human behavior should be perceived as being embedded in a complex set of contexts (Berry, 2022). Researchers might be expected to consider these contexts when developing terminology and interpreting their results; however, that is often not the case. For example, Lee et al. (2007) have found that openness to experience is connected to a higher number of personal pronouns in an essay written by the subject. This has a clear interpretation, because it is impolite to use personal pronouns when speaking about older people or people with higher status – a title or occupation name should be used instead. Open people, therefore, follow the rules of politeness to a lesser degree than less open people. However, such an interpretation is missing in the Lee et al. article. That is not strange, because researchers who conduct cross-cultural studies sometimes interpret their results with terminology and information from literature that comes from ESC and ignore interpretations that come from their cultural environment. Results are interpreted according to what would be appropriate if the examined

---

[2] Article 2 was part of a collection of five articles for which the author received the Early Career Award from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

society was one of the societies of ESC, or according to how the examined society is perceived in the ESC research environment. Researchers might not think thoroughly about indigenous rules and conditions that are valid in the examined society and fail to interpret their results this way.

A worse situation might arise if the difference is not only in the possible interpretation of results, but if there is a structural difference in the phenomenon examined between the compared cultures. This situation is illustrated in Article 2 with the case of lexical hypothesis research. The original lexical research was conducted in English. Adjectives that describe personality were selected from the dictionary. A factor analysis showed which of these adjectives are used together when describing a person. It was found that there are five factors that represent all of these adjectives. A similar result was found in other languages. However, when taking this research procedure from English to another language, it was assumed that the target language had the same structure for the description of personality. In English, perhaps, it is only vocabulary (or more narrowly - adjectives) which serves to describe personality. But other languages might have different structures and there might be other parts of the specific language – like some grammatical rules – that allows the description of personality. If it is assumed that such language works in a similar way as English and the adjective-examination research design is reused in the new language environment without the consideration or the examination of other parts of the language, some part of the phenomenon might remain hidden.

Such ignorance of the structural differences of the phenomena between the cultures might diminish the cultural diversity of the issues studied by cross-cultural psychological research. The article argues that a researcher who aims to study phenomenon already studied in a different culture should not copy the research design from that culture, but that they should introspectively examine whether the structure of the phenomenon is the same in the culture where they aim to conduct the research. The cultural diversity of the phenomena researched might increase if such introspective examination would become the standard part of empirical articles.

Article 3

Low cultural diversity in psychological research is supported by the widespread use of quantitative research. As Franz (2022) shows, the necessary condition for quantitative research design is to have a meaningful interpretation of what the numbers used in this design actually mean in psychological reality. A large part of psychological research does not have such a meaningful interpretation. And its absence allows to ignore that the number given to the psychological attribute measured in two cultures could actually have different meanings in both cultures. Because this difference is ignored, it hinders the research ability to illustrate cultural diversity. Additionally, we cannot ignore the possibility that reality might not fit with the concepts used in psychology, including their logical relationships to the quantitative structure (Michell, 2022). The study of psychological phenomena should be separated from the means used for their exploration (Uher, 2021). Article 3 describes that the selection of a mathematical structure suitable to the capture of the phenomenon in question should be made after understanding the phenomenon well enough (Franz, 2023) – such a selection of structure cannot be made properly if the phenomenon is not yet understood. Other numerical mathematical structures might be more suitable for the capture of psychological phenomena and such structures (or qualitative research) might be more able to mirror cultural diversity. If researchers apply a reflective approach to the methods used and employ quantification only when it is really suitable (Tafreshi et al., 2016), it might support cultural diversity in research. It is, therefore, important to show the low legitimacy of the quantitative base of culture classifications in order to support a better assessment of the cultural differences by psychological science. This is partially done in this journal article.

Article 4

As mentioned for Article 3 (see above), the usage of the quantitative approach in psychology is questionable. Article 4 describes that this usage is, to a large extent, caused by a phenomenon called tokenism. Tokenism is when someone who has a distinctive characteristic related to some field – like being expert in statistics/numerical mathematics – is erroneously considered to be expert in a much broader field (i.e., general mathematics). Psychologists traditionally cooperate with numerical mathematicians and many psychologists are trained in statistics. The whole community might consider these people to be mathematics experts and consider them to be able to decide whether numbers are the best mathematical structure to represent psychological phenomena. This might not be true, because most of the psychologists who are expert in statistics probably do not have experience with, and probably do not consider, other mathematical structures (called qualitative mathematics by Rudolph, 2013) to represent psychological phenomena.

The same logic applies to a token possessed by someone who originates in a specific culture. Such a person might be considered to be knowledgeable about much larger sets of cultures, like the whole region to which this culture belongs. The person does not need to have good knowledge about other countries and cultures in this region. If this person is considered an expert on the region due to this token and they are asked to design cross-cultural comparative research for this region, it might lead to the creation of a design that portrays the region as sharing common psychological/cultural characteristics. Consequently, the research might fail to show the actual cultural diversity in the region.

---

[3] Article 4 was part of the collection of five articles for which the author received the Early Career Award from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

Article 5

Linkov, V., & Lu, W.-L. (2017). I won't speak our language with you: English privilege, English-speaking foreigner stereotype, and language ostracism in Taiwan. *Human Affairs: Postdisciplinary Humanities & Social Sciences Quarterly*, **27(1), 22-29.** https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2017-0003

Foreign-looking people in Taiwan are addressed in English by the locals even if they speak Mandarin and not English. As illustrated by qualitative interviews and discussed in Article 5, this behavior might be caused by the higher prestige of the English language. Speaking English means higher status and a person who speaks English might receive a better reception by society.

This same logic might cause lower cultural diversity in the cross-cultural knowledge of researchers in psychology. Because of the higher status of English-speaking and English-educated researchers, the logical choice for students is to go to study to an ESC. The research community then contains people who predominantly spend part of their life in an ESC and who possess cross-cultural experience from this country, but who lack the cross-cultural experience from other countries. In 2012, I examined where professors who taught at Korean universities were educated. I found only four departments that provided information about the education of their employees, which altogether employed 38 professors. Thirty-three were foreign educated. Of those, 31 were educated in the United States, one in Australia, and one in Germany. Having such limited cultural diversity in the cross-cultural experience in the whole research community might influence the ability of the researchers to realize cross-cultural differences that are different from those mainly applicable to the US and some other culture. Limited diversity in cross-cultural experience might be the main factor influencing the cultural diversity in cultural-comparative psychological research.

Article 6

Linkov, V. (2014). Několik poznámek k vytváření interkulturních psychologických výzkumů [Few notes on conducting cross-cultural comparison in psychological research]. *Psychologie a její kontexty,* **5(2), 101-108.** https://psychkont.osu.cz/fulltext/2014/Linkov_2014_2.pdf

Article 6 aims to review problems that might come during preparations for cross-cultural research. First, the scales used in the research might not be designed for the comparison of the specific societies, because they were developed for some other group of people or for some larger human group that included the society in question (but not specifically for that culture). As a result, these scales might measure something that does not distinguish between the compared societies, or that might distinguish between them, but the measured behavior might not have an important role in these societies. Second, cross-cultural research is highly influenced by the people who conduct it. The researcher needs to cooperate with colleagues from other countries and these colleagues might have their own political preferences. Some governments might want to ignore the cultural specificity of indigenous people and label them as the being the same as the majority population in order to enforce national unity. For example, the operationalization of China/Chinese-ness as a single entity is at odds with the ethnical and cultural diversity of China (Gao, 2022). Other governments might consider some cultural groups to be inferior to the country's majority group and not want to bother about their cultural specificity. A foreign colleague might include these views in their research and omit the collection of samples in such populations. It is the responsibility of the cross-cultural researcher to check that this does not happen when acquiring other countries' samples for their research.

Article 7

Linkov, V. (2017). Korejská domorodá psychologie: Přehled některých pojmů [Korean indigenous psychology: A review of some concepts]. *Človek a Spoločnosť*, 20(2), 72-79. https://individualandsociety.org/storage/uploads/casopis/2017/2/korejska-domoroda-psychologie-prehled-nekterych-po/150227154306-linkov-po.pdf

When psychological textbooks are translated into the local language they were usually written in English. These textbooks provide the local environment with the terminology and conceptualization of psychological knowledge that is common in ESCs. Terminologies that are used in other cultures are not introduced in this way. Students are primed into the conceptualization used in the English environment, which might be less sensitive to other concepts. This might bring lesser cultural diversity to the cross-cultural research that they conduct in their career. It might be useful if local-language texts introduced the concepts used by various IPs so that students might be introduced to them as early as they are introduced to the global/English concepts. This is the role of Article 7 for Korean indigenous psychology.

Article 7 summarizes the history of indigenous psychology and how the Korean IP was developed. It reviews the most important terms used by the Korean IP. The main goal is to increase the cultural diversity of the psychological terminology that is available for the Czech language.

Article 8

Linkov, V. (2019). Základní témata čínské původní psychologie [Basic themes of Chinese indigenous psychology], *Psychologie a její kontexty***, 10(1), 3-16.**
https://doi.org/10.15452/PsyX.2019.10.0001[4]

Article 8 reviews the concepts and terminology used by Chinese indigenous psychology. There are long excerpts, especially from the works of Kwang-Kuo Hwang, that introduce the phenomena that he described. The article also introduces how Chinese indigenous psychology came into existence and discusses whether something similar exists for the European/Czech environment.

An important characteristic of this article is the change of the Czech term to denote indigenous psychology. The earlier used term "domorodá psychologie", which was used in previous Czech works that mentioned indigenous psychology (including the Article 7) has a derogatory connotation in Czech, so I used term „původní psychologie".

A common feature of both Article 7 and Article 8 is that they do not refer to cross-cultural studies that compare indigenous concepts among Korean, Chinese, and Japanese cultures. Despite the call for the comparison of indigenous phenomena (Yang, 2000) and despite the existence of comparable phenomena (e.g., face) in all three cultures, no comparative studies were done in the 2000s nor the 2010s. The diversity of cultural-comparative psychological studies in East Asia could not be significantly improved without the comparison of the indigenous phenomena.

---

[4] Article 8 was part of a collection of five articles for which the author received the Early Career Award from the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology.

Article 9

Linkov, V., O'Doherty, K., Choi, E., & Han, G. (2021). Linguistic Diversity Index: A Scientometric Measure to Enhance the Relevance of Small and Minority Group Languages. *SAGE Open,* **11(2).** https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211009191

Cultural diversity in psychological research is endangered by current research evaluation measures. As Liu (2020) describes, local perspectives developed by IPs are marginalized when research quality is evaluated by citations because locally-relevant phenomena cannot compete with globally-relevant phenomena for widespread relevance and large numbers of citations. If research evaluation measures to benefit cultural diversity are employed, it might help the indigenous approaches to survive. Article 9 is an attempt to offer such a measure. The main premise lies beyond the logic of the Linguistic Diversity Index (LDI), which is introduced in this text and which holds that companies that produce scientometric databases would not develop a new database or add a new database field just for cultural-oriented research. Such a new measure should, therefore, use that information that is already contained in scientometric databases. The only field in these databases that contains information relevant to a researcher's understanding of the local culture is "language of publication". LDI is, therefore, an attempt to develop a measure to benefit the understanding of the local language/culture based on the field/column "language of publication" in the scientometric databases. It is probably not a good measure, but information contained in the current databases does not allow the development of something significantly better without actually changing the databases or adding more information about each publication.

Conclusion

The articles collected for this habilitation thesis describe various issues that influence the way that cross-cultural research is conducted and how culturally diverse the views it offers really are. The quality of cross-cultural psychology depends on how diverse the cross-cultural comparisons are conducted and whether cultures are compared to more than just a small set of reference cultures (e.g., the US). We might suggest the following to increase the quality of cross-cultural research: Research design is better when the researcher introspectively evaluates whether the terminology and conceptualization borrowed from another culture matches with the culture of interest (and not just copies and pastes the original conceptualization). If this quantification is used, it is better to check whether the phenomenon under investigation really fits the quantitative structure in all of the involved cultures. The quality of research increases if the researcher checks that the scholars from whom they acquire information really have knowledge about the culture of interest and not just about another culture in the same region. The conceptualization of the research might be better if scholars with diverse cultural and educational backgrounds are involved in the preparations, rather than just scholars who are connected to cultural environments with the highest status in the academic environment. Researchers should check whether the people with whom they collaborate do not ignore some indigenous groups in their countries because their governments had decided to deny them recognition as an independent culture. Various indigenous concepts should enter the researcher's consideration as early as the mainstream concepts in order to deliver a better conceptualization of the phenomenon of interest. And research results should be generalized only to the cultural group for which it is appropriate and not to any other larger cultural group that contains the first one.

In my view, the most important issue that influences cultural diversity in psychological research is whether it allows cultural-specific concepts and terminologies into the international research arena. IPs, which create culturally specific terminologies and descriptions of local psychological phenomena, are endangered if the quality of their research is evaluated by the number of citations from around the globe (Liu, 2020). The phenomena they describe is interesting only for the local scientific community and, if someone from the other side of the globe wants to use information they offer, they need to be at least a little bit familiar with that local culture. That takes time and not many researchers might be willing to

study another culture. As a result, the number of citations that indigenous researchers receive internationally cannot compete with researchers who study phenomena that are relevant everywhere around the globe. If countries where IPs are developed stop to reward their activities, it might lead to less culturally diverse concepts and terminologies that are available to international researchers. Solving the problem of how to reward indigenous research in an environment that increasingly relies on international fame is crucial for the support of cultural diversity in cross-cultural psychological research.

Author contributions to the included articles

[1] Linkov, V. (2013). Comparative psychological research in East Asia: An opportunity for East Asian studies scholars. *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies*, 4 (1), 51-65. https://doi.org/10.2478/vjeas-2013-0003

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[2] Linkov, V. (2017). Psychology is not primarily empirical science: A comparison of cultures in the lexical hypothesis tradition as a failure of introspection. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 51(2), 285-302. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-016-9375-1

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[3] Linkov, V. (2021). Research based on scientific realism should not make preliminary assumptions about mathematical structure representing human behavior: Cronbach and Gleser's measure as an example. *Theory & Psychology*, 31(3), 465-470. https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211016082

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[4] Linkov, V. (2014). Tokenism in psychology: Standing on the shoulders of small boys. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 48 (2), 143-160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-014-9266-2

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[5] Linkov, V., & Lu, W.-L. (2017). I won't speak our language with you: English privilege, English-speaking foreigner stereotype, and language ostracism in Taiwan. *Human Affairs: Postdisciplinary Humanities & Social Sciences Quarterly*, 27(1), 22-29. https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2017-0003

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	85	100

The first author conducted the planning for the study, the data acquisition, and the analysis, and wrote the main body of the article, with the exception of a small part of the Introduction. The second author wrote the small part of the Introduction and proofread the entire text.

[6] Linkov, V. (2014). Několik poznámek k vytváření interkulturních psychologických výzkumů [Few notes on conducting cross-cultural comparison in psychological research]. *Psychologie a její kontexty,* 5(2), 101-108. **https://psychkont.osu.cz/fulltext/2014/Linkov_2014_2.pdf**

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[7] Linkov, V. (2017). Korejská domorodá psychologie: Přehled některých pojmů [Korean indigenous psychology: A review of some concepts]. *Člověk a Spoločnosť*, 20(2), 72-79. **https://individualandsociety.org/storage/uploads/casopis/2017/2/korejska-domoroda-psychologie-prehled-nekterych-po/150227154306-linkov-po.pdf**

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[8] **Linkov, V. (2019). Základní témata čínské původní psychologie [Basic themes of Chinese indigenous psychology],** *Psychologie a její kontexty*, **10(1), 3-16.** **https://doi.org/10.15452/PsyX.2019.10.0001**

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	100	100

[9] **Linkov, V., O'Doherty, K., Choi, E., & Han, G. (2021). Linguistic Diversity Index: A Scientometric Measure to Enhance the Relevance of Small and Minority Group Languages.** *SAGE Open,* **11(2).** https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211009191

Experimental work (%)	Supervision (%)	Manuscript (%)	Research direction (%)
100	100	90	100

The first author presented the idea, developed the algorithm for the computation of the LDI and the example in the article, created the conceptualization of the text, wrote the first version of the manuscript, and participated in the manuscript rewriting and revisions. The second, third, and fourth authors proofread the text and participated in the manuscript rewriting and revisions.

References

Adams, G., Dobles, I., Gómez, L. H., Kurtiş, T., & Molina, L. E. (2015). Decolonizing Psychological Science: Introduction to the Special Thematic Section. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, *3*(1), 213-238. https://doi.org/10.5964/jspp.v3i1.564

Allwood, C. M. (2019). Future prospects for indigenous psychologies. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2)*,* 90–97. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000108

Allwood, C.M. (2020). Yang's Global Psychology and Beyond. In L. Sundararajan, K.K. Hwang, & K.H. Yeh (Eds), *Global Psychology from Indigenous Perspectives* (pp. 11-128). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35125-0_7

Arnett, J. J. (2008). The Neglected 95%. Why American Psychology Needs to Become Less American. *American Psychologist*, 63(7), 602-614. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.63.7.602

Berry, J. W. (2022). The Forgotten Field: Contexts for Cross-Cultural Psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 53(7-8), 993–1009. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221093810

Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Consiglio, C., Picconi, L., & Zimbardo, P.G. (2003). Personalities of politicians and voters: Unique and synergistic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 849-856. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.849

Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., & Zimbardo, P.G. (1999). Personality profiles and political parties. *Political Psychology*, 20(1), 175-197. https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00141

Cerha, O. (2013). *Kulturní a interkulturní psychologie [Cultural and cross-cultural psychology]* [Unpublished rigorous thesis]. Faculty of Arts, Charles University in Prague.

Cerha, O. (2015). Svoboda – kulturní univerzálie? [Freedom – a cultural universal?]. In D. Heller & I. Sobotková (Eds.), *Psychologické dny 2014: Fenomén svobody v kontextu psychologie a filosofie: sborník z konference: 32. Psychologické dny, 11. - 13. září 2014, Olomouc* (pp. 20-24). Czech-Moravian Psychological Society.

Dhar, A., & Dixit, S. (2022). Making of a Crisis: The Political and Clinical Implications of Psychology's Globalization. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 42(2), 108-130. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000187

Ellis, B. D., & Stam, H. J. (2015). Crisis? What crisis? Cross-cultural psychology's appropriation of cultural psychology. *Culture and Psychology*, 21(3), 293–317. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X15601198

Franz, D.J. (2022). "Are psychological attributes quantitative?" is not an empirical question: Conceptual confusions in the measurement debate. *Theory & Psychology*, 32(1), 131-150. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211045340

Franz, D.J. (2023). Quantitative research without measurement. Reinterpreting the better-than-average-effect. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 68, article 100976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newideapsych.2022.100976

Gabrenya, W., & Glazer, S. (2022). Bridging 50 Years of Theoretical and Applied Cross-Cultural Psychology: Contributions of IACCP and JCCP. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 53(7-8), 752–788. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221110874

Gao, Z. (2022). Culturing the Mind: China as a Glocal Site of Epistemological Innovation. *Integrative Behavioral and Psychological Science*, 56(2)**,** 331–342. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-022-09699-z

Hartmann, W.E., Kim, E.S., Kim, J.H.J., Nguyen, T.U., Wendt, D.C., Nagata, D.K., & Gone, J.P. (2013). In Search of Cultural Diversity, Revisited: Recent Publication Trends in Cross-Cultural and Ethnic Minority Psychology. *Review of General Psychology*, 17(3), 243-254. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032260

Henrich, J., Heine, S.J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people of the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 33(2-3), 61-83. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X

Hwang, K.-K. (in press). An Epistemological Strategy for Initiating Scientifc Revolution against WEIRD Psychology. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-022-09681-9

Jahoda, G. (2016). On the rise and decline of 'indigenous psychology'. *Culture and Psychology*, 22(2), 169-181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X16634052

Li, N. (2022, July 12-16). *Global diversity of authors, editors, and journal ownerships across subdisciplines of psychology* [Conference Presentation]. 26th International Congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology, online.

Linkov, V. (2020). Political party membership and personality characteristics in the Czech Republic (2005). *E-psychologie*, 14 (2), 25-36. https://doi.org/10.29364/epsy.370

Liu, J.H. (2020). A Commentary on Commentaries on the Prospects for a More Equitable Global Psychology. In L. Sundararajan, K.K. Hwang, & K.H. Yeh (Eds), *Global Psychology from Indigenous Perspectives* (pp. 177-188). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35125-0_11

Lee, CH.H., Kim, K., Seo, Y.S., & Chung, C.K. (2007). The relations between personality and language use. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 134(4), 405-413.

https://doi.org/10.3200/GENP.134.4.405-414

Long, W. (2019). Indigenous psychology: Going nowhere slowly? *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 39*(2), 115–119. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000114

Lonner, W. (2016). Editorial: A Commentary on the Assessment and Analysis of "Culture-Content" in Basic Psychology Texts. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture, 11*(1). https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1144

Michell, J. (2022). Denying Descartes and wary of Wittgenstein: Response to Franz. *Theory & Psychology*, 32(1), 151-157. https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543211046204

Nwoye, A. (2015). What is African Psychology the psychology of? *Theory & Psychology*, 25(1), 96–116. https://doi.org/10.1177/0959354314565116

Oppong, S. (in press). Indigenous psychology in Africa: Centrality of culture, misunderstandings, and global positioning. *Theory & Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1177/09593543221097334

Pe-Pua, R. (2020). From Indigenous Psychologies to Cross-Indigenous Psychology—Prospects for a "Genuine, Global Human Psychology". In L. Sundararajan, K.K. Hwang, & K.H. Yeh (Eds), *Global Psychology from Indigenous Perspectives* (pp. 189-223). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35125-0_12

Rudolph, L. (Ed.). (2013). *Qualitative Mathematics for the Social Sciences. Mathematical Models for Research on Cultural Dynamics.* Routledge.

Sinha, D. (2002). Culture and psychology: The perspective of cross-cultural psychology. *Psychology and Developing Societies*, 14(1), 11-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/097133360201400102

Smith, P. B., & Bond, M. H. (2022). Four Decades of Challenges by Culture to Mainstream Psychology: Finding Ways Forward. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 53(7-8), 729–751. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221084041

Sundararajan, L., & Raina, M.K. (2015). Revolutionary Creativity, East and West: A Critique From Indigenous Psychology. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 35(1), 3-19. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037506

Sundararajan, L. (2019). Whither Indigenous Psychology?. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2), 81-89. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000115

Syed, M., & Kathawalla, U.-K. (2022). Cultural psychology, diversity, and representation in open science. In K. C. McLean (Ed.), *Cultural methods in psychology: Describing and transforming cultures* (pp. 427–454). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190095949.003.0015

Tafreshi, D., Slaney, K. L., & Neufeld, S. D. (2016). Quantification in psychology: Critical analysis of an unreflective practice. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology,* 36(4)*,* 233–249. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000048

Uher, J. (2021). Psychometrics is not measurement: Unraveling a fundamental misconception in quantitative psychology and the complex network of its underlying fallacies. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology,* 41(1)*,* 58–84. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000176

Yang, K.-S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches: The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology,* 3(3)*,* 241–263. **https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-839X.00067**

Yeh, K.H., & Sundararajan, L. (2019). Introduction. In K.H. Yeh (Ed.), *Asian Indigenous Psychologies in the Global Context* (pp. 1-15). Palgrave Macmillan. https://**doi**.org/**10.1007/978-3-319-96232-0_1**

Yeh, KH. (2020). Pioneer of Chinese Indigenous Psychology: Prof. Kuo-Shu Yang. In L. Sundararajan, K.K. Hwang, & K.H. Yeh (Eds), *Global Psychology from Indigenous Perspectives* (pp. 33-44). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35125-0_3

Articles included in this collection

Articles 1-5 are not included in the publicly accessible version of this habilitation thesis, because the publication rights belong to the respective publishing houses.

Několik poznámek k vytváření interkulturních psychologických výzkumů

Few notes on conducting cultural comparisons in psychological research

Václav Linkov[1]*

[1] *College of Social Sciences, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan*

Abstrakt

Článek shrnuje některé problémy současného interkulturního psychologického výzkumu. Za prvé, používané konstrukty a metody často nedokážou říci nic podstatného o rozdílech mezi dotčenými kulturami. Za druhé, skupiny (často původní obyvatelstvo), které nejsou reprezentovány na univerzitách v dotčených zemích bývají z výzkumu vynechány. Za třetí, výzkumníci často generalizují vytvořené pojmy a konstrukty na širší populace, než se kterými mají zkušenost a jejichž kulturám rozumí. Za čtvrté, mnoho psychologických časopisů publikujících interkulturní výzkumy tyto problémy ignoruje. Proto je výzkumníkům připravujícím interkulturní výzkum doporučeno, aby ověřovali relevanci konstruktů a metod publikovaných v psychologických časopisech z jiných zdrojů, zejména se snažili výzkum konzultovat s lidmi, kteří rozdíly mezi příslušnými kulturami znají a dokážou vhodnost daného konstruktu či metody pro jejich porovnání posoudit.

Klíčová slova: interkulturní psychologie, měření, sociální dimenze výzkumu

Abstract

Some problems of conducting cultural comparisons in psychological research are mentioned. First, the constructs and methods used often don't tell anything meaningful about cultures in question – as if we used temperature (construct) and thermomether (method) to compare water and nitrogen. Often, method developed to measure construct meaningful in culture A (or construct meaningful for comparison between culture A and other cultures) is used to compare cultures B and C. As a result, the used method might measure something, which is relevant only for some of the compared cultures, or is not meaningful for such cultural comparison at all – cultures B and C might look similar when construct meaningful for description of difference between cultures A and D is used. Second, groups not being represented in academia in countries in question (often

_____
*Korespondenční autor: Václav Linkov, Zahradníkova 26, Brno 60200, ČR
e–mail: vaclav.linkov@hotmail.com

indigenous groups in these countries) are often omitted from research. Researchers from some countries might be motivated to don't mention such groups in the published research. Third, researchers often generalize developed constructs and results to larger groups than they have actually knowledge and understanding about. Chauvinist idea that one's own culture is representative for geographically close cultures might be behind this behavior as well as pragmatic idea that the research stating its results to be valid for larger group of people has larger chance to be published. Fourth, constructs and methods developed by these types of research are published in psychological journals, which ignore these issues.

Before preparing a cultural–comparative research it is recommended to get good knowledge about cultures in question and use this knowledge to judge meaningfulness of constructs used in psychological research. If there are no meaningful constructs for description of differences between cultures in question, it is better to develop a new construct.

Keywords: cultural comparison in psychology, measuring, social dimension of research

_____

Úvod

V československé psychologii byla otištěna výzva, aby čeští psychologové začali produkovat více výzkumů zabývajících se mezikulturním psychologickým porovnáváním (Klicperová–Baker, 2012). S možnou zvyšující se produkcí interkulturních výzkumů v ČR je tak dobré připomenout skutečnosti, na které je při vytváření srovnávacích psychologických výzkumů potřeba dávat pozor a které české texty zabývající se interkulturní psychologií často explicitně nezmiňují (jako např. Průcha, 2003). V následujících odstavcích proto shrnu dva hlavní zdroje nízké kvality interkulturních psychologických výzkumů, kterými je (pro psychologii typická – viz Machado & Silva, 2007) nedostatečná evaluace toho, co je měřeno/zkoumáno a kdo a kým je měřen/zkoumán.

Co a čím je měřeno

V interkulturní psychologii se to s používanými pojmy a jejich měřením často má jako bychom chtěli měřit rozdíl mezi dvěma substancemi, o nichž bychom nevěděli, čím se liší, a k dispozici bychom měli teploměr – rozhodli bychom se tedy měřit teplotu jakožto konstrukt pro porovnání těchto substancí. Po naměření rozdílu bychom prohlásili, že tyto substance se skutečně liší teplotou a začali bychom používat teploměr pro měření rozdílů mezi substancemi i nadále. Pokud by však jedna substance byla voda a druhá dusík (uvedený předtím do tekutého stavu kvůli ekvivalenci mezi měřenými substancemi), ke zjištění, že se tyto substance liší tím, z čeho se skládají, bychom nikdy nedošli. Tímto způsobem se postupuje u mnoha kvantitativních interkulturních výzkumů, protože přeložit a použít nějakou metodu je jednodušší než přemýšlet, čím by se srovnávané kultury mohly lišit. Kulturní

rozdíly zjištěné takovými metodami pak sice odpovídají nějakým reálným rozdílům mezi dotčenými kulturami, nemusí však zdaleka jít o rozdíly podstatné či smysluplné.

Často jde o to, že je pro porovnávání použita metoda, která byla vyvinuta pro kulturní prostředí A (případně porovnávání tohoto prostředí s nějakým jiným), a tato metoda je upravena (většinou přeložena) pro porovnávání prostředí B s prostředím C. Stejně jako sebelepší teploměr pro měření teploty vzduchu není vhodným nástrojem pro popis podstatných rozdílů mezi vodou a dusíkem, protože teplota není vhodným konstruktem pro tento účel, není ani sebelepší psychometrická metoda vyvinutá v určitém kulturním prostředí či prostředích vhodným nástrojem pro popis rozdílů mezi jinými kulturními prostředími (a stejně tak nemusí být pro tento účel vhodný konstrukt, který tato metoda měří). Tento často používaný přístup pak vede k tomu, že komparativní psychologické výzkumy nejsou schopny zachytit rozdíly mezi kulturami B a C, respektive tvrdí, že se dané kultury liší něčím, co je i pro laika majícího zkušenost s oběma kulturními prostředími irelevantní. Je tedy třeba zdůraznit, že počátkem interkulturního psychologického výzkumu založeného na psychometrických metodách by mělo být zkoumání určitého fenoménu vyskytujícího se v porovnávaných kulturách, formulace konstruktu vzniklého na základě znalosti tohoto fenoménu a vyvinutí metody pro jeho měření – nikoliv použití sebekvalitnější psychometrické metody vyvinuté jinde či pro jiný účel a očekávání, že konstrukt měřený touto metodou bude schopen o rozdílu mezi danými kulturami něco smysluplného vypovědět.

Pravděpodobně žádný konstrukt není vhodný pro smysluplné porovnávání všech kultur. Porovnávání může dát smysluplnou informaci pouze tam, kde v daných kulturách (nebo alespoň v některé z nich) je podstatný ten fenomén, na jehož základě byl konstrukt v kultuře či kulturách svého původu vytvořen. Příkladem konstruktu, který při použití pro porovnávání některých kultur nemusí dávat žádnou smysluplnou informaci o rozdílu mezi těmito kulturami, je dichotomie individualismus–kolektivismus. Tento konstrukt vznikl na základě dotazníků vyplňovaných zaměstnanci IBM ve 40 zemích (Hofstede, 1980), v nichž byli dotazováni na věci týkající se svého pracovního života. Byl však vytvořen pouze z pohledu jednoho určitého kulturního prostředí – prostředí americké firmy (A) – a pokud je použit k porovnávání nějakých prostředí B a C, nemusí o nich nic smysluplného vypovědět. To ukázal výzkum Oyserman, Coon a Kemmelmeiera (2002), kdy různé asijské kultury vycházely nebo nevycházely v porovnávání se severoamerickými kulturami jako kolektivistické podle toho, jaké položky se do škály měřící kolektivismus přidaly, přičemž pro každou kulturu šlo o jiné položky (viz podrobnější diskuse v Linkov, 2013). Tento konstrukt tedy není pro porovnávání těchto kultur smysluplný a místo něj by bylo smysluplnější používat několik jiných konstruktů vytvořených z položek, které jsou v jednotlivých kulturách zodpovídány různě a mají tedy potenciál zprostředkovat informaci o rozdílu mezi nimi (dichotomie individualismus–kolektivismus je založena na odpozorovaném fenoménu, kdy se lidé vztahují ke skupině obsahující *jednoho* nebo *více* lidí; stejně významná by ale mohla být např. dichotomie založená na fenoménu, kdy se lidé vztahují k *menšímu počtu* a *mnoha* lidem – a kdyby byly položky v dotaznících IBM sestavovány a analyzovány z pozice, že podstatný je takovýto protiklad, výsledný konstrukt by byl pravděpodobně pojmenován jinak a dokázal by něco smysluplného vypovědět o rozdílech mezi jinými kulturami než o jakých to dokáže vypovědět konstrukt vytvořený na základě dotazníků IBM).

Pro mezikulturní porovnávání je vhodné vyjít z konstruktu, který je vytvořen či převzat odjinud na základě poznání, že je schopen vypovědět něco podstatného o některé z porovnávaných kultur (tím ovšem není zaručeno, že konstrukt bude schopen poskytnout podstatnou informaci o obou/všech porovnávaných kulturách). Je tedy potřeba vyjít z nějakého fenoménu, který se v jedné nebo v obou/všech porovnávaných kulturách vyskytuje a zkonstruovat metodu, která umožní porovnat jeho existenci v jiných kulturách. Příkladem takového použití je například výzkum Tafarodi, Shaugnessy, Lee, Leung, Ozaki, Morio a Yamaguchi (2009). Autoři vyšli z čínské tendence ignorovat lidi, s nimiž člověk není v žádném sociálním vztahu. Autoři vymysleli metodu, kdy nechali zkoumanou osobu nejprve seřadit deset univerzálních hodnot podle důležitosti. Poté dali zkoumané osobě dvě podobná pořadí – jedno stejné jako vyplnila ona sama, druhé přesně opačné, řekli jí, že pochází od dvou lidí, a vyzvali ji, ať si vybere, s kterým z nich by chtěla žít. Poté zkoumané osobě řekli, že se má dozvědět více o vybraném člověku, a ukázali jí tři sady slov ze „slovně asociačního testu", z nichž jedna údajně pocházela od vybraného člověka, druhá od nevybraného člověka a třetí od nějakého dalšího člověka. Nakonec testovali, kolik slov z těchto tří sad si zkoumaná osoba zapamatovala. Tuto metodu použili v Číně, Japonsku a Kanadě. V zapamatování informací o vybraném člověku nebyl mezi těmito třemi kulturami rozdíl. Rozdíl byl ale v zapamatování informací o dalších dvou lidech: Japonci si pamatovali více než Kanaďané a Kanaďané více než Číňané.

Je třeba podotknout, že problém, zda konstrukt popisuje a metoda měří něco podstatného pro porovnání dvou kultur, nemusí souviset s tím, zda jsou metoda či konstrukt vhodné pro použití v obou kulturách či v jiných kulturách, než kde byly vyvínuty (tj. emic–etic debatou v psychologii). V uvedeném příkladě je teploměr jistě vhodným nástrojem pro zjištění něčeho podstatného o vodě i o dusíku – protože teplota je konstruktem, který nám něco smysluplného na vodě i dusíku popíše. Nicméně to neznamená, že teploměr je vhodný pro zjištění něčeho podstatného o rozdílu mezi vodou a dusíkem (dusík a voda se liší něčím podstatnějším, než je teplota). Měření za účelem srovnání dvou kultur je něco jiného než měření v každé z těchto kultur. Pro zjištění smysluplnosti určité metody pro porovnávání je tak nutné zvážit její vhodnost z hlediska tohoto porovnávání, nikoliv pouze z hlediska obou či všech dotčených kultur. Problém, zda metoda měří něco podstatného nebo smysluplného proto nesouvisí s požadavkem její invariance u jednotlivých kultur (aby v jednotlivých kulturách měřila ten stejný konstrukt – viz Cheung, de Vijver, & Leong, 2011, s. 594). To, že metoda měří stejný konstrukt ve všech kulturách, neznamená, že měřit v nich tento konstrukt za účelem porovnávání je smysluplné. Požadavek na invarianci metody je na místě pouze tehdy, pokud lze danou metodou zjistit nějaké smysluplné rozdíly mezi objekty zkoumání – tedy kulturami. Sebekorektnější způsob použití statistických metod sám o sobě smysluplnost výstupu nijak nezaručuje (tu zaručuje pouze porozumění objektu zkoumání, které výzkumníkovi umožní nezůstat při analýze na povrchu): „Uvědomte si, že pokud provedete faktorovou analýzu na základě povrchových vlastností objektů, nikdy nedostanete něco jako tabulku prvků. Vyjdou vám faktory jako barva, hustota a vzor na povrchu, které mohou být někdy užitečné, ale neposkytnou vám uspokojivý vědecký systém." (Epstein, 2010, s. 38)

Kdo a kým je měřen

Kdo je ve výzkumu prezentován jako reprezentant určité kultury či země často závisí na tom, kdo zde pracuje na univerzitách. Například v Malajsii se vláda snaží postupně pomalajšťovat původní nemalajské obyvatelstvo v provincii Sabah. Výzkumník z malajské univerzity tak může prezentovat obyvatelstvo Malajsie jako skládající se z Malajců a v posledních stoletích přistěhovalých Číňanů a Indů, přičemž původní nemalajské obyvatelstvo zůstane vynecháno. Podobná situace jako v Malajsii existuje v mnoha zemích, přičemž nemusí nesouviset s mírou politické svobody v dané zemi, ani tím, jak pozitivně je daná země prezentována v médiích. Určité skupiny obyvatel (mnohdy původní obyvatelstvo předurčené vládou k asimilaci a zániku) nejsou mezi výzkumníky na univerzitách reprezentovány a tito výzkumníci nemusí mít zájem je zkoumat.

Kvalitu výzkumu ovlivňuje to, kdo na výzkumu spolupracuje. V předchozím odstavci jsem popsal situaci, kdy je jako kultura určená ke zkoumání prezentovaná kultura lidí, kteří drží moc v daném univerzitním/výzkumném prostředí a spolupracují na mezikulturních srovnávacích výzkumech. Dále může nastat (dle mého názoru poměrně častá) situace, kdy se člověk pocházející z určité kultury snaží prezentovat jako osoba mající znalosti o jiných kulturách, které jsou k jeho domácí kultuře geograficky blízko (případně jsou klasifikovány podobně dle nějaké psychometrické metody), i když s těmito kulturami nemá žádnou větší zkušenost. Např. čínský psycholog, který v jiných oblastech východní Asie nikdy nebyl ani se tam nedomluví, tak může tvrdit, že rozumí asijskému prostředí, a navrhovat tak do výzkumu hypotézy a metody týkající se údajných asijských charakteristik. Takový postoj odpovídá šovinismu považujícímu Čínu za předobraz ostatních asijských kultur – „čínocentrismu" (Kim, 2009) – občas se vyskytujícímu v čínském akademickém prostředí (mnohé příklady např. v Zadrapa & Pejčochová, 2009). Důvod prezentace vlastní kultury jako reprezentující širší celek však nemusí být pouze šovinistický či politický, ale čistě pragmatický – prezentací širší generalizace lze získat větší publicitu.

Kdo na výzkumu spolupracuje může ovlivnit i to, zda jsou členové výzkumného týmu schopni poznat vhodnost či nevhodnost určitého konstruktu pro mezikulturní porovnávání. V některých zemích je zvykem zaměstnávat na katedrách psychologie pouze lidi s určitou interkulturní zkušeností – např. téměř všichni vyučující na katedře psychologie na Soulské národní univerzitě (Seoul National University) vystudovali v USA. Korejský výzkumník navrátivší se do rodné země po dlouhé době strávené v USA může přijmout „Asian American" identitu a vnímat kultury mající stejné „asijské" označení jako podobné aniž s nimi má osobní zkušenost (Linkov, 2014). Pokud se pak na výzkumu, v rámci nějž se porovnávají dvě asijské kultury, podílí výzkumníci sdílející americkou interkulturní zkušenost a s ní získanou „home–field disadvantage" (Medin, Bennis, & Chandler, 2010) náhledu na svět z amerického pohledu, může dojít k tomu, že je pro mezikulturní porovnávání vybrán konstrukt, který pro porovnávání asijských kultur není smysluplný, protože nikdo ve výzkumném týmu nemá zkušenost z obou porovnávaných kultur, která by mu umožnila poznat nevhodnost tohoto konstruktu pro popis rozdílu mezi těmito kulturami.

Co by měl psycholog připravující interkulturní výzkum zvážit

Psycholog připravující interkulturní výzkum by si měl uvědomil následující věci: 1. Pojmy a metody, na kterých zvažuje svůj výzkum postavit, mohly vzniknout bez analýzy jejich schopnosti říci něco podstatného o rozdílech mezi populacemi, které budou v připravovaném výzkumu porovnávány (a autoři předchozích publikací používajících příslušný konstrukt či metodu se o tom nezmiňují). 2. Publikované studie mohou obsahovat eticky sporná místa ohledně toho, o kom se článek zmiňuje (a jejich autoři nemusí mít zájem o tom spolupracujícího českého výzkumníka informovat) . 3. Autoři publikovaných studií nemusí mít znalosti ani zkušenosti umožňující jim posoudit vhodnost jimi použitých pojmů a konstruktů, stanovených hypotéz a publikovaných závěrů pro populace, na něž svůj výzkum generalizují (a opět nemusí mít zájem to připustit).

Při plánování interkulturního psychologického výzkumu je třeba si uvědomit, že většina psychologických časopisů publikující tyto výzkumy (např. *Journal of Cross–Cultural Psychology*) uveřejňuje pouze kvantitativní empirické články´a metaanalýzy a kritickou evaluací prezentovaných konceptů se nezabývá (analýza některých zde publikovaných konstruktů je např. v Linkov, 2013). V podstatě jediná možnost, jak výše popsané problémy odhalit a být schopen připravit kvalitní výzkum, je dostatečně dotčeným kulturám rozumět. Psycholog připravující interkulturní výzkum by tak měl věnovat dostatečný čas (nejlépe v řádu let) na seznámení s kulturou země/zemí (případně skupiny/skupin), o níž/nichž chce ve svém výzkumu pojednávat. Alternativou pak může být spolupráce s odborníky z kateder zabývajících se dotčenými kulturami (navržená v Linkov, 2013). Informace umožňující posoudit kvalitu publikovaných interkulturních psychologických článků je také možné hledat v časopisech zabývajících se analýzou toho, co je zkoumáno (např. *Culture & Psychology*, který se však nezabývá analýzou konceptů vyprodukovaných kvantitativními studiemi), případně je možné informace vyhledat na internetu. Je třeba zdůraznit, že při plánování interkulturního výzkumu mohou mít psychologové tendenci schovávat se za „kolektivní odpovědnost" a legitimizovat svoje nedostatečné porozumění tématu odkazem na spolupracující zahraniční kolegy nebo „zaručené" metody. Ani jedno však nemusí být zárukou kvalitního výzkumu, za který pak v důsledku nenese odpovědnost nikdo. Toto by si měl psycholog připravující interkulturní výzkum uvědomit. Eticky a metodologicky sporné části vytvářeného výzkumu pak nebudou vznikat díky nevědomosti, ale vědomým rozhodnutím výzkumníka.

Závěr

V tomto textu jsem zmínil hlavní překážky, které psychologům brání ve vytváření kvalitních mezikulturních srovnávacích výzkumů. Společným jmenovatelem popsaných nešvarů je, že výzkum dělají psychologové s nedostatečnou znalostí obou (všech) porovnávaných kultur, kteří nekriticky používají určitou psychometrickou metodu aniž by přemýšleli (nebo byli schopni přemýšlet) nad její vhodností pro daný výzkum. Při uvažování o vhodnosti dané metody pro porovnání dotčených kultur se pak spoléhají na spolupracující

zahraniční kolegy (kteří ovšem o ostatních zkoumaných kulturách kromě své vlastní rovněž nemusí nic vědět, a tudíž také spoléhají na znalosti spolupracujícího kolegy). Bez (skutečné) kritické analýzy jsou pak přejímány i pojmy a „výsledky" takovým způsobem vzniklé.

Porozumění rozdílům mezi kulturami je tacitní znalost a tu nelze získat odečítáním rozdílů výsledků získaných psychometrickými metodami (Hwang, 2003) – proto je třeba oběma/všem kulturám, které chce výzkum porovnávat, nejprve porozumět (např. s pomocí lidí, kteří tacitní znalost o příslušných rozdílech mají) a teprve potom vybrat či vytvořit smysluplnou metodu pro výzkum. Kultury se mohou v psychologickém výzkumu jevit jako „blízké" jenom díky tomu, že metody pro jejich měření byly vytvořeny na základě zkušeností z jiných kultur či rozdílů mezi jinými kulturami než jaké jsou v publikovaném článku zkoumány. Zejména by tak mělo být při promýšlení výzkumu zváženo, zda existující konstrukty, metody použité pro výzkum a publikované výsledky jsou skutečně smysluplné v daném kulturním kontextu, případně zda rozdíly mezi kulturami, které jsou popisovány na základě existujících konstruktů jako podobné, nemohou být lépe popsány pomocí nových konstruktů vytvořených na základě znalosti daných kulturních prostředí.

Věřím, že tento text přispěje k tomu, aby čeští psychologové při plánování interkulturního výzkumu a spolupráce více přemýšleli o tom, co bude zkoumáno a s kým budou spolupracovat, a vyprodukovali spíše méně, ale o to kvalitnějších výzkumů.

Literatura

Cheung, F. M., van den Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the study of personality in culture. *American Psychologist, 66*, 593–603.

Epstein, S. (2010). The big five model: Grandiose ideas about surface traits as the foundation of a general theory of personality. *Psychological Inquiry, 21*, 34–39.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work–related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hwang, K. K. (2003). In search of a new paradigm for cultural psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 287–291.

Kim, M.S. (2009). Cultural bias in communication science: challenges of overcoming ethnocentric paradigms in Asia. *Asian Journal of Communication, 19*, 412–421.

Klicperová–Baker, M. (2012). 21. kongres mezinárodní asociace pro kroskulturní psychologii (IACCP). *Československá psychologie, 56*, 608–609.

Linkov, V. (2013). Comparative psychological research in East Asia: An opportunity for East Asian studies scholars. *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies, 4*(1), 51–65.

Linkov, V. (2014). Tokenism in psychology: Standing on the shoulders of small boys. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science, 48*(2), 143–160.

Machado, A., & Silva, F. J. (2007). Toward a richer view of the scientific method. The role of conceptual analysis. *American Psychologist, 62*, 671–681.

Medin, D., Bennis, W., & Chandler, M. (2010). Culture and the Home–Field Disadvantage. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*, 708–713.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta–Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 3–72.

Průcha, J. (2003). Interkulturní psychologie: Relevantní informační zdroje a témata výzkumu. *Československá psychologie, 47*, 573–586.

Tafarodi, R., W., Shaughnessy, S., C., Lee, W., W., S., Leung, D., Y., P., Ozaki, Y., Morio, H., & Yamaguchi, S. (2009). Disregard for Outsiders: A Cultural Comparison. *Journal of Cross–Cultural Psychology, 40*, 567–583.

Zádrapa, L., & Pejčochová, M. (2009): *Čínské písmo.* Praha, Academia.

A few notes on conducting cultural comparisons in psychological research[1]

Václav Linkov*

College of Social Sciences, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan

*Corresponding author: Václav Linkov, Zahradníkova 26, Brno 60200, Czech Republic, e–mail: vaclav.linkov@hotmail.com

Abstrakt

Článek shrnuje některé problémy současného interkulturního psychologického výzkumu. Za prvé, používané konstrukty a metody často nedokážou říci nic podstatného o rozdílech mezi dotčenými kulturami. Za druhé, skupiny (často původní obyvatelstvo), které nejsou reprezentovány na univerzitách v dotčených zemích bývají z výzkumu vynechány. Za třetí, výzkumníci často generalizují vytvořené pojmy a konstrukty na širší populace, než se kterými mají zkušenost a jejichž kulturám rozumí. Za čtvrté, mnoho psychologických časopisů publikujících interkulturní výzkumy tyto problémy ignoruje. Proto je výzkumníkům připravujícím interkulturní výzkum doporučeno, aby ověřovali relevanci konstruktů a metod publikovaných v psychologických časopisech z jiných zdrojů, zejména se snažili výzkum konzultovat s lidmi, kteří rozdíly mezi příslušnými kulturami znají a dokážou vhodnost daného konstruktu či metody pro jejich porovnání posoudit.

---

[1] This is the translation of an article that was originally published in Czech as:

Linkov, V. (2014). Několik poznámek k vytváření interkulturních psychologických výzkumů [A few notes on conducting cross-cultural comparisons in psychological research]. *Psychologie a její kontexty,* 5(2), 101-108.
https://psychkont.osu.cz/fulltext/2014/Linkov_2014_2.pdf

Klíčová slova:

interkulturní psychologie, měření, sociální dimenze výzkumu

Abstract[2]

Some of the problems with conducting cultural comparisons in psychological research are mentioned. First, the constructs and methods used often do not provide anything meaningful about the cultures in question. This is similar to using temperature (i.e., a construct) and a thermomether (i.e., a method) to compare water and nitrogen. Often, the method is developed to measure the construct that is meaningful in Culture A (or a construct that is meaningful for comparison between Culture A and other cultures), then it is used to compare Cultures B and C. As a result, the used method might measure something that is relevant only for some of the compared cultures or that is not meaningful for such a cultural comparison at all – Cultures B and C might look similar when the construct is meaningful for the description of differences between Cultures A and D is used. Second, the groups that are not represented in academia in the countries in question (often indigenous groups in these countries) are often omitted from research. Researchers from some countries might be motivated to not mention such groups in their published research. Third, researchers often generalize the developed constructs and results to larger groups about which they actually have knowledge and understanding about. The chauvinist idea that one's own culture is representative for geographically close cultures might be behind this behavior, just as the pragmatic idea that research that states its results to be valid for a larger group of people has a larger chance to be published. And, fourth, the constructs and methods developed by these types of research are published in psychological journals, which ignore these issues.

Before preparing cultural–comparative research it is recommended to get good knowledge about the cultures in question and use this knowledge to judge the meaningfulness of the constructs used in the psychological research. If there are no meaningful constructs for

---

[2] The English abstract is longer than the Czech version because it was a requirement of the journal.

the description of the differences between the cultures in question, it is better to develop a new construct.

Keywords:

cultural comparison in psychology, measuring, social dimension of research

Introduction

The journal *Československá psychologie* (Czechoslovak Psychology) printed a suggestion that Czech psychologists should publish more research that contains cross-cultural comparisons (Klicperová–Baker, 2012). Because the amount of cross-cultural research in the Czech Republic might increase, it is good to review some issues that are important to consider during the preparation of cross-cultural research and that are not explicitly covered in Czech publications about cross-cultural psychology (for example Průcha, 2003). In order to fulfill this goal, I will show two main sources for the low quality of cross-cultural psychological research. First, an insufficient evaluation of what is measured/researched (this is typical for psychology – see Machado & Silva, 2007). And, second, an insufficient evaluation of who is measured/researched and who is conducting this measurement/research.

What is measured and how

The terminology and measurement of the terms used in cross-cultural psychology could often be illustrated by searching for the difference between two substances, about which we will not have any information on how they might differ. We could have thermometer, so we would use the thermometer to look for a difference. Then, if we find the difference in

temperature, we would say these substances are distinguishable from each other by temperature and we will start to you use a thermometer to compare different substances. However, if one substance is water and the other is similar-looking liquid nitrogen (being transferred to fluid state before the measurement so that substances look equivalent), we will never find that these substances differ in ways other than their chemical element. Such an approach is used in many cross-cultural research projects, because translating and using a method is easier than considering what might differentiate the cultures. Cultural differences found by such methods correspond to some real differences. However, these differences do not necessarily need to be substantial or meaningful.

The problem is often that the method used for comparison was developed for Cultural Environment A (or to compare this environment with another environment) and this method is adapted (usually translated) to make a comparison between Environment B and Environment C. Even the best thermometer developed for measuring the air temperature would not be a good tool to measure the substantial differences between water and nitrogen, because temperature is not good construct for this purpose. Similarly, even the best psychometric method developed in one cultural environment or environments is not a good instrument for the description of substantial differences between two other cultural environments (and the construct measured by this method does not need to be good for this purpose). This often-used approach leads to the situation where comparative psychological research is often not able to catch the differences between Cultural Environments B and C, or it says that these cultures differ by something that looks irrelevant, even for a layperson with experience in both cultural environments. It should be stressed that cross-cultural psychological research based on psychometric methods should begin with the evaluation of the phenomenon that is present in both cultures, the formulation of the construct as created on the basis of the knowledge of this phenomenon, and finally the development of a method for the measurement of this construct. It would be folly to use this psychometric method, which might have perfect quality but was developed for another culture and another purpose, and expect that the construct measured by this method might reveal anything meaningful about differences between the involved cultures.

There is probably no construct that would be suitable for the comparison of all cultures. The comparison might give meaningful information only in cases where the phenomenon on which the construct was created in the original culture is substantial in the compared cultures (or at least one of them). The dichotomy of individualism-collectivism

might serve as an example of the construct, which might give no meaningful information about cultural differences when comparing certain cultures. This construct was created based on the questionnaires filled out by IBM employees in 40 countries (Hofstede, 1980). They were asked about issues related to their work life. However, it was created from the point of view of one concrete cultural environment – the environment of the American company (A). When used for the comparison of Cultural Environments B and C, it might provide no meaningful information about them. This was shown by Oyserman, Coon, and Kemmelmeier (2002), who pointed out that various Asian cultures were found to be collectivistic in comparison with North American cultures based on the items that were included in the collectivism scale used in the research – and there were different items in each culture (see more thorough discussion in Linkov, 2013). This construct is, therefore, not meaningful for a comparison of Asian cultures. It would be more meaningful to use several different constructs created from items that are answered differently in different cultures and, therefore, have the potential to reveal information about the differences between these cultures (i.e., the individualism-collectivism dichotomy is based on the observed phenomenon that people relate themselves either to a group with one or a group with more people; of similar importance might be the dichotomy based on the phenomenon that people relate themselves either to a group with a small number of people or a group with a large number of people – and if the items in the IBM questionnaires were created and analyzed from the point of view that such a dichotomy was important, the resulting construct would have probably had a different name and would be able to tell something meaningful about the differences between the different cultures than about the cultures for which the construct was created based on the IBM questionnaires).

When conducting cross-cultural comparisons, it is better to start from a construct that is created or borrowed based on the understanding that it can tell something meaningful about one of the compared cultures (however, this does not guarantee that it can provide meaningful information about both/all compared cultures). It is necessary to start from some phenomenon that exists in one or both/all of the compared cultures, and construct a method that would allow for the comparison of its existence in other cultures. An example of such an approach is the research conducted by Tafarodi et al. (2009). The authors started with the Chinese tendency to ignore people with whom they have no social ties. The authors created a method where they first allowed the investigated person to order 10 universal values according to their importance. Then they showed the person two other orders – one was the same as this

97

person just had provided, and the other was exactly the opposite. They told the person that these orders were created by two other people and asked them to choose with whom they wanted to live. After that, the examined person was told that they should learn more about the selected person. They showed the examined person three sets of answers from a verbal "association test" – the first set was allegedly from the selected person, the second was from the non-selected person, and the third was from someone different. Finally, they tested how many words from these three sets the examined person was able to recall. This method was used in China, Japan, and Canada. There was no difference in the information recall about the selected person between these three cultures. However, there was difference in the recall of information about the two other people: The Japanese recalled more than the Canadians and the Canadians more than the Chinese.

It is necessary to note that the problem, whether a construct that describes or a method the measures, has something substantial for comparison between the two cultures that does not need to be connected to whether the method or construct is suitable for usage in both cultures or cultures other than those for which it was developed (in other words, with the emic-etic debate in psychology). In the thermometer example at the beginning of this section, the thermometer is certainly a good tool for getting substantial information about water and nitrogen, because temperature is a construct that is able to describe something meaningful about both. However, that does not mean that the thermometer is suitable for realizing something substantial about the *difference* between water and nitrogen (i.e., water and nitrogen differ in more substantial ways). Measuring the difference between two cultures is something different than measurements conducted in each of the cultures. When assessing the meaningfulness of the method for comparison, it is necessary to consider whether it is suitable for this comparison, not only whether it is suitable for measuring both or all of the considered cultures. The problem about whether a method measures something important or meaningful, therefore, is not related to the requirement of measurement invariance in the different cultures (i.e., to measure the same construct in all cultures – see Cheung, de Vijver, & Leong, 2011, s. 594). The fact that the method measures the same construct in all cultures does not mean that it is meaningful for comparison of these cultures. The method invariance requirement is useful only in cases where the method is able to reveal some meaningful differences between the objects of investigation, in this case, cultures. Even the most correct application of statistical methods does not guarantee that the result will be meaningful (this is guaranteed

only by understanding the object of investigation, which allows the researcher to analyze more than just the surface level):

> "Note that if you factor analyzed the surface descriptions of objects, you would never get anything like an atomic chart. You would get factors such as color, density, and texture, which might be useful for some purposes but would hardly provide a satisfactory scientific system." (Epstein, 2010:38)

Who is measured and by whom

Who is presented as a representative for a culture in some research often depends on who works at the universities in that country. For example, the Malaysian government tries to make Malays from the non-Malay indigenous population in the Sabah province. A researcher from a Malaysian university might present the population of Malaysia as composed from Malays and descendants of Chinese and Indian immigrants, with indigenous non-Malay people omitted. A similar situation exists in many countries and it is not necessarily connected to the amount of political freedom in the country or its positive image in the media. Certain groups of people (often indigenous tribes predestined by government to be assimilated and cease to exist) are not represented in the population by researchers at universities. Researchers of other ethnicities might be not motivated to study them.

Research quality is influenced by who cooperates. In the previous paragraph, I described a situation where the culture of people who hold power at a university (or research environment) and who collaborate in international research is the one that is selected as the culture to be researched. Another situation might arise (in my opinion quite often) where a person who is raised in some culture tries to be considered as a person with knowledge of other cultures that are geographically close to their actual home culture (or which are similarly classified according to some psychometric method) even if they do not have experience with these other cultures. For example, a Chinese psychologist who has never been to other areas of East Asia and who does not understand their languages, might claim that they understand the Asian environment and suggest hypotheses and methods with regards to alleged Asian characteristics. Such an approach is consistent with chauvinism that considers China to be an archetype of other Asian cultures – "Chinacentrism" (Kim, 2009) – which is

sometimes present in the Chinese academic environment (many examples could be found in Zadrapa & Pejčochová, 2009). The reason one's own culture is presented as representative of a larger group or community might not only be chauvinist or political, but also pragmatic in order to present a larger generalizability to attract more publicity.

Who is represented in the research team might influence the team's ability to recognize whether some construct is or is not suitable for cross-cultural comparison. It is common to employ people with only certain cross-cultural experiences at departments of psychology in some countries (e.g., almost all of the professors at the Department of Psychology of Seoul National University have degrees from the United States). A Korean researcher who returns home after a long time spent in the US might accept the "Asian American" identity and perceive cultures as having the same "Asian" label and being similar to each other without actually having personal experience with those cultures (Linkov, 2014). If researchers who share the American cross-cultural experience cooperate in research that compares two Asian cultures, they might have acquired the same „home–field disadvantage" (Medin, Bennis, & Chandler, 2010) of perceiving the world from the American point of view. This might lead to the selection of a construct that is not meaningful for the comparison of Asian cultures, because no one on the research team has experience with both compared cultures — such experience would allow them to realize that such a construct is not suitable for the description of the differences between both cultures.

What a psychologist preparing cross-cultural research should consider

Psychologists who prepare cross-cultural research should realize the following: 1. The terms and methods that they consider to base their research on could originally have been developed without analyzing whether they are able to say something substantial about the differences between the populations, which would be compared in the prepared research (and the authors of previous publications employing this construct would not have mentioned this). 2. Published studies might contain ethically challengeable parts with regards to whom (which groups) they refer (and their authors might not be interested to share information with a Czech

researcher). 3. The authors of published studies might not have the knowledge and experience to allow them to assess whether the terms, constructs, and hypotheses they use, or the results they publish, are suitable for the populations for which they aim to generalize the results (and they might not be interested to make this admission).

When planning cross-cultural psychological research, it is necessary to realize that the majority of psychological journals that publish such research (e.g., Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology) publish only quantitative empirical articles and meta-analyses and they do not bother about the critical evaluation of the used concepts (see Linkov, 2013). In principle, the only option to realize the problems that are described above and to prepare good quality research is a solid understanding of the cultures in question. A psychologist who is preparing cross-cultural research should spend enough time (years, if possible) to familiarize themself with the cultures of country/countries (or group/groups) in which they want to conduct their research. An alternative might be cooperation with scholars from departments that specialize in these cultures (recommended in Linkov, 2013). Information that allows the assessment of the quality of published cross-cultural psychology articles might be found in journals that are interested in the analyses of what is being researched (e.g., Culture & Psychology, although it does not publish analyses of quantitative concepts) or it is possible to search the internet. It is important to point out that psychologists who plan cross-cultural research might justify their approach by "collective responsibility" and legitimize their insufficient understanding of the themes in question by references to foreign colleagues or "guaranteed" methods. Nevertheless, this might not guarantee good quality research. Psychologists preparing cross-cultural research should realize this. If they do this, the ethically and methodologically controversial parts of research would not result from ignorance, but rather from the conscious decision of the researcher.

Conclusion

I noted the main obstacles that prevent psychologists from the creation of good cross-cultural comparative research. The common denominator for all of the mentioned problems is that the research is conducted by psychologists without sufficient knowledge of both (all) of

the compared cultures, who use a psychometric method without thoroughly contemplating its suitability. When considering whether a method is suitable for the comparison of their cultures of interest, they might rely on foreign colleagues with whom they cooperate (but who might know nothing about cultures other than their own and rely on cooperating colleagues). Subsequently, terms and "results" created in this way are accepted without (real) critical analysis.

Understanding the differences between cultures is tacit knowledge that cannot be gained by reading about the differences between the results obtained by different psychometric methods (Hwang, 2003). It is necessary to first understand both/all of the cultures which are compared (e.g., with the help of people who already have tacit knowledge about these differences) – and, after that, select or create a meaningful method for the research. Cultures might appear as "close" to each other in a psychological article only because the methods for their measurement were created based on insufficient knowledge about other cultures or about the differences of the cultures other than those which are assessed in that specific article. When hesitating about the planned research, considerations should be made that the existing constructs, the methods used in the research, and the published results are really meaningful for that specific cultural context, or whether the differences between the cultures described as similar are based on existing constructs that might not be described better when using new constructs that were created using a more thorough understanding of the cultural environments in question.

I hope this text might help Czech psychologists who plan cross-cultural research and cooperation such that they will more often think about what will be researched and with whom they will cooperate so that they will create work that may be less in quantity but higher in quality.

References

Cheung, F. M., van den Vijver, F. J. R., & Leong, F. T. L. (2011). Toward a new approach to the study of personality in culture. *American Psychologist*, 66, 593–603.

Epstein, S. (2010). The big five model: Grandiose ideas about surface traits as the foundation of a general theory of personality. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21, 34–39.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work–related values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hwang, K. K. (2003). In search of a new paradigm for cultural psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 287–291.

Kim, M.S. (2009). Cultural bias in communication science: challenges of overcoming ethnocentric paradigms in Asia. *Asian Journal of Communication,* 19, 412–421.

Klicperová–Baker, M. (2012). 21. kongres mezinárodní asociace pro kroskulturní psychologii (IACCP) [21st congress of the International Association for Cross-Cultural Psychology]. *Československá psychologie*, 56, 608–609.

Linkov, V. (2013). Comparative psychological research in East Asia: An opportunity for East Asian studies scholars. *Vienna Journal of East Asian Studies*, 4(1), 51–65.

Linkov, V. (2014). Tokenism in psychology: Standing on the shoulders of small boys. *Integrative Psychological and Behavioral Science*, 48(2), 143–160.

Machado, A., & Silva, F. J. (2007). Toward a richer view of the scientific method. The role of conceptual analysis. *American Psychologist*, 62, 671–681.

Medin, D., Bennis, W., & Chandler, M. (2010). Culture and the Home–Field Disadvantage. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 708–713.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking Individualism and Collectivism: Evaluation of Theoretical Assumptions and Meta–Analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 3–72.

Průcha, J. (2003). Interkulturní psychologie: Relevantní informační zdroje a témata výzkumu [Cross-Cultural Psychology: Relevant sources of information and themes of research]. *Československá psychologie*, 47, 573–586.

Tafarodi, R., W., Shaughnessy, S., C., Lee, W., W., S., Leung, D., Y., P., Ozaki, Y., Morio, H., & Yamaguchi, S. (2009). Disregard for Outsiders: A Cultural Comparison. *Journal of Cross–Cultural Psychology*, 40, 567–583.

Zádrapa, L., & Pejčochová, M. (2009). *Čínské písmo [Chinese script].* Praha, Academia.

Korejská domorodá psychologie: Přehled některých pojmů

Václav Linkov, Centrum dopravního výzkumu, v.v.i., Brno, vaclav.linkov@hotmail.com

Abstract:
Article reviews some terms used in Korean indigenous psychology. First are described indigenous psychologies and their goals. Then are described Korean terms jeong, woori, han, hwabyung, shimcheong, noonchi a chemyon. Indigenous psychology is psychology adapted into specific cultural environment. Such psychologies evolved as reaction to American psychology since 1960s. Indigenous psychologies aim to create specific psychology for every society with specific population. It is assumed that after this is accomplished a more just global psychology will be created. When indigenous psychology studies local environment, it may adapt two strategies. It might either study local specifics of phenomena studied by global psychology, or it might study local phenomena only. In Korea, the latter approach was employed by Sang-Chin Choi and his colleagues. They studied following phenomena: Jeong is feeling of attachment to other people. Person feeling jeong to other person is emphatic to him or her, interested in the other's feelings and tries to support the other. It is independent of likeability of the other person. Woori is feeling of we-ness, whose members do not distinguish between self and others. People in a woori collective are connected by jeong. The strong jeong is the strong is feeling of we-ness. This feeling is created by continuous showing of interest in other in form of giving favors to him or her. Han is feeling of accumulated suppressed anger. Korean society doesn't tolerate people to show their anger, because it might harm relationships with others. So they accumulate this feeling in their heart and try to relieve it by various activities. If relief is not successful, han might evolve into hwabyung. Hwabyung is indigenous Korean psychiatric syndrome. Person with hwabyung is angry and feel that society is unjust. This feeling evolves when person is repeatedly exposed to unfair situations, where he or she cannot get better treatment because of society restraints which don't allow to show anger explicitly. Person feels hatred, depression and guilt. Hwabyung syndrome involves insomnia, anorexia, problems with breath, dry mouth and similar symptoms. Hwabyung is a way how person can justify being relieved from social roles in Korean society. Shimcheong is affect which comes when other person in woori collective shows jeong to insufficient (or over-sufficient) extent. If person does something, which harms the other, it shows that he or she might not feel jeong towards this other person. The second person might have their shimcheong activated. In the state of shimcheong person analyzes all previous interactions with person who have shown insufficient jeong. He or she also analyzes future expectations from the relationship with the other person. The analysis of the relationship finally results in its confirmation, change or termination. Noonchi is a state, when person carefully watches other people. The person can assess appropriately real feelings and wishes of the other person regardless of what the other person actually says or does. Noonchi helps to maintain social harmony. Person might behave according to social conventions even if he or she wishes otherwise, but because of the other people's noonchi he or she might receive the feedback he or she desires. Chemyon (social face) is how person presents himself or herself towards other people. To save one's face means to satisfy expectations of other people in certain situation. For Koreans it is important to actively maintain one's face by showing signs connected with social status. High social status is viewed as connected with high moral qualities, so people with high social status have to maintain saving their faces to a greater extent. Korean indigenous psychology might be considered weaker in comparison with other indigenous psychologies, nevertheless it made very good job in conceptualization of some aspects of Korean behaviour.

V tomto článku budou popsány některé pojmy korejské domorodé psychologie (indigenous psychology). České publikace o interkulturní psychologii (Průcha, 2010; Čeněk, Smolík a Vykoukalová, 2016) pojmy a koncepty studované domorodými psychologiemi obsahují pouze okrajově nebo vůbec. Tento článek si klade za cíl tento dluh částečně – co se týče korejské domorodé psychologie – napravit. V textu se nejprve dotknu domorodé psychologie (DP) obecně a poté se budu věnovat popisu vybraných pojmů korejské DP: jeong, woori, han, hwabyung, shimcheong, noonchi a chemyon. Tyto pojmy uvádím v anglické transkripci používané citovanými autory,[1] při popisu daného pojmu uvádím v závorce původní korejské slovo a českou transkripci, pokud se liší od anglické.

Domorodá psychologie

Domorodá psychologie je *„psychologie, která byla částečně vypůjčena ze Západu a poté transformována na psychologii přizpůsobenou potřebám určité kultury/země“* (Jahoda, 2016, 172). Domorodé psychologie začaly vznikat v sedmdesátých letech na Filipínách a na Taiwanu odkud se pak šířily do dalších zemí (Jahoda, 2016). Východoasijské domorodé psychologie se vyvíjely jako reakce na psychologii americkou. Jejich zakladatelé měli vzdělání a zahraniční kulturní zkušenost především z USA a dalších anglicky mluvících zemí, zavádění západní psychologie ve svých zemích ovšem považovali za akademický a kulturní kolonialismus (Hwang, 2005). Proto je v jejich publikacích obsažen okcidentalistický pohled na „západní“ kultury. Zakladatel DP na Taiwanu Kuo-Shu Yang (2012) považuje za první DP evropskou psychologii v 19. století, přičemž Evropu, případně euroamerickou civilizaci, chápe jako jednu kulturní entitu. Tato DP byla spolu s psychologiemi anglicky mluvících zemí exportována do nezápadních zemí, v nichž začala být praktikována psychology, kteří často vystudovali na západě (v případě východoasijských zemí zejména v Americe). Tito psychologové jsou limitováni tím, že svým výzkumem navazují na „západní“ psychologii, takže již nemohou vytvořit nezávislou DP. Yang proto jimi vytvářené psychologie nazývá zdomorodněné (indigenized). Tyto psychologie jsou postaveny na co největší nezávislosti svého poznání na cizích psychologiích a jejich pojmech a kompatibilitě nově vytvářené psychologie s místním prostředím. Podobně jako Jahoda (2016) nebudu dále rozlišovat mezi pojmy domorodá a zdomorodněná psychologie.

Cílem domorodých psychologií je podle Yanga (2000) *„vytvořit zvláštní domorodou psychologii pro každou společnost s danou populací nebo odlišnou kulturou. Poté bude možné vzít tento specifický systém znalostí a výsledky s ním spojeného výzkumu a použít je k vytvoření domorodých psychologií čím dál větších populací definovaných s pomocí regionálních, národních, etnických, lingvistických a zeměpisných souvislostí. Nakonec bude integrací domorodých psychologií na nižších úrovních vytvořena nejvyšší domorodá psychologie, univerzální, nebo přesněji řečeno globální, psychologie pro všechny lidské bytosti na zemi.“* (s. 246)

Jak konstatuje Jahoda (2016), tento cíl se domorodým psychologiím nedaří plnit. Z těch, které analyzoval, nemůže být žádná *„označena jako domorodá psychologie ve smyslu koherentního systému znalostí“* (s. 172). Domorodé psychologie vytvořily pouze teorie pro specifické fenomény existující v příslušných kulturách. Jednou z těchto psychologií je korejská DP, jíž zkoumané některé fenomény budou popsány dále v textu.

---

[1] Používané romanizace korejštiny se v průběhu posledních desetiletí měnily. Pokud je používáno více verzí, uvádím tu, která je použita v článcích, ze kterých čerpám.

DP může být vytvářena dvěma způsoby: buďto jako empirické zkoumání domorodých konceptů, které jsou specifické v dané kultuře, nebo jako zkoumání fenoménů a konceptů vyskytujících se v globální psychologii a hledání jejich místních specifik (Kim, Park, Park, 1999). V tomto textu je zahrnut první typ korejské DP, která se snaží o popis domorodých konceptů, DP zkoumající globálně se vyskytující fenomény zde zahrnuta není. Korejská DP je oproti jiným asijským zemím slabší. „Kolonizace" korejského akademického prostředí je silnější, na prestižních korejských univerzitách učí a dělají výzkum téměř jenom lidé vystudovaní v USA. To přispívá k tomu, že se zde výzkumníci více orientují na koncepty vyskytující se v globální psychologii.

Korejskou DP založenou na místních konceptech se pokusil vytvořit Sang-Chin Choi (1940 – 2011), který ji kromě řady článků shrnul v posmrtně vydané knize *Psychologie Korejců* (Choi, 2011). Na něj navazují někteří jeho žáci. Svůj přístup k psychologickému výzkumu týkající se kultur a jejich porovnávání – tzv. *„komparativní kulturní psychologii"* – popisují Choi a Han (2000). Odmítají přístup interkulturní psychologie (cross-cultural psychology), která psychologické fenomény fragmentuje na z kontextu vytržené konstrukty, které pak porovnává v navzájem obtížně porovnatelných kulturních prostředích. Takový přístup považují za porovnávání jablek s pomeranči. Místo toho by se každý výzkumník měl nejprve snažit rozumět vlastní kultuře a na základě zde se vyskytujících fenoménů vytvořit vlastní koncepty. Koncepty, které jsou v korejské psychologii podobné konceptům v japonské a čínské psychologii, by měly porovnány nejprve s nimi. Teprve na základě takového porovnání vzniklý širší koncept může být porovnáván s případnými souvisejícími koncepty západní psychologie (Choi a Han, 2000). V souladu s tímto programem se Choi se spoluautory snažil popisovat psychologické fenomény vyskytující se v korejské kultuře. Některé koncepty, které popsal, jsou shrnuty v následujícím přehledu.

Pojmy korejské domorodé psychologie

Jeong

Jeong (정, čong, rovněž používána romanizace cheong) je pocit připoutání k dalším lidem. Tento pocit je tím, co vytváří woori. Ve stavu jeong je člověk vůči druhému empatický, zajímá se o něj, podporuje ho a pomáhá mu (Choi, Han, 2008). Jeong se vyznačuje pocitem mizejících hranic mezi já a dalšími lidmi. Člověk sám cítí emoce druhého člověka. Jeong existuje bez ohledu na to, zda druhého má rád nebo ne a zda má ze vztahu prospěch (Yang, 2006).

Woori

Woori (우리, uri), doslovně „my", je skupina, v níž jednotlivci neoddělují sebe a ostatní. Její členové jsou navzájem spojeni pomocí pocitu jeong. Woori se vyznačuje bezpodmínečným přátelstvím, altruismem, vzájemným připoutáním a upřednostňováním jeho členů oproti ostatním. Čím silnější je jeong, tím silnější je pocit „my" (Yang, 2006). Pocit woori a vzájemné důvěry se vytváří vzájemnými opakovanými projevy zájmu a péče (마음, maum). Slova a dárky zde nejsou důležité tím, že byly darovány, ale tím, že vyjadřují péči o druhého. Protože je těžké odhadnout, jaký projev péče bude považován za dostatečný, Korejci často vybírají drahé dárky nebo druhému věnují celý den, aby jej někam dovezli autem. Zájem pečovat o druhého je nejvíce vidět, pokud péče vyžaduje hodně času, peněz a dalších zdrojů. Výměnou projevů péče se po čase vytvoří citová vazba jeong (Han, Choi, 2011).

Han

Han (한) je stav potlačeného a nahromaděného vzteku – směs patosu, smutku a pocitů ztráty a nespravedlnosti. První reakcí na událost je vztek a touha po odplatě. Tento vztek je ale vzhledem ke korejské tendenci nenarušovat vztahy projevy emocí nutno potlačit. Nastupuje tedy fáze smutku a bezmoci. Ta přejde v přemýšlení o tom, proč daná situace nastala. Nakonec člověk han vstřebá a je schopen o něm mluvit. Nahromaděný vztek je třeba uvolnit, což se často děje pomocí různých kreativních činností (Jeong, 2015:4). Pocit han je možno uvolnit také mluvením, příjemnými aktivitami, případně dlouhodobě tím, že se dostaví nějaký úspěch. Např. matka, která byla v manželově rodině trvale ponižována, uvolní han nashromážděný během svého života tím, že její dítě má úspěšnou kariéru. Han je možno uvolnit také usilovnou prací. Han pociťovaný Korejci kvůli historickému utlačování korejského národa je považován za jednu z příčin tvrdé práce vedoucí ke korejskému ekonomickému úspěchu (Min, 2009). Pocit potlačeného vzteku může přerůst v typicky korejský syndrom – hwabyung.

Hwabyung

Hwabyung (화병, hwabjong) je patologická forma pocitu han. Hwabyung znamená nemoc ze vzteku (doslova „ohnivá nemoc"). Pacienti mají pocit vzteku a toho, že je nespravedlivá společnost nenechá dělat, co by chtěli, a nejsou schopni tento problém překonat. Tento pocit vzniká po opakujícím vystavení nespravedlivým sociálním situacím, jako např. při dlouhodobých rodinných konfliktech. Jedinec si myslí, že je cílem trvalé agrese ze strany společnosti a ostatních. Svůj vztek ale nesmí dát najevo a dlouhodobě jej potlačuje, takže se v něm kumuluje. To v něm vyvolává nenávist a pocity viny, úzkosti a deprese. V chování se hwabyung projevuje pláčem, vzdycháním, upovídaností a nucením otevírat dveře a utíkat z uzavřených situací. Postižení mají pocit tepla a vyhýbají se teplým místům, pocit bušení srdce, problémů s dýcháním, tlaku na hrudi a sucha v ústech. Trpí nespavostí a anorexií. Pacienti neustále mluví o tom, jak trpí, přičemž slzí a vzdychají. Hwabyung je způsobem, jak lidé dávají najevo, že trpí, a umožňuje jim získat důvod pro vyvázání se ze svých sociálních rolí. Jde o chronickou nemoc. V roce 1990 mělo hwabyung přes 4% Korejců na venkově (Min, 2009).

Shimcheong

Shimcheong (심정, šimčong) je stav afektu, který nastane, pokud ostatní lidé projeví jeong neadekvátně: buďto méně, než by měli, nebo naopak více. Pokud jej projeví méně a ukazují tak, že jim na člověku nezáleží, je tím zpochybněna jejich důvěryhodnost a jedinec se musí zamyslet nad tím, proč se tak stalo a zda člověku, který neprojevil jeong, dále důvěřovat (Choi, Han, 2008). Choi a Kim (2006) ilustrují shimcheong následovně:

„Na olympiádě v Soulu 88 korejský závodník reagoval na neférové rozhodnutí tak, že po vyhlášení výsledku odmítl odejít z ringu. To způsobilo zdržení ve zbývajícím programu dne. Většina západních médií kritizovala jeho chování jako nesprávné. Korejci naopak vyjadřovali soucit s boxerem. Titulky korejských novin byly následující: 'Nefér rozhodnutí donutilo korejského boxera sedět na zemi', 'Boxerovo chování je pochopitelné' nebo 'Korejci sdílí boxerův shimcheong'" (s. 359)

Shimcheong se projevuje ve vztazích, kde alespoň jeden člověk daný vztah chápe jako woori. Vztahy s neznámými lidmi jsou postaveny na racionalitě a jeong od ostatních se v nich neočekává (Choi, Han, 2008). Ve vztahu, který je oběma (či více) účastníky chápán jako woori, se očekává, že tito účastníci budou brát ohled na potřeby ostatních jakožto projev jeong. Pokud tak neučiní a udělají něco, co člověka ve woori poškodí, aktivuje to u tohoto člověka

shimcheong. V tomto stavu afektu analyzuje všechny minulé a současné interakce a budoucí očekávání od vztahu s druhým, který neprojevil jeong. Afekt shimcheong se po nějakém čase uklidní a jeho výsledkem je potvrzení, přehodnocení nebo ukončení vztahu. Úroveň vztahu variuje na škále mezi úplnou vzájemností woori a vztahem neznámých lidí, shimcheong může vést ke změně této úrovně. Osoba, kvůli které shimcheong nastal, o tom vůbec nemusí vědět – nemusí svoji (ne)aktivitu považovat za důležitou nebo daný vztah nemusí považovat za woori. Shimcheong může být i pozitivní, pokud osoba ve vztahu woori udělá pro druhého více, než očekával.

Při shimcheongu vyvolaném negativní událostí člověk místo pocitu bezpečí ve vztahu začne cítit pocit odcizení a zrazenosti. Vyhodnocuje, zda je tento pocit oprávněný, k čemuž používá kulturně dané vzorce toho, co je ve vztazích s danou úrovní vzájemnosti dovoleno a co ne. Partner, který vidí, že u druhého vyvolal shimcheong, může situaci vylepšit tím, že se sám zamyslí, čím shimcheong vyvolal. Shimcheong tak slouží k tzv. shimcheong dialogu – sdělování svých úmyslů mezi partnery. V tomto dialogu může člověk, který u druhého vyvolal shimcheong, udělat něco, co druhého uklidní. Tím mu zároveň sděluje, že daný vztah má pro něj hodnotu (Choi, Han, Kim, 2007).

Shimcheong je náhlé uvědomění si já ve vzájemném vztahu a vyhodnocení hodnoty já v tomto vztahu. Korejci ve vztahu woori nehodnotí chování samo o sobě, ale motivaci, která k tomuto chování vedla. Hodnocení smýšlení a motivace druhého člověka ve vztahu je obtížné, takže se člověk často zmýlí – shimcheong slouží k tomu, aby svůj omyl vyhodnotil a napravil (Choi, Han, 2008). Od empatie se shimcheong liší tím, že je vyvolán nesplněním vlastního očekávání, nikoliv potřebou druhého, a že je možný pouze v blízkém vztahu obsahujícím jeong (Han, Choi, 2008).

Negativní vyhodnocení vztahu v rámci shimcheongu vede často k sebelítosti. Korejci vyjadřují lidem ve stavu shimcheong podporu a účast (Choi, Han, 2008). Při zničení vztahu na bázi woori po skončení shimcheongu je pocit jeong nahrazen pocitem han, tedy pocitem lítosti, vzteku a opuštěnosti. Lidi, kteří cítí han, může tato společná zkušenost sblížit, takže vzniká nové woori obsahující jeong. Pocity jeong a han jsou takto svázány cyklickou kauzalitou (Choi, Kim, 1998).

Noonchi

Noonchi (눈치, nunčchi) je stav, kdy člověk pozorně sleduje ostatní lidi. Pokud má někdo noonchi, znamená to být schopen číst mysl druhých lidí a správně reagovat. Dokáže odhadnout jejich náladu, sociální situaci a nesoustředí se při tom na to, co je řečeno, ale „čte mezi řádky". To mu umožňuje uspokojit jejich nevyřčená přání. Noonchi slouží k udržení sociální harmonie a pomáhá předcházet konfliktům. Korejci na noonchi druhých spoléhají. Někdo tak může říci „ano", znamená to ovšem „ne" a záleží na noonchi druhé osoby, aby si situaci správně vyložila. Osoba mající správnou úroveň noonchi dokáže rychle a správně řešit společenské situace, pokud má ale noonchi moc, neustále se zabývá sledováním, co od ní očekávají ostatní lidé. Neustálé sledování ostatních může přerůst v trvalou úzkost a obavy z nenaplnění jejich očekávání. To pak u některých lidí vede k sociální fobii a paranoie. Pokud lidé naopak noonchi nemají, jsou společností vnímáni jako nedospělí a necitliví (Jeong, 2015, 8). Noonchi pomáhá řešit sociální situace tak, aby zůstala zachována tvář všech zúčastněných. Je možné žádost druhého neodmítnout a přitom ji nesplnit.

Chemyon

Chemyon (체면, čchemjon) – sociální tvář – je to, jak se člověk prezentuje ostatním i sobě samému. Zachovat si tvář znamená vyhovět očekáváním druhých lidí v dané situaci. Snaha o zachování tváře vychází z konfuciánské doktríny přiměřeného chování, přičemž lidé by měli cítit stud, pokud se přiměřeně nechovají. Stud vyvolaný ztrátou tváře může vzniknout dvěma způsoby – buď to, že si člověk svou nedostatečnost sám uvědomí, nebo si ji uvědomí díky nesouhlasné reakci jiných lidí. Chemyon tak vyjadřuje dvě lidské potřeby: potřebu pozitivního sebehodnocení a potřebu být akceptován ostatními. V tradiční společnosti byla ztráta tváře vzniklá uvědoměním si vlastního selhání považována za horší, v současnosti je ale za horší považována ztráta tváře vzniklá díky reakci jiných lidí (Choi, Kim, 2004). Chování sloužící k zachování tváře měří škála, kterou sestavili Choi a Lee (2002).

Pro Korejce je pro udržení tváře důležité aktivně ukazovat ostatním znaky toho, že mají schopnosti a další znaky spojené s jejich místem ve společnosti a daným statusem (Choi, Kim, 2004). Kvůli tomu se mohou snažit získat stejné symboly statusu, jako značkové oblečení, auta nebo plastické operace. Některé znaky statusu přitom mohou cizincům připadat podivné. Na konci devatenáctého století se Evropané a Američané divili, proč korejská šlechta používá dýmky, které byly tak dlouhé, že si je šlechtic nedokázal zapálit sám. Důvodem bylo, že takto musel zaměstnat dalšího člověka na zapalování dýmky, což si každý nemohl dovolit a šlechtic takto ukazoval svůj status: čím delší dýmka, tím vyšší postavení (Neff, Cheong, 2009, 231-233).

Tvář hraje roli především v interakci s lidmi, s nimiž není člověk v blízkém vztahu. Ztráta tváře může nastat například při neúspěchu u zkoušky, v soutěži nebo v zaměstnání, ukázáním vlastní slabosti, porušením morálních pravidel nebo nesplněním povinnosti. Protože vysoký sociální status je v korejské společnosti spojován s vysokými morálními kvalitami, musí vysoce postavení lidé dbát o zachování své tváře více. Pokud by vysokým požadavkům nevyhověli, byli by okolím považováni za nevhodné pro svou pozici. Proto jejich tvář brání i níže postavení lidé. Korejci mohou o výše postaveném člověku mluvit pozitivně, aby zachovali jeho tvář, i když jinak mají zcela opačný názor (Choi, Kim, 2004).

Koncept tváře existuje i v čínské a japonské kultuře. Choi a Kim (2004) poznamenávají, že neexistuje komparativní výzkum, který by tyto koncepty porovnával. Domívají se ale, že japonský koncept je orientovaný více defenzivně, kdežto korejský více na aktivní předvádění svých schopností a statusu.

Závěr

V tomto textu jsem popsal pojmy korejské DP tak, jak byly prozkoumány Sang-Chin Choiem a dalšími korejskými výzkumníky. Nesnažil jsem se přitom o úplnost a vycházel jsem hlavně ze zdrojů dostupných v angličtině. Uvedené pojmy se vesměs týkají specifických fenoménů v korejské společnosti. Stav psychologického výzkumu korejské společnosti se dá ilustrovat následující anekdotou: První korejská výzkumnice, které jsem se zeptal na to, kdo se v Koreji zabývá domorodými fenomény, mi odpověděla, že tím se zabýval Sang-Chin Choi, ale ten již zemřel. Tak špatné to ovšem není – na Světovém psychologickém kongresu v Jokohamě se korejské (a dalším asijským) DP věnovalo sympózium, kde vystoupili Taekyun Hur, Min Han a Gyuseog Han. Dá se tedy očekávat, že se dočkáme dopracování dalších konceptů do takové kvality, že budou popsány v publikacích orientovaných na mezinárodní veřejnost.

Literatura:

Čeněk, J., Smolík, J., & Vykoukalová, Z. (2016). *Interkulturní psychologie. Vybrané kapitoly.* Praha: Grada.

Han, G., & Choi, S.-Ch. (2008). Shimcheong is a case for the first person psychology: A reply. *International Journal for Dialogical Science,* 3, 255-260.

Han, G., & Choi, S.-Ch. (2011). Trust working in interpersonal relationships: A comparative cultural perspective with a focus on East Asian culture. *Comparative Sociology,* 10, 380-412.

Hwang, K.-K. (2005). From anticolonialism to postcolonialism: The emergence of Chinese indigenous psychology in Taiwan. *International Journal of Psychology,* 40, 228-238.

Choi, S.-Ch. (2011). *Hangugin ui šimrihak [Psychologie Korejců].* Soul: Hakjisa.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Han, G. (2000). Munhwašimrihakčok jonkubangpoplon [Metodologie kulturní psychologie]. *Korean Journal of Social and Personality Psychology,* 14, 123-144.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Han, G. (2008). Shimcheong psychology: A case of an emotional state for cultural psychology. *International Journal for Dialogical Science,* 3, 205-224.

Choi, S.-Ch., Han, G., & Kim, Ch.-W. (2007). Analysis of cultural emotion. Understanding of indigenous psychology for universal implications. In J. Valsiner & A. Rosa, *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociocultural Psychology* (s. 318-342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Kim, Ch.-W. (1998). "Shim-cheong" psychology as a cultural psychological approach to collective meaning construction. *Korean Journal of Social and Personality Psychology,* 12, 79-96.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Kim, Ch.-W. (2006). Naïve psychology of Koreans' interpersonal mind and behavior in close relationships. In U. Kim, K.-S., Yang & K.-K. Hwang. *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. Understanding People in Context.* (s. 357-369). New York: Springer.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Kim, K. (2004). Chemyeon – Social face in Korean culture. *Korea Journal*, 44 (2), 30-51.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Lee, S.-J. (2002). Two-Component Model of Chemyon-Oriented Behaviors in Korea: Constructive and Defensive Chemyon. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology,* 33, 332-345.

Jahoda, G. (2016). On the rise and decline of 'indigenous psychology'. *Culture & Psychology,* 22, 169-181.

Jeong, H. (2015). *Archeology of Psychotheraphy in Korea. A study of Korean therapeutic work and professional growth.* New York: Routledge.

Kim, U., Park, Y.-S., & Park, D. (1999). The Korean indigenous psychology approach: Theoretical considerations and empirical applications. *Applied Psychology: An International Review,* 48, 451-464.

Min, S. K. (2009). *Hwabyung* in Korea: Culture and dynamic analysis. *World Cultural Psychiatry Research Review,* 4, 12-21.

Neff, R. D., & Cheong, S. (2009). *Korea through western eyes.* Seoul: Seoul National University Press.

Průcha, J. (2010). *Interkulturní psychologie.* 3. vyd. Praha: Portál.

Yang, I. (2006). Jeong exchange and collective leadership in Korean organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management,* 23, 283-298.

Yang, K.-S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches:The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology,* 3, 241-263.

Yang, K.-S. (2012). Indigenous Psychology, Westernized Psychology, and Indigenized Psychology: A Non-Western Psychologist's View. *Chang Gung Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences,* 5 (1), 1-32.

Korean Indigenous Psychology: A Review of Some Concepts[1]

Václav Linkov,

Centrum dopravního výzkumu, v.v.i., Brno,

vaclav.linkov@hotmail.com

Abstract:[2]

This article reviews some terms used in Korean indigenous psychology. First, indigenous psychologies and their goals are described. Then are described the Korean terms *jeong, woori, han, hwabyung, shimcheong, noonchi,* and *chemyon*. Indigenous psychology is psychology adapted for a specific cultural environment. Such psychologies have evolved in reaction to American psychology since 1960s. Indigenous psychologies aim to create a specific psychology for every society and its specific population. It is assumed that, after this is accomplished, a more just global psychology will be created. When indigenous psychology studies a local environment, it may adapt two strategies. It might either: study the local specifics of phenomena studied by global psychology, or it might study local phenomena only. In Korea, the latter approach was employed by Sang-Chin Choi and his colleagues. They studied the following phenomena:

Jeong is the feeling of attachment to other people. A person feeling *jeong* to other another person is emphatic to him or her, interested in the other's feelings, and tries to support them. It is independent of the likeability of the other person. *Woori* is a feeling of we-ness, whose members do not distinguish between the self and others. People in a *woori* collective are connected by *jeong*. A strong *jeong* is the strong feeling of we-ness. This feeling is created

---

[1] This is the translation of an article which was originally published in Czech as:
   Linkov, V. (2017). Korejská domorodá psychologie: Přehled některých pojmů [Korean indigenous psychology: A review of some concepts]. *Člověk a Spoločnosť*, 20(2), 72-79. https://individualandsociety.org/storage/uploads/casopis/2017/2/korejska-domoroda-psychologie-prehled-nekterych-po/150227154306-linkov-po.pdf

[2] This article contains an unusually long abstract, because it was the journal requirement for articles that were not published in English.

by the continuous show of interest in another in the form of doing favors to him or her. *Han* is the feeling of accumulated and suppressed anger. Korean society does not tolerate when people show their anger, because it might harm relationships with others. So they accumulate this feeling in their heart and try to relieve it through various activities. If relief is not successful, *han* might evolve into *hwabyung*. *Hwabyung* is an indigenous Korean psychiatric syndrome. A person with *hwabyung* is angry and feels that society is unjust. This feeling evolves when the person is repeatedly exposed to unfair situations, where he or she cannot get better treatment because of societal restraints that do not allow the explicit show of anger. The person feels hatred, depression, and guilt. *Hwabyung* is a syndrome that involves insomnia, anorexia, problems with breath, dry mouth, and similar symptoms. *Hwabyung* is a way a person can justify being relieved from social roles in Korean society. *Shimcheong* is an affect which comes when other person in a *woori* collective shows *jeong* to an insufficient (or over-sufficient) extent. If the person does something that harms another, it shows that he or she might not feel *jeong* towards this other person. The second person might have their *shimcheong* activated. In the state of *shimcheong* the person analyzes all of the previous interactions with a person who has shown insufficient *jeong*. He or she also analyzes future expectations from the relationship with the other person. The analysis of the relationship finally results in its confirmation, change, or termination. *Noonchi* is a state where the person carefully watches other people. The person can appropriately assess the real feelings and wishes of the other person, regardless of what the other person actually says or does. *Noonchi* helps to maintain social harmony. The person might behave according to social conventions even if he or she wishes otherwise, but, because of the other people's *noonchi*, he or she might receive the feedback he or she desires. *Chemyon* (social face) is how a person presents himself or herself towards other people. To save one's face means to satisfy the expectations of other people in certain situations. For Koreans, it is important to actively maintain one's face by showing signs connected with social status. High social status is viewed as connected with high moral qualities, so people with high social status have to maintain saving their faces to a greater extent. Korean indigenous psychology might be considered weaker in comparison to other indigenous psychologies; nevertheless, it did a very good job in the conceptualization of some aspects of Korean behavior.

Key words:

Indigenous psychology. Korea. Face. Shimcheong.

This article describes some terms of Korean indigenous psychology. Czech publications about cross-cultural psychology (Průcha, 2010; Čeněk, Smolík a Vykoukalová, 2016) rarely contain terms and concepts that are studied by indigenous psychologies, or they do not contain them at all. This article aims to partially – regarding Korean indigenous psychology – correct this debt. I will first cover indigenous psychologies (IP) in general and then I will describe selected terms of Korean IP: *jeong, woori, han, hwabyung, shimcheong, noonchi, and chemyon*. I use the English transcription for the Korean terms used by the cited authors.[3] When describing a term, I add the Korean word and the Czech transcription if it differs from the English transcription.

Indigenous psychology

Indigenous psychology is "a psychology that has been partly borrowed from the West and then transformed into a psychology adapted to the needs of a particular culture/country" (Jahoda, 2016, 172). Indigenous psychologies developed in the Philippines and Taiwan, then spread to other countries (Jahoda, 2016). East Asian indigenous psychologies developed as a reaction to American psychology. Their founders had education and foreign cross-cultural experience, especially in the US and other English-speaking countries. Despite this, they considered the implementation of Western psychology in their countries to be academic and cultural colonialism (Hwang, 2005). As a result, their publications contain an occidentalist view of "Western" cultures. The founder of IP in Taiwan, Kuo-Shu Yang (2012), considers 19th century European psychology to be the first IP. He considers Europe, or Euro-American civilization, to be one cultural entity. This IP was,

---

[3] The romanizations of the Korean language have changed trough the last decades. If there are multiple versions in use, I use the version that was used in the articles I cite.

together with English-speaking-country psychologies, exported to non-Western countries, where it started to be practiced by psychologists who were usually educated in the West (in the case of East Asian countries, usually all in the US). Yang calls the psychologies they create "indigenized" psychologies, because these psychologists are limited by basing their research on "Western" psychology such that they are unable to create and independent IP. Their psychologies are based on the maximum independence of their knowledge from foreign psychologies. They are also based on the newly created psychological compatibility with the local environment. Similar to Jahoda (2016), I will not distinguish between the terms "indigenous" and "indigenized" psychology in this article.

According to Yang (2000), the goal of indigenous psychologies „is to construct a specific indigenous psychology for each society with a given population or a distinctive culture. After that, the specific knowledge system and its various research findings may be used to develop the indigenous psychologies of progressively larger populations defined in terms of regional, national, ethnic, linguistic, religious, or geographical considerations. Finally, the highest indigenous psychology, a universal, or more properly a global, psychology for all human beings on the earth will be formed by integrating lower-level indigenous psychologies. " (p. 246)

Indigenous psychologies are not successful in fulfilling this goal, as concluded by Jahoda (2016). No IP from those that he analyzed could be „described as IP in the sense of coherent systems of knowledge " (p. 172). Indigenous psychologies only created theories for specific phenomena that existed in their cultures. The Korean IP is one of these psychologies. Some of the phenomena it investigates will be described below.

An IP might be created in two ways: Either as an empirical investigation of indigenous phenomena, which are specific to a culture; or as the investigation of phenomena and concepts that are present in global psychology and the search for their local specifics (Kim, Park, & Park, 1999). This text covers the first type of Korean IP, which tries to describe indigenous concepts. The IP that investigates globally emerging phenomena is not covered here. The Korean IP is weaker than IPs in other Asian countries. The "colonization" of the Korean academic environment is stronger. Mostly only US-educated people teach and conduct research at prestigious Korean universities. This contributes to the situation where researchers in Korea orient themselves towards concepts that are present in the global psychology.

An attempt to create a Korean IP based on the local concepts was made by Sang-Chin Choi (1940-2011). He described his findings – apart from many articles – in a posthumously published book, Psychology of Koreans (Choi, 2011). Some of his students continue his work. Choi and Han (2000) describe their approach regarding the psychological research of culture and cultural comparison – so-called "comparative cultural psychology". They refuse the approach of cross-cultural psychology where psychological phenomena are fragmented to constructs without context, and then later compared to hardly comparable cultural environments. Such an approach is like comparing apples to oranges. Instead of such an approach, every researcher should try to get an understanding of their own culture first, and then create their own concepts based on the locally present phenomena. Korean psychological concepts, which are similar to those in Japanese and Chinese psychologies, should be compared to these psychologies first. Only after a broader concept is developed as a result of this comparison should it be compared to similar concepts in Western psychology (Choi & Han, 2000). Following this program, Choi and his co-authors tried to describe the psychological phenomena present in Korean culture. Some of these concepts are described in the review that follows.

Concepts of Korean indigenous psychology

Jeong

Jeong (정, *čong*, romanization *cheong* is also used) is the feeling of being attached to other people. This feeling creates *woori*. In the state of *jeong*, the person is empathic towards other people, interested in them, supports them, and helps them (Choi & Han, 2008). *Jeong* is characterized by the vanishing borders between I and other people. A person feels the emotions of another person. *Jeong* exists regardless of whether the person likes the other and regardless whether the person profits from the relationship (Yang, 2006).

Woori

Woori (우리, *uri*) literally means "we". It is a group in which individuals do not separate themselves from others. Members of *woori* are connected by the *jeong* feeling. *Woori*

is characterized by unconditional friendship, altruism, mutual attachment, and a preference for its members in comparison with other people. The stronger the *jeong*, the stronger the feeling of "we" (Yang, 2006). The *woori* feeling and mutual trust are created through the repetition of the mutual manifestations of interest and care (마음, maum). Words and gifts are not important because they were given, but because they show care for the other. Koreans often buy expensive gifts or spent a whole day to drive someone somewhere because it is hard to estimate which sign of care will be considered sufficient. Interest in care about the other is the most visible when caring takes a lot of time, money, and other resources. An exchange of such manifestations of care will, in the end, create the *jeong* emotional tie (Han, Choi, 2011).

Han

Han (한) is the state of suppressed and aggregated anger. It is a mix of pathos, sadness, and the feelings of loss and injustice. The first reaction after an event might be anger and the desire to take revenge. However, such anger should be suppressed due to the Korean tendency to not endanger relationships by showing emotions. Instead, a phase of sadness and helplessness follows. This phase turns into thinking about why the situation happened. Finally, people absorb *han* and they are able to speak about it. Suppressed anger should be released, which often happens through creative activities (Jeong, 2015:4). A *han* feeling might be released by talking and pleasant activities, and last for a long time through the experience of some success. For example, a mother who was continuously humiliated by her husband's family might release the *han* she had accumulated when her child has a successful career. *Han* might also be released through hard work. The *han* that Koreans feel due to the historical oppression of the Korean nation is considered to be one of the causes that have led to Korean economic success (Min, 2009). The suppressed anger might turn to a specifically Korean syndrome known as *hwabyung*.

Hwabyung

Hwabyung (화병, *hwabjong*) is a pathological form of the feeling *han*. *Hwabyung* is an illness that stems from anger (literally "fire illness"). Patients feel anger, they feel that the unjust society does not allow them to do what they want, and they are unable to get over these feelings. This feeling arises after being repeatedly involved in unjust social situations, like

long-term conflicts in a family. The person thinks that they are the target of permanent aggression from society and other people. But the person is not allowed to show their anger and they have to suppress it, so the anger accumulates. Hatred, feelings of guilt, anxiety, and depression grow inside. *Hwabyung* shows through crying, sighing, a talkative mood, and the tendency to run out of closed rooms. People have feelings of being hot, so they avoid warm places. They feel their heartbeat, pressure in their chest, and a dry mouth, and they have difficulty to breathe. Insomnia and anorexia might follow. People talk all the time about how they suffer and cry and sigh while talking. *Hwabyung* is a way that people might show they suffer, so that they might have an argument for release from their social roles. It is a chronic illness. *Hwabyung* was present in 4% of Koreans in the countryside in 1990 (Min, 2009).

Shimcheong

Shimcheong (심정, *šimčong*) is the state that arises when other people inadequately show *jeong*: either less than they should or more than they should. If they show less *jeong* than expected, they show that the other person is not important to them. This questions their credibility and the person questions why and whether it is possible to still trust a person who did not show *jeong* (Choi, Han, 2008). Choi and Kim (2006) illustrate *shimcheong* in following way:

> In the 88' Seoul Olympics, a Korean athlete would not come down the ring as a reaction against the unfair judgment when his loss was announced. This happening ended up with delayed processes of the remaining agenda of the day. Most of Western media criticized his behavior as illegitimate. However, Korean people expressed sympathies with the boxer. Headlines of Korean newspapers read like this: ‚Unfair judgment Kept a Korean boxer seated on the canvass‘, ‚The boxer's behavior understandable‘ or ‚The boxer's *shimjung* shared by Koreans.‘ (s. 359)

Shimcheong appears in relationships where at least one person considers the relationship to be *woori*. Relationships with strangers are based on rationality and signs of *jeong* are not expected from others (Choi & Han, 2008). But if a relationship is considered to be *woori* by one (or more) participants, it expected that the participants will care about the others' needs as a sign of the *jeong* they feel. If they do not care about the other's needs and do something that harms the other person in *woori*, that person's *shimcheong* will be activated. This leads the person to analyze all of the past and current interactions, and the

future expectations from the relationship with the one who did not show *jeong*. The *shimcheong* feeling will calm down after some time and result in confirming, reconsidering, or ending the relationship. The degree of the relationship varies on a scale between the total mutuality of *woori* and a relationship between strangers. *Shimcheong* might lead to a change of this degree. The person who initiated *shimcheong* does not need to know about it. They might not consider their (in)activity to be important. Or they might not consider the relationship to be *woori*. *Shimcheong* might be also positive if a person in a *woori* relationship helps the other more than was expected.

A person starts to feel alienation and betrayal – instead of feeling safe in the relationship – from *shimcheong* that is caused by a negative event. The person evaluates whether these feelings are justified. The evaluation uses culturally specific patterns for what is and is not allowed in relationships with a similar degree of mutuality. The partner who willfully caused *shimcheong* might improve the situation by thinking about their actions that initiated it. In this way *shimcheong* might start a so-called *shimcheong* dialogue, which means that partners tell each other about their intentions. The person who initiated *shimcheong* might do something to calm down the other as part of this dialogue. By doing this, they establish that they value the relationship (Choi, Han, & Kim, 2007).

Shimcheong is the sudden realization of self in a mutual relationship and the evaluation of the value of the self in this relationship. Koreans in a *woori* relationship do not evaluate the behavior itself, but the motivation that leads to that behavior. The evaluation of the other's intentions and motivations in the relationship is difficult, so the person might often be wrong – and *shimcheong* serves to judge and correct such mistakes (Choi & Han, 2008). *Shimcheong* differs from empathy because it is caused by the failure to meet one's own expectations and not by the other's needs. It is possible only in a close relationship that contains a *jeong* feeling (Han & Choi, 2008).

The negative evaluation of a relationship in *shimcheong* leads to self-pity. Koreans show their support and sympathy towards people who go through *shimcheong* (Choi & Han, 2008). When a *woori* relationship is destroyed after *shimcheong* ends, the *jeong* feeling is replaced by the feeling of *han* (i.e., loneliness, anger, pity). People who both feel *han* might become closer due to this mutual experience, which might create new *woori* with *jeong* feelings present. *Jeong* and *han* feelings are tied to each other by cyclical causality (Choi & Kim, 1998).

119

Noonchi

Noonchi (눈치, *nunčchi*) is the state when a person carefully watches other people. If someone has *noonchi*, it means that they are able to read others' minds and react appropriately. The person is able to estimate their mood and social situation, and it does not concentrate only on what was said but "reads between the lines". In this way the person might satisfy the unsaid wishes of others. *Noonchi* serves to maintain social harmony and prevent conflicts. Koreans rely on others' *noonchi*. Someone could say "yes", but it actually means "no". *Noonchi* helps the other person to understand these words accurately. A person has a good degree of *noonchi* if they can solve social situations quickly and correctly. However, if person has too much *noonchi*, they would constantly watch others and think about what they might expect. The constant observation of others might turn into anxiety and the fear of being unable to fulfill others' expectations. Some people might develop social phobia and paranoia. If people lack *noonchi*, society considers them to be childish and insensitive towards others (Jeong, 2015, 8). *Noonchi* helps to solve social dilemmas in a way that saves face for all of the involved people. It is possible to simultaneously not refuse another's request and not comply to it.

Chemyon

Chemyon (체면, *čchemjon*) – social face – is how a person appears to others and themself. Keeping face means to comply to others' expectations in a given situation. The effort to save one's face comes from the Confucian doctrine of appropriate behavior – people should feel shame if their behavior is inappropriate. Shame caused by the loss of face might arise because the person realizes their insufficiency or they might realize it through the discordant reactions of others. *Chemyon* reflects two human needs: the need for positive self-evaluation and the need to be accepted by others. The loss of face due to one's own realization of fault was considered to be worse in traditional society. In modern society, the loss of face due to the reaction of others is considered worse (Choi & Kim, 2004). Face-saving behaviors are measured on a scale developed by Choi and Lee (2002).

Koreans consider actively showing signs of one's abilities – or other things connected to status – to be important for keeping one's face (Choi & Kim, 2004). They might try to get

similar signs of status – like brands clothes and cars, or plastic surgeries – to achieve the face-keeping goal. Some signs of status might look strange to foreigners. At the end of the 19th Century, Europeans and Americans were surprised that Korean nobility used tobacco pipes that were so long that it was impossible to light without help. The reason was that the noble man had to employ another person for the task. The majority of people could not afford to employ a person just to light a fire, so the noble man showed his status in this way. The longer pipe, the higher position of the person (Neff & Cheong, 2009, 231- 233).

Face is especially involved in interactions with people with whom the person does not have a close relationship. The loss of face might happen by failing an exam, losing a competition, having trouble at one's workplace, showing a weakness, breaking moral rules, or failing to fulfill one's duty. Higher-ranked people have to take more care about keeping their face, because their high social status is believed to be connected with the high moral qualities of Korean society. If these people do not meet high standards, they would be considered ineligible for their position. This is why lower ranked people help them keep their face. Koreans might speak positively about a highly ranked person even if they do not believe it (Choi & Kim, 2004).

The concept of face also exists in Chinese and Japanese societies. Choi and Kim (2004) note that there does not exist comparative research that compares these concepts with each other. They think that the Japanese concept might be more defensively oriented, but the Korean concept is oriented more on actively showing one's abilities and status.

Conclusion

I described the concepts used by Korean IP as they were investigated by Sang-Chin Choi and other Korean researchers. I did not aim for a complete and comprehensive description of these concepts. I also used mostly only sources available in English. These concepts are all related to specific phenomena in Korean society. The current state of psychological research on Korean society might be illustrated by the following event: The first Korean researcher whom I asked about who studied indigenous phenomena in Korea replied that Sang-Chin Choi investigated this, but that he already passed away. Nevertheless,

it is not so bad – International Congress of Psychology in Yokohama included a symposium devoted to Korean (and other Asian) IPs with presentations by Taekyun Hur, Min Han, and Gyuseog Han. It might be expected that some other concepts will develop quality that will allow its description in international publications.

References:

Čeněk, J., Smolík, J., & Vykoukalová, Z. (2016). *Interkulturní psychologie. Vybrané kapitoly*. Praha: Grada.

Han, G., & Choi, S.-Ch. (2008). Shimcheong is a case for the first person psychology: A reply. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, 3, 255-260.

Han, G., & Choi, S.-Ch. (2011). Trust working in interpersonal relationships: A comparative cultural perspective with a focus on East Asian culture. *Comparative Sociology*, 10, 380-412.

Hwang, K.-K. (2005). From anticolonialism to postcolonialism: The emergence of Chinese indigenous psychology in Taiwan. *International Journal of Psychology*, 40, 228-238.

Choi, S.-Ch. (2011). *Hangugin ui shimrihak [Psychology of Koreans]*. Seoul: Hakjisa.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Han, G. (2000). Munhwashimrihakchok jonkubangpoplon [Methodology of cultural psychology]. *Korean Journal of Social and Personality Psychology*, 14, 123-144.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Han, G. (2008). Shimcheong psychology: A case of an emotional state for cultural psychology. *International Journal for Dialogical Science*, 3, 205-224.

Choi, S.-Ch., Han, G., & Kim, Ch.-W. (2007). Analysis of cultural emotion. Understanding of indigenous psychology for universal implications. In J. Valsiner & A. Rosa, *The Cambridge Handbook of Sociocultural Psychology* (pp. 318-342). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Kim, Ch.-W. (1998). "Shim-cheong" psychology as a cultural psychological approach to collective meaning construction. *Korean Journal of Social and Personality Psychology*, 12, 79-96.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Kim, Ch.-W. (2006). Naïve psychology of Koreans' interpersonal mind and behavior in close relationships. In U. Kim, K.-S. Yang & K.-K. Hwang. *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. Understanding People in Context*. (pp. 357-369). New York: Springer.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Kim, K. (2004). Chemyeon – Social face in Korean culture. *Korea Journal*, 44 (2), 30-51.

Choi, S.-Ch., & Lee, S.-J. (2002). Two-Component Model of Chemyon-Oriented Behaviors in Korea : Constructive and Defensive Chemyon. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 33, 332- 345.

Jahoda, G. (2016). On the rise and decline of 'indigenous psychology'. *Culture & Psychology*, 22, 169-181.

Jeong, H. (2015). *Archeology of Psychotheraphy in Korea. A study of Korean therapeutic work and professional growth*. New York: Routledge.

Kim, U., Park, Y.-S., & Park, D. (1999). The Korean indigenous psychology approach: Theoretical considerations and empirical applications. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 48, 451-464.

Min, S. K. (2009). Hwabyung in Korea: Culture and dynamic analysis. *World Cultural Psychiatry Research Review*, 4, 12-21.

Neff, R. D., & Cheong, S. (2009). *Korea through western eyes.* Seoul: Seoul National University Press.

Průcha, J. (2010). *Interkulturní psychologie [Cross-cultural psychology].* 3. vyd. Praha: Portál.

Yang, I. (2006). Jeong exchange and collective leadership in Korean organizations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management,* 23, 283-298.

Yang, K.-S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches:The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 241- 263.

Yang, K.-S. (2012). Indigenous Psychology, Westernized Psychology, and Indigenized Psychology: A Non-Western Psychologist's View. *Chang Gung Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences,* 5 (1), 1-32.

Acknowledgements

Základní témata čínské původní psychologie

Basic themes of Chinese indigenous psychology

Václav Linkov[*]

Centrum dopravního výzkumu, v.v.i

Abstrakt

Původní psychologie studují místní fenomény s pomocí konceptů a terminologie vycházejících z dané kultury. Takovou psychologií je i čínská původní psychologie, která vznikla jako hnutí za odzápadnění psychologie v čínsky mluvících zemích. Mezi témata, která zkoumá, patří guanxi – vztah mezi dvěma lidmi udržovaný vzájemnou výměnou dárků či pomoci. Dalšími v textu probranými tématy jsou tvář, renqing (laskavost), yuan (víra v osud určující vývoj mezilidských vztahů), xiao (úcta k rodičům vycházející z konfuciánských tradic), zhong yong (myšlení středu), suzhi (kvalita člověka) a bao (koncept reciprocity).

Klíčová slova: Původní psychologie, Čína, guanxi

Abstract

Indigenous psychologies study local phenomena through concepts and terminology native to people in the given culture in order to provide a deeper understanding of the local culture. Indigenous psychologies began to spread in 1970 s in various non-western countries. Chinese indigenous psychology began as a movement for liberating psychology in Chinese areas from western influences. In this text, we review the culturally specific themes studied by Chinese indigenous psychologists.

One popular concept studied by many researchers is *guanxi*. *Guanxi* is a relationship between two people which is based on something that they have in common and which is maintained by the mutual exchange of favors. The possibility of receiving help is the main reason people seek to establish *guanxi*.

Another concept is that of the "face". Face represents evaluation of person's behavior in a social situation. Chinese people are very concerned with saving face for themselves and their acquaintances. Face could be lost through the incorrect behavior of a person, and also through the misbehavior of a family member. It is better to lose face in the presence of strangers than in the presence of people who are close.

Renqing is the will to help another person. If someone receives renqing, he or she should return it. It is hard to measure the value of a favor, so it can never be fully returned. Chinese people, therefore, do not like to receive renqing from someone.

Yuan is destiny, which is responsible for relationships. A romantic relationship is considered to be based upon good or bad *yuan*. If the relationship does not go well, it is not

---

[*] Korespondenční autor: Václav Linkov, Centrum dopravního výzkumu, v. v. i., Líšeňská 33a, Brno, 60200
Email: linkov@email.cz

the responsibility of partners or people who persuaded couple to start relationship (i.e., parents), but it is because of *yuan*. In this way, *yuan* helps to maintain social harmony.

Filial piety (*xiao)* binds children to their parents. Children should respect their parents and their parents can influence their children's decisions, including romantic-partner selection. Chinese parents enforce tight control of their children from early childhood.

Zhong yong is the tendency to maintain a middle-of-the-road style of thinking and behavior. Everything should be perceived from many points of view and a decision should be not made too quickly. Extremes should be avoided.

Suzhi is the quality of a person – moral characteristics, abilities, and education. People with higher social status are expected to have more *suzhi*.

Bao is the concept of reciprocity. If someone does something good or bad, it should be returned. The reciprocity concept helps to maintain harmony in society.

Chinese indigenous psychology might serve as inspiration for researchers from other cultures. Nevertheless, researchers need to pay attention to the risk of the reification of their own cultures. Chinese indigenous psychologists are criticized for overestimating the role of culture on the behavior of Chinese people. Researchers who are developing indigenous psychologies in their cultures should be aware of the political pressure to express the uniqueness of their own culture. In the case of Czech psychology, it is an open question as to whether it should develop its own indigenous psychology or work with researchers from culturally similar nations, like other Slavic cultures.

Keywords: Indigenous psychology, China, guanxi

Úvod

Původní psychologie[2] studují fenomény v konkrétní kultuře s pomocí konceptů a terminologie, které používají sami lidé v dané kultuře. To umožňuje danou kulturu lépe pochopit a porozumět jí. Původní psychologie začaly v nezápadních zemích vznikat v sedmdesátých letech 20. století jako reakce na hegemonii západní (a zvláště americké) psychologie a postupně se rozšířily do mnoha zemí (Jahoda, 2016). V tomto článku popíšeme základní témata, kterými se zabývá čínská původní psychologie. Zaměříme se přitom na koncepty, které jsou pro Čínu specifické a umožňují tak lépe pochopit její kulturu.

Cíle čínské původní psychologie shrnuje Yang (1999). Hegemonie západních vzdělávacích systémů vedla k tomu, že sociální vědci z nezápadních společností přijali teorie, koncepty a metody pocházející ze Západu. To vedlo k vytvoření pozápadněných sociálních věd, které jsou nekompatibilní s místními kulturami a fenomény. Psychologie v čínských společnostech prošla tímto procesem pozápadnění, čímž vznikla pozápadněná – v případě Taiwanu amerikanizovaná – psychologie. Čínská původní psychologie vznikla jako hnutí za sinizaci (počínštění) této psychologie (Yang, 1999, 2006). Nejvíce je rozvinuta na Taiwanu, kde k jejímu rozkvětu došlo po konferenci o sinizaci sociálních věd konané v roce 1981 v Taipei. Její protagonisté věří, že změnou teoretických a metodologických východisek je možno vytvořit psy-

---

[2] Překlad anglického pojmu „indigenous psychology" do češtiny není ustálený. Dříve jsem používal překlad „domorodá psychologie", který jsem přejal z publikovaných textů (např. Čeněk, Smolík & Vykoukalová, 2016). Tento překlad však má v češtině negativní konotace. Nabízí se slovo „lokální", které ale sugeruje, že jde o něco méně důležitého než „globální". Zároveň by činilo potíže při překladu v literatuře používaných pojmů (např. Yang (2000) píše o „local indigenous psychology"). Proto jsem zvolil překlad „původní psychologie".

chologii, která umožní lépe porozumět sociálním a psychologickým procesům v čínské kultuře (Hwang, 2005).

Původní psychologie vyprodukovaly hodně manifestů, které popisují představu autorů o tom, jak se má dělat psychologický výzkum tak, aby bral v úvahu kulturní specifika v zemích výzkumníků a zároveň přispíval ke globálnímu rozvoji psychologie jako vědy (Hwang, 2019). Stejně je to i s čínskou původní psychologií. Yang (1999) považuje západní psychologii za psychologii individualistickou, která zkoumá izolovaného jednotlivce. Čínská původní psychologie je oproti tomu podle Yanga psychologií kolektivistickou zkoumající jedince ve vztahu jak k jeho sociálnímu okolí, tak k historickým okolnostem. Původní psychologie zkoumá jak procesy a schémata chování u jednotlivců z místních kultur, tak jejich sociální kontext. Výzkum podle Yanga začíná tím, že si místní výzkumník na základě vlastních zkušeností představí, jaké by byly jeho vjemy, pocity, myšlenky, motivy a chování v dané situaci. Poté, co takto mobilizuje své tacitní znalosti, může udělat pilotní výzkum jako nestrukturovanou kvalitativní studii. Na základě toho pak navrhne design výzkumu. Výzkum v původní psychologii však není vyhrazen pouze místním výzkumníkům – místní výzkumník může mít „vymytý mozek" (Yang, 1999:187) tréninkem v západní psychologii a podobně nepředpojatý výzkumník-cizinec tak může místní fenomény zkoumat lépe než on.

Podle Yanga (1999) by původní psychologie měla začít studiem kulturně jedinečných fenoménů a teprve poté, co se na nich naučí jak k výzkumu přistupovat z místní perspektivy, by měla přejít k fenoménům existujícím ve více kulturách. Po vytvoření lokálních původních psychologií tak vzniknou původní psychologie větších kulturních celků, a nakonec z nich odvozená globální psychologie (Yang, 2000). Hwang (2013:11) považuje za cíl původních psychologií vytvoření globální psychologie postavené na sérii teorií, které reflektují jak univerzální strukturu lidské mysli, tak mentalitu lidí v dané kultuře.

Dalším příkladem představy o fungování původních psychologií je článek Liua (2017a), podle něhož je mainstreamová psychologie postavena na západní filosofii vycházející z řeckých kořenů. Proto je její hlavní metodou rozdělit problém na proměnné a tyto analyzovat zvlášť. Asijské a zejména čínská psychologie mohou tento přístup změnit tím, že do psychologie přinesou holistický přístup. Pro asijskou psychologii je irelevantní polemika, zda používat epistemologii pocházející z přírodních věd nebo epistemologii vzniklou jako její protipól, protože tento spor je plodem západní civilizace. Západní dualistická filosofie, která proti sobě staví pozorovanou věc (phenomenon) a její skutečnou podobu (noumenon), je pro asijskou psychologii méně vhodná než holistický přístup čínské filosofie, že člověk je schopen poznat noumenon i phenomenon. Pro asijskou psychologii je vhodné vycházet z toho, že zákony lidského chování nejsou univerzální, ale závisí na situaci a sociálním postavení aktérů. Ke dvěma dimenzím reality a jejího zobrazení v teoriích také patří dimenze třetí – úmysly a touhy výzkumníka, který tyto teorie tvoří. Výzkumník nemá být neutrální vůči věcem, které zkoumá, ale má se prostřednictvím výzkumu snažit humanizovat společnost (Liu, 2017a). Společenské vědy mají sloužit jako nástroj k zamezení možným špatným verzím budoucnosti (Liu, 2017 b).

Témata čínské původní psychologie

Guanxi

Termín *guanxi* (關係) označuje specifický typ vztahů v čínské společnosti. Základem je guanxi dyáda – spojení či vztah mezi dvěma lidmi. Z těchto dyád se formují „guanxi sítě" lidí, kteří

jsou navzájem propojeni pomocí guanxi. Po vytvoření guanxi tento vztah člověk může používat k dosažení svých cílů. Guanxi je postaveno na *guanxi bázi* – něčem, co je společné lidem majícím spolu guanxi: stejné místo narození, stejná škola, práce ve stejné organizaci, společní známí. Guanxi se podle typu báze dělí na *jia-ren guanxi* mezi členy primární rodiny, *shou-ren guanxi* na základě vzdálenějších příbuzenských vztahů, přátelství, vztahu mezi učitelem a studentem, mezi spolužáky, sousedy nebo kolegy z pracoviště, a *sheng-ren guanxi* mezi obyvateli stejné obce nebo zaměstnanci velké společnosti (Su & Littlefield, 2001). Dále může jako guanxi báze sloužit tzv. předjímající báze – do budoucna orientovaná základna pro guanxi vztah, kdy oba lidé ve vznikající guanxi dyádě v budoucnu chtějí dělat něco podobného a spolupracovat. Guanxi je způsob, jak se Číňané vyrovnávají s životem v prostředí, kde neexistuje všeobecná důvěra mezi lidmi. Guanxi je tím lepší, čím více si lidé mohou věřit. Důležité je proto vidět u partnera jasné známky toho, že chce ve vztahu vytrvat a že se snaží dělat vše v nejlepším zájmu jedince. Důležité je ovšem i to, aby partner mohl být člověku k něčemu užitečný. Guanxi vzniká tak, že dva neznámí lidé hledají guanxi bázi, na níž by svůj vztah mohli založit. Jejich rozhovor se tak točí kolem životních zážitků, zkušeností, známých, kolegů a spolužáků. Snaží se najít něco, co mají společného. Pokud nenajdou společné místo, organizaci ani osobu, začnou hovořit o svých životních plánech, aby mohli vytvořit předjímající bázi. Pokud není nalezena ani vytvořena guanxi báze, nemůže guanxi vzniknout (Chen & Chen, 2004). Pro nastolení a udržení guanxi u mužů v obchodních vztazích často slouží společná návštěva klubu s hosteskami, kde pijí alkohol (Bedford & Hwang, 2013).

Guanxi se udržuje výměnou vzájemných laskavostí a protislužeb (Leung, Heung & Wong, 2006). Aby guanxi vydrželo, je třeba dodržovat několik pravidel. Za prvé, lidé musí pomoci těm, kteří jim dříve také pomohli, a nesmí je ohrožovat, pokud tak neučiní, ztrácí tvář (Wong et al., 2007). Za druhé, poskytnutí protislužby nemusí být okamžité. Může trvat velmi dlouho a ochota vrátit laskavost i po dlouhé době signalizuje kvalitu guanxi. Za třetí, to, co je druhému oplaceno, pro něj musí mít skutečnou hodnotu – proto je nutné druhého znát a zajímat se o něj (ovšem pokud člověk nabízenou laskavost, jako například pozvání do klubu, odmítne, může to znamenat konec guanxi vztahu, Bedford & Hwang, 2013). Za čtvrté, člověk se snaží druhého si zavázat, a proto se mu snaží vrátit více, než kdysi sám dostal. Skutečnost, že poskytl více, ukazuje jeho ochotu setrvat v guanxi a dále jej udržovat (Chen & Chen, 2004). Na druhou stranu všem bývá tolerováno, že slabší partner poskytuje méně (Dunning & Kim, 2007).

Možnost požádat o pomoc a obdržet ji je důvodem, proč lidé guanxi budují a udržují (Hui & Graen, 1997). Pokud jejich požadavek není reflektován nebo dostanou méně, než očekávali, mohou se cítit oklamáni a kvalita guanxi se zhorší (Chen & Peng, 2008). Pokud tak člověk pomoc poskytnout odmítne a má zájem guanxi udržet, snaží se situaci vysvětlit tak, že pomoc poskytnout nemohl kvůli nějaké jím nezměnitelné příčině a není za to tedy odpovědný. Druhé straně pak odmítnutí musí nahradit jiným způsobem (Chen & Chen, 2004).

Guanxi ovlivňuje mnoho aspektů čínského života, například to, jak si Číňané rozdělují odměny se svými kolegy či spolupracovníky. Při dělení se dávají Číňané konkrétnímu člověku tím více, čím silnější je jejich guanxi s daným člověkem. Pokud s daným člověkem vztah na bázi guanxi nemají (např. jde o neznámého člověka), dělí se tak, jak je to výhodné pro ně samé (Zhang, 2006). Zamezení poškození vztahů v rámci guanxi sítě je tak důležitější než princip spravedlnosti (Wang & Pak, 2015).

Tvář

Tvář (mianzi**,** 面子) je kognitivní odpovědí na sociální hodnocení chování člověka v konkrétní situaci (Hwang, 2006). Dělí se na dva typy. Sociální tvář je získaná pomocí statusu vznikajícímu díky talentu a úsilí nebo díky kontaktům. Morální tvář je základem integrity osobnosti člověka. Člověk se nemusí starat o svou sociální tvář, vždy se ale musí snažit zachovat si tvář morální (Hwang, 2006).

Tématem výzkumů týkajících se tváře je především její zachování. Snaha zachovat si tvář souvisí s nižší přívětivostí a vyšším neuroticismem (Fung & Ng, 2006). Člověk by se měl snažit zachovat tvář svých představených. Když výše postavený člověk něco řekne nebo udělá, neměl by ho podřízený veřejně kritizovat, i když v soukromí si může myslet, co chce. Pokud odmítne tvář druhého člověka zachovat, ať už nadřízeného nebo kolegy, vztah to zničí a vytratí se z něj pozitivní city (Hwang, 1998). Lidé spojují zachování své tváře se správným chováním a pracovními výsledky. Pro staré lidi ovšem zachování tváře znamená zejména řádné chování a úspěšnou kariéru jejich dětí, jejich vlastní chování je pro ně méně důležité. Kvůli zachování tváře hodnotí Číňané špatné chování cizích lidí hůře než to stejné chování u svých příbuzných, tím jim umožňují zachovat si tvář (Hwang, 2006).

Pocit ztráty tváře může být zapřičiněn např. spácháním krádeže, nedostatečnou výchovou dětí, neúctou k rodičům, nedodržováním slibů, vlastizradou a špionáží pro cizí mocnosti, pliváním a odhazováním odpadků na ulici nebo příliš hlasitým mluvením na veřejnosti. Tyto situace mohou být rozděleny na nemorální chování, špatné návyky (např. nedodržování hygieny), nekompetentní chování (neschopnost vykonat něco, co je ostatními očekáváno) a odhalení soukromých záležitostí (např. obnažení na veřejnosti nebo odhalení špatných úmyslů). Kromě zachování tváře vlastní se člověk snaží zachovat i tvář svého „širšího já" – skupiny, do které patří, například rodiny (Hwang & Han, 2010).

Ztráta tváře závisí na tom, kde ji člověk ztratí a za jakých okolností. Zda je to před výše nebo níže postavenou osobou, zda se to děje v kontextu emocionální podpory dalších lidí nebo v kontextu nepřátelství a jak se lidé poté chovají. Pokud člověk má ztratit tvář, snaží se, aby to nastalo takovým způsobem, který je pro něho nejméně zraňující. Nejlepší je tak ztratit tvář před neznámými lidmi, s nimiž se už člověk nemusí znovu vidět. Rovněž je lepší ztratit tvář před přáteli než před rodinou: Přátelé na rozdíl od rodiny nejsou ztrátou tváře zasaženi také. Při výzkumu, zda by si lidé pro léčení pohlavně přenosné nemoci vybrali lékaře z rodiny nebo neznámou osobu, si 91% účastníků vybralo neznámého lékaře, přičemž jako důvod uvedli, že nechtějí ztratit tvář. Pokud by ovšem potřebovali léčit žlučníkové kameny, vybralo by si 92% lékaře z rodiny, aby získali lepší péči. Podobné to bylo u studie, kdy si lidé měli vybrat, zda by si v roli otce rodiny šli půjčit peníze na školné pro dítě do banky nebo od někoho z rodiny. Pokud by důvodem, proč si jdou půjčit peníze, bylo, že byli okradeni, šli by za někým z rodiny. Pokud by ale peníze neměli, protože je nedokázali vydělat, šli by raději do banky, protože to znamená, že neobstáli v roli otce-živitele a před někým z rodiny by tak ztratili tvář (Han, 2016).

Renqing

Renqing (人情) je koncept uplatňující se ve vztazích, které mají citovou složku, nicméně nejsou natolik blízké, aby se v nich lidé mohli otevřít (např. vztahy se sousedy, spolužáky a kolegy).

Prvním významem slova renqing je empatie a ochota pomoci. Člověk, který zná renqing, je člověk, který je empatický a pomáhá druhým, když vidí, že to potřebují. Renqing je také sada společenských norem o tom, jak se chovat v situaci, kdy se někdo dostane do potíží (Hwang, 1987). V takovém případě má člověk soucítit a snažit se pomoci – dát renqing potřebnému, v tomto smyslu má renqing význam poskytnuté služby či laskavosti a mezi čínskými tradičními hodnotami je nejsilněji spjat s hodnotou darovaných věcí (Qian, Razzaque & Keng, 2007). Renqing je spjat s ideou rovnosti a reciprocity. Pokud člověk dostane od druhého renqing, tak mu jej dluží a měl by mu jej oplatit, přičemž se snaží vrátit více, než dostal (Khan, Zolkiewski & Murphy, 2016). Protože kdy a jestli vůbec někdy bude renqing splacen je nejisté, lidé pečlivě zvažují, zda jej poskytnout (Hwang, 1987), ochota poskytnout renqing tak závisí na ochotě pokračovat ve vztahu s danou osobou (Shi et al., 2011). Podle Khan, Zolkiewské a Murphyho (2016) lze renqing v obchodních vztazích rozdělit na poskytnuté laskavosti, jako např. dřívější vyřízení požadavku daného partnera před jeho konkurenty, a příležitosti, jako např. pozvání daného partnera, aby přednesl řeč na obchodním jednání.

Má-li někdo dobrou tvář, zvyšuje to jeho status, a tedy i ochotu druhých věnovat mu renqing. Vylepšení či zachování tváře druhého je rovněž způsobem, jak druhému poskytnout renqing. Proto Číňané nekritizují jiné lidi, zejména nadřízené, případně při kritice druhých používají nejednoznačné termíny a kritiku zamlžují. Tvář může člověk zlepšit tím, že poskytne renqing, naopak ji může ztratit tím, že renqing neposkytne nebo nevrátí, pokud jej dluží. Pokud je člověk vyzván, aby renqing poskytl nebo splatil, může tak uplatnit strategii odkladu – neodpovídat a předstírat, že žádost neslyšel nebo nepochopil. Tím si zachová tvář a zároveň se vyhne poskytnutí renqing (Hwang, 1987).

Protože se empatie a pomoc nedají přesně zkalkulovat, nelze dluh v renqing plně splatit i když se o to člověk snaží. Zatímco dluh v penězích splatit jde, dluh v renqing nejde splatit nikdy. Proto se Číňané snaží nedostat do situace, kdy by někomu renqing dlužili. To platí hlavně pro bohaté lidi, kteří mají hodně zdrojů, a tedy hodně co ztratit (Hwang, 1987). Renqing také nemusí být vhodnou strategií v obchodě – pro více zkušené a úspěšnější obchodníky je dodržování pravidel renqingu méně důležité než pro ty méně zkušené (Tsai, Chi & Hu, 2009).

Yuan

Číňané tradičně věřili, že to, jak se který vztah mezi lidmi vyvíjí, je předurčeno osudem (Goodwin & Findlay, 1997). Yuan (緣) znamená osud nebo osudové předurčení v kontextu vztahu. Yuan je zodpovědný za to, zda se lidé navzájem přitahují nebo odpuzují. Uplatňuje se zejména v blízkých vztazích, ale ovlivňuje i další vztahy, třeba s přáteli nebo obchodními partnery. Dlouhodobé vztahy ovlivňuje yuanfen (緣份), za náhodná setkání (např. cestování ve stejném voze ve vlaku) odpovídá jiyuan (機緣) (Yang & Ho, 1988). V současné době významy slov yuan a yuanfen splývají, slovo yuan se vyskytuje v deseti procentech čínských populárních písní (Cheng & Yau, 2006).

Protože je vývoj vztahů předurčen yuanem, nedá se před ním nikam utéct a člověk jej musí akceptovat. Díky tomu z nešťastného vývoje není možné obviňovat ty, kteří vztah pomohli vytvořit, jako jsou rodiče, kteří v tradiční společnosti domlouvali manželství a rozhodovali, koho si děti vezmou. Přisouzení vývoje yuanu tak v takovém případě jednak umožňuje udržet

dobré vztahy s rodiči a dalšími osobami, jednak umožňuje zachovat jejich tvář. Yuanu je možno přisoudit i dobrý vývoj manželství. Tato atribuce pomáhá snížit závist druhých a rovněž chránit jejich tvář – pokud za úspěch manželství jiného může osud, nemusí se člověk v neúspěšném manželství za tento stav stydět (Yang & Ho, 1988). Yuan tak primárně slouží k udržení harmonie a solidarity ke skupině (Goodwin & Findlay, 1997).

Pro člověka žijícího v nepovedeném vztahu slouží yuan také jako obrana jeho vlastního ega a sebehodnocení. Když za vývoj vztahu může osud, znamená to, že člověk sám vinu nenese. To posiluje rovněž harmonii ve vztahu, protože z potíží nelze vinit ani partnera. Podobně tato atribuce slouží i k ospravedlnění stavu, kdy jedinec nemá partnera, a pomáhá lidem vyrovnat se s rozchodem (Lee, Lee & Lee, 2012). Neprovdaná žena tak může říci, že ještě nepotkala muže, s nímž by ji spojil osud. Případně, že jí osud určil zůstat neprovdána. To jí pomůže zachovat si vlastní tvář i tvář její rodiny. V ranných fázích vztahu může yuan fungovat i jako katalyzátor sloužící k jeho udržení. Protože dobrý prvotní dojem byl způsoben osudem, je dobré ve vztahu zůstat i když tento dojem vyprchá (Yang & Ho, 1988).

Úcta k rodičům

Úcta k rodičům (filial piety*, xiaodao,* 孝道) vychází z konfuciánského pojetí, že rodina je jedno tělo a dítě pochází z těl rodičů. Vztahy v rodině jsou hierarchické, děti se mají starat o rodiče a o ně samé se budou starat jejich vlastní děti. Úcta k rodičům v minulosti zahrnovala i podřízení se jejich vůli ohledně volby povolání nebo životního partnera (Hwang, 1999; Yeh & Bedford, 2004). Do určité míry se to projevuje i dnes. Zhang a Kline (2009) zkoumali, jak se čínští studenti liší od amerických v tom, zda si nechají od rodičů mluvit do toho, s kým chodí. Zatímco američtí studenti by chodili i s někým, koho jejich rodiče nesnáší a vztah jim rozmlouvají, čínští studenti by se nechali rodiči přemluvit k rozchodu. Stejně tak se blízký vztah k rodičům projevuje i tím, že taiwanští adolescenti častěji, než američtí vyhledávají při školní šikaně pomoc dospělých (Ma & Bellmore, 2016).

Výzkumu xiaodao se věnovali Wu et al. (2016), kteří zkoumali ochotu Taiwanců a Američanů pomoci matce a životnímu partnerovi v různých situacích – buďto život ohrožující nebo obyčejné. Měli si představit situaci, kdy oba potřebují pomoc, ale je možné stihnout pomoci jenom jednomu. Zatímco 72,7% Taiwanců by v život ohrožující situaci pomohlo matce, Američanů by to udělalo pouze 25%. U běžné situace by matce pomohlo 82,5% Taiwanců, kdežto Američanů pouze 37%. Když byli dotázáni, co je sociální normou v podobné volbě v jejich společnosti, domnívalo se 77,2% Taiwanců (ale jen 23,9% Američanů), že je to v život ohrožující situaci pomoci matce. Autoři udělali další experiment, kdy se ptali, jak moc si jsou lidé se svou matkou a životním partnerem blízcí. Taiwanci se cítili bližší matce než partnerovi, u Američanů tomu bylo naopak. Blízkost k dané osobě se ukázala jako důvod, proč se rozhodují ji zachránit. Pokud se měli rozhodnout mezi matkou a sourozencem, vybírali si Taiwanci častěji matku. Při volbě mezi matkou a dítětem vybírali oba stejně často. Američané přitom vybírali vždy mladšího příbuzného.

Pro postoj rodičů k výchově čínských dětí je typický pojem *guan*, který znamená vedení a trénování dětí skrze stálou kontrolu, jasné příkazy a vysoké nároky (Wang & Chang, 2010). Děti jsou rodiči vedeny k prosociálnímu chování, přičemž hlavní motivací je stud – pokud dítě

udělá něco, co není v souladu s prosociálním chováním, dávají mu rodiče najevo, že by se mělo stydět (Chen, 2010). Děti jsou rodiči trénovány k tomu, aby se styděly, již od velice raného věku – sotva se naučí chodit a mluvit. Rodiče je kárají, vyhrožují tresty, dávají jim hanlivá jména a svůj nesouhlas vyjadřují všemi dostupnými způsoby. Domnívají se, že striktní disciplína je nezbytná pro vytvoření blízkého vztahu s dětmi (Fung, 2006).

Zhong yong

Číňané mají tendenci k myšlení střední cesty – zhong yong (中庸). Doktrína středu znamená udržovat rovnováhu a harmonii směřováním mysli k vyváženému stavu, aniž člověk hledá kompromis mezi protikladnými póly. Člověk má nahlížet na každou situaci z různých perspektiv a vyhnout se extrémům. Tento způsob myšlení slouží k udržení harmonie s ostatními lidmi, přičemž se uplatňuje především vůči blízkým lidem a lidem, se kterými má člověk vazby, méně vůči lidem neznámým (Ji, Lee & Guo, 2010). Číňané tak častěji, než Američané souhlasí s tvrzeními typu „když slyším dva rozdílné názory, často souhlasím s oběma", „moje názory se mění v různých situacích" apod. (Boucher, Peng, Shi & Wang, 2009). Souvislost myšlení středu s udržením harmonie ve skupině ukazuje výzkum Seo, Kim, Tam a Rozina (2016), kteří zjistili, že hongkongští Číňané hodnotí svůj výkon hůře v přítomnosti velkého množství lidí, než pokud je přítomno malé množství lidí, kdežto u Američanů množství přihlížejících nehraje roli. Protože štěstí jednoho člověka může narušovat společenskou harmonii, je štěstí ve východoasijských kulturách považováno za méně pozitivní věc, než je tomu v kulturách západních (Choi, Kim & Uchida, 2016).

Protože lidé uplatňující myšlení střední cesty mají vyšší sebehodnocení a životní spokojenost a skórují níže ve škálách úzkosti a deprese, zkusili Yang et al. (2016), jestli jeho trénink zvýší účinnost klasické psychoterapie. Jednu skupinu studentů s depresivními potížemi nechali podstoupit standardní podpůrnou skupinovou terapii. Druhou skupinu nechali podstoupit skupinovou terapii o stejné délce se stejným psychoterapeutem, přičemž ten je navíc učil přemýšlet podle doktríny středu. Tato terapie byla účinnější v zmírnění depresivních potíží než podpůrná terapie u kontrolní skupiny.

Suzhi a bao

Termín suzhi (素质）označuje kvalitu člověka. Suzhi se týká osobnostních a charakterových vlastností člověka, morálních vlastností, schopností a vzdělání. Dělí se na morální kvality (de, 德), „vnitřní suzhi" týkající se např. etiky, sebekultivace a pomáhání druhým, a talent (cai, 才), „vnější suzhi" týkající se vzdělání, statusu, rodinného zázemí, schopností a životních zkušeností. Číňané tradičně dělí lidi na lidi s malým a velkým suzhi. Protože suzhi je spojeno s třídní příslušností, umožňuje takové označení vyhnout se pojmu třída. U lidí s lepším sociálním postavením se očekává větší suzhi, tedy lepší morálka. Pojem suzhi také často používá vláda, když mluví o loajalitě a morálce občanů (Wang, Lamond, Worm, Gao & Yang, 2014). Vysoké suzhi u čínských adolescentů snižuje sociální úzkost, protože přispívá k vyššímu sebehodnocení, které dále zvyšuje pocit bezpečí, což přispívá k nízké úzkosti (Pan, Zhang, Hu & Pan, 2018).

Číňané věří v koncept reciprocity – bao (報). Bao se týká jak pozitivní, tak negativní reciprocity. Lidé nemají druhým dlužit žádnou laskavost a mají se snažit vše oplatit. Tento zvyk slouží k tomu, aby se vztahy mezi lidmi nezhoršovaly a udržela se harmonie ve společnosti. Pokud někdo provede něco špatného, není nutné oplácet mu to osobně – odplatu mohou zajistit nadpřirozené síly např. ve formě nemoci (Leung, 2010:234).

Diskuse a závěr

Čínská původní psychologie může být inspirací pro výzkumníky z jiných kultur, protože těmto výzkumníkům umožňuje získat hlubší vhled do čínské kultury a inspirovat se zde (Xie, Su & Zhong, 2017). Výše popsané koncepty tak mohou výzkumníky inspirovat ke studiu existence podobných fenoménů v jejich vlastních kulturách a přispět tak vytvoření vyváženější globální psychologie. Při vytváření původních psychologií je však přítomno několik rizik, zejména tendence příliš zdůrazňovat jedinečnost vlastní kultury, přeceňovat její vliv, a s tím související přílišná fragmentace psychologie.

Původní psychologie předpokládají, že existuje něco jako místní kultura, co lze psychologicky zkoumat. Podle Allwooda (2011) výzkumníci v oblasti původních psychologií používají koncept kultury přejatý z antropologických studií malých skupin z první poloviny dvacátého století předpokládající, že v dané skupině existují nějaká univerzální pravidla chování. Protože se příliš nesnaží definovat, co je to kultura, o níž mluví, neuvědomují si, že tento koncept se nedá použít na společnost s miliony obyvatel, v níž různé skupiny sdílejí různé hodnoty a vzorce chování. Původní psychologové mají tendenci reifikovat koncept kultury jako něco, co existuje mimo lidi a ovlivňuje jejich chování, a ne jako něco, co tito lidé aktivně tvoří a mění v procesu vzájemné interakce (Allwood, 2011; Sundararajan, 2019). Rovněž Hwangův přístup je kritizován jako příliš redukcionistický ve smyslu přeceňování role kultury pro psychologii jedince. Idea kultury jako něčeho homogenního, co určuje fungování jedinců v ní žijících, je esencialistická a výzkumníkům v oblasti původních psychologií je doporučováno věnovat větší pozornost jednotlivcům a rozdílům mezi lidmi považovanými za patřící do stejné kultury (Kirschner, 2018).

Jednou z příčin sklonu původních psychologií reifikovat vlastní kulturu je jejich svázanost s politikou, když určují, co může a nemůže být považováno za místní kulturu (Allwood, 2011), případně na co všechno je možné poznatky získané v místní kultuře vztáhnout. V kontextu čínské původní psychologie se tak může objevovat tendence považovat čínskou psychologii za předobraz jiných východoasijských původních psychologií, a tedy za aplikovatelnou na jiné východoasijské národy, a rovněž tendence považovat vlastní kulturní skupinu za reprezentující celou společnost v dané zemi, např. v případě čínské psychologie konfucianismus za reprezentující Čínu (Sundararajan, 2019). Hwang (2019) a Liu (2017a) považují svůj přístup za aplikovatelný na všechny „nezápadní" kultury. Proti tomu se ovšem ozývají výzkumníci z jiných kultur. King a Hodgetts (2017) považují Liuovu „neokonfuciánskou" epistemologii za přístup možná vhodný pro studium čínské společnosti, který ovšem při použití v jiných kulturách může být stejně problematický jako současný hegemonní západní přístup.

Je otázkou, jaký je optimální počet původních psychologií, zda má každá kultura vyvíjet vlastní nebo kultury na určitém stupni příbuznosti mají vyvíjet společnou (Hwang, 2016).

Zatímco asijské kultury jsou si navzájem poměrně vzdálené a čínská původní psychologie je tak samostatná psychologická oblast smysluplná, kultury v okolí českých zemí jsou české kultuře nejspíše bližší, než je tomu v případě vzájemné blízkosti východoasijských zemí. Je tedy i otázkou, jestli by se čeští psychologové měli čínskou původní psychologií inspirovat a pokusit se vytvořit českou původní psychologii, případně původní psychologii nějaké větší kulturní entity, například evropskou nebo slovanskou.

Zdá se, že pod hlavičkou původní psychologie není vyvíjena žádná psychologie mající jako objekt Evropu jako kulturní entitu odlišnou od neevropských kultur. Smith (2005) se domnívá, že vzhledem k evropskému původu akademické psychologie nelze na Evropu aplikovat model vývoje původní psychologie jako reakci na mainstream. Za původní (*indigenous*) evropskou sociální psychologii považuje Smith Tajfelovu teorii sociální identity a Moscoviciho teorii sociálních reprezentací, nicméně v obou případech by se spíše hodilo slovo *original*, protože jde o univerzální teorie původně vzniklé v Evropě, nikoliv teorie vyvíjené jakožto aplikovatelné zejména na osoby patřící do evropského kulturního okruhu ve smyslu původních (*indigenous*) psychologií, tj. popisu místního chování lišícího se od chování na jiných místech (Poortinga, 2016).

Původní psychologie náboženství pro slovanskou oblast je navrhována Pankallou a Kośnikem (2018), kteří se snaží popisovat prožívání slovanské pohanské spirituality, přičemž základem je slovanské pojetí duše skládající se ze třech významů: místo, kde sídlí já; život dávající objekt asociovaný s dechem; a způsob posmrtné existence člověka. Pojem duše by podle nich měl být i základem pro organizaci teoretických kategorií původní slovanské psychologie náboženství a její ontologie a epistemologie (Pankalla a Kośnik, 2018).

Smyslem původních psychologií ovšem není vyvinout původní psychologii pro každou jednotlivou kulturu, spíše více akcentovat roli místní kultury v psychologii jednotlivce (Hwang, 2016). Není proto nutné mít původní psychologii v každém kulturním okruhu. Čínská kultura je však kulturou značně specifickou a jako taková si svou původní psychologii zaslouží.

Grantová podpora

Reference

Allwood, C.M. (2011). On the foundation of the indigenous psychologies. *Social Epistemology*, 25(1), 3–14.

Bedford, O., & Hwang, S.L. (2013). Building relationships for business in Taiwanese hostess clubs: the psychological and social processes of *guanxi* development. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20, 297–310.

Boucher, H., C., Peng, K., Shi, J., & Wang, L. (2009). Culture and implicit self-esteem: Chinese are "good" and "bad" at the same time. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 40, 24–45.

Čeněk, J., Smolík, J., & Vykoukalová, Z. (2016). *Interkulturní psychologie. Vybrané kapitoly.* Praha: Grada.

Dunning, J.H., & Kim, Ch. (2007). The cultural roots of guanxi: An exploratory study. *The World Economy*, *30*, 329–341.

Fung, H. (2006). Affect and early moral socialization: Some insights and contributions from indigenous psychological studies in Taiwan. In Kim, U., Yang, K.-S., & Hwang, K.-K. (2006, eds.). *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. Understanding People in Context* (s. 175–196). New York: Springer.

Fung, H. H., & Ng, S.-K. (2006). Age differences in the sixth personality factor: Age differences in interpersonal relatedness among Canadians and Hong Kong Chinese. *Psychology and Aging*, *21*, 810–814.

Goodwin, R., & Findlay, Ch. (1997). „We are just fated together"… Chinese love and the concept of *yuan* in England and Hong Kong. *Personal Relationships*, *4*, 85–92.

Han, K.-H. (2016). The feeling of „face" in Confucian society: From a perspective of psychosocial equilibrium. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:1055. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01055

Hui, Ch., & Graen, G. (1997). Guanxi and professional leadership in contemporary sino--american joint ventures in mainland China. *Leadership Quarterly*, *8*, 451–465.

Hwang, K.-K. (1987). Face and favor: The Chinese power game. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 944–974.

Hwang, K.-K. (1998). Guanxi and mientze: Conflict resolution in Chinese society. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, *7*, 17–37.

Hwang, K.-K. (1999). Filial piety and loyalty: Two types of social identification in Confucianism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *2*, 163–183.

Hwang, K.-K. (2005). From anticolonialism to postcolonialism: The emergence of Chinese indigenous psychology in Taiwan. *International Journal of Psychology*, *40*, 228–238.

Hwang, K.-K. (2006). Moral face and social face: Contingent self-esteem in Confucian society. *International Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 276–281.

Hwang, K.-K. (2012). *Foundations of Chinese Psychology. Confucian Social Relations.* New York: Springer.

Hwang, K.-K. (2016). Philosophical switch for the third wave of psychology in the age of globalization. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 58, 97–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12085

Hwang, K.-K. (2019). Enhancing cultural awareness by the construction of culture-inclusive theories. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *39*(2), 67–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000086

Hwang, K.-K., & Han, K.-H. (2010). Face and morality in Confucian society. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (s. 479–498). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, X. (2010). Socio-emotional development in Chinese children. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (s. 39–52). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, X.-P., & Chen, Ch. C. (2004). On the intricacies of the Chinese guanxi: A process of guanxi development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *21*, 305–324.

Chen, X.-P., & Peng, S. (2008). Guanxi dynamics: Shifts in the closeness of ties between Chinese coworkers. *Management and Organization Review*, *4*, 63–80.

Cheng, S. C. L., & Yau, O. H. M. (2006). Yuan (緣): The case of Chinese pop songs. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 11, 331–340.

Choi, E., Kim, Y.-Y., & Uchida, Y. (2016). The folk psychology of happiness in Korea. *Korean Journal of Culture and Social Issues*, *22*, 165–182. https://doi.org/10.20406/kjcs.2016.05.22.2.165

Jahoda, G. (2016). On the rise and decline of 'indigenous psychology'. *Culture & Psychology, 22*, 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X16634052

Ji, L.-J., Lee, A., & Guo, T. (2010). The thinking styles of Chinese people. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (s. 155–167). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khan, A., Zolkiewski, J., & Murphy, J. (2016). Favour and opportunity: renqing in Chinese business relationships. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, *31*(2), 183–192. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-02-2014-0036

King, P., & Hodgetts, D. (2017). Gathering a few thoughts on 'Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy'. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *20*, 161–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12174

Kirschner, S. R. (2018). Indigenous psychology compared to what? Some complexities of culture, language and social life. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 39*(2), 98–106. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000110

Lee, Y.Ch., Lee, Y.-Ch., & Lee, Ch.-K. (2012). The study of relationships among undergraduate students' explanatory style, yuan-fen style, and breakup-dealing. In Wu, Y. (2012, ed.). Advanced Technology in Teaching – Proceedings of the 2009 3rd International Conference on Teaching and Computational Science (WTCS 2009) Volume 2: Education, Psychology and Computer Science (s. 393–400). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Leung, K. (2010). Beliefs in Chinese culture. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (s. 221–240). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leung, T.K.P., Heung, V.C.S., & Wong, Y.H. (2008). Cronyism. One possible consequence of guanxi for an insider: how to obtain and maintain it? *European Journal of Marketing*, *42*, 23–34.

Liu, J.H. (2017a). Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy: Practical postulates for actioning psychology as a human science. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *20*, 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12168

Liu, J.H. (2017 b). Dialoguing Height Psychology into a life of interconnectedness: Response to commentaries by Hwang, Bhawuk, King & Hodgetts, Kashima, and Xie, Su, & Zhong. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *20*, 176–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12180

Ma, T.-L., & Bellmore, A. (2016). Connection or independence: Cross-cultural comparisons of adolescents' coping with peer victimization using mixed methods. *Journal of Cross--Cultural Psychology*, *47*, 109–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115605386

Pan, Z., Zhang, D., Hu, T., & Pan, Y. (2018). The relationship between psychological *Suzhi* and social anxiety among Chinese adolescents: the mediating role of self-esteem and sense of security. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 12–50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-018-0255-y

Pankalla, A., & Kośnik, K. (2018). Religion as an invaluable source of psychological knowledge: Indigenous Slavic psychology of religion. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology, 39*(3), 154–164. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000080

Poortinga, Y.H. (2016). Integration of basic controversies in cross-cultural psychology. *Psychology of Developing Societies*, *28*(2), 161–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971333616657169

Qian, W., Razzaque, M.A., & Keng, K.A. (2007). Chinese cultural values and gift-giving behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, *24*(4), 214–228.

Seo, M., Kim, Y.-H., Tam, K.-P., & Rozin, P. (2016). I am dumber when I look dumb in front of many (vs. Few) others: A cross-cultural difference in how audience size affects perceived social reputation and self-judgments. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *47*, 1019–1032. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116659020

Shi, G., Shi, Y., Chan, A. K. K., Liu, M.T., & Fam, K.S. (2011). The role of renqing in mediating customer relationship investment and relationship commitment in China. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *40*, 496–502.

Smith, P. B. (2005). Is there an indigenous European social psychology? *International Journal of Psychology*, *40*, 254–262.

Su, Ch., & Littlefield, J.E. (2001). Entering Guanxi: A business ethical dilemma in mainland China? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *33*, 199–210.

Sundararajan, L. (2019). Whither indigenous psychology? *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2), 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000115

Tsai, M.-H., Chi, S.-Ch. S., & Hu, H.-H. (2009). Salespeople's renqing orientation, self-esteem, and selling behaviors: An empirical study in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Psychology*, *24*, 193–200.

Wang, D.-Ch., & Pak, Ch.-M. (2015). Renqing (personal relationship) and resource allocation: behaviour analysis of low income qualification assessment by village secretaries. *China Journal of Social Work*, 8(2), 107–121.

Wang, G. G., Lamond, D., Worm, V., Gao, W., & Yang, S. (2014). Understanding the indigenous Chinese concept of suzhi (素质) from an HRM perspective. A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, *5*, 98–114.

Wang, Q., & Chang, L. (2010). Parenting and child socialization in contemporary China. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (s. 53–67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wong, Y.H., Leung, T.K.P., Hung, H., & Ngai, E.W.T. (2007). A model of guanxi development: Flexibility, Commitment and Capital Exchange. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *18*, 875–887.

Wu, T.-F, Cross, S. E., Wu, Ch.-W., Cho, W., & Tey, S.-H. (2016). Choosing your mother or your spouse: Close relationship dilemmas in Taiwan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *47*, 558–580. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115625837

Xie, T., Su, D.Ch., & Zhong, N. (2017). Confucianism as canonic culture. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *20*, 170–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12175

Yang, K.S., & Ho, D.Y.F. (1988). The role of yuan in Chinese social life: A conceptual and empirical analysis. In Paranjpe, A. C., Ho, D. Y. F., & Rieber, R. W. (Eds.). *Asian contributions to psychology* (s. 263–281). New York: Praeger.

Yang, K.S. (1999). Towards an indigenous Chinese psychology: A selective review of methodological, theoretical, and empirical accomplishments. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 181–211.

Yang, K.S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches: The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, *3*, 241–263.

Yang, K.S. (2006). Indigenized conceptual and empirical analyses of selected Chinese psychological characteristics. *International Journal of Psychology*, *41*, 298–303.

Yang, X., Zhang, P., Zhao, J., Zhao, J., Wang, J., Chen, Y.… Zhang, X. (2016). Confucian culture still matters: The benefits of zhongyong thinking (doctrine of the mean) for mental health. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *47*, 1097–1113. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116658260

Yeh, K.H., & Bedford, O. (2004). Filial belief and parent-child conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, *39*, 132–144.

Zhang, S., & Kline, S. L. (2009). Can I make my own decision? A cross-cultural study of perceived social network influence in mate selection. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*, 3–23.

Zhang, Z.-X. (2006). Chinese conceptions of justice and reward allocation. In Kim, U., Yang, K.-S., & Hwang, K.-K. (2006, eds.). *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. Understanding People in Context* (s. 403–420). New York: Springer.

Basic themes of Chinese indigenous psychology[1]

Václav Linkov[2]

CDV – Transport Research Centre

Abstrakt

Původní psychologie studují místní fenomény s pomocí konceptů a terminologie vycházejících z dané kultury. Takovou psychologií je i čínská původní psychologie, která vznikla jako hnutí za odzápadnění psychologie v čínsky mluvících zemích. Mezi témata, která zkoumá, patří guanxi – vztah mezi dvěma lidmi udržovaný vzájemnou výměnou dárků či pomoci. Dalšími v textu probranými tématy jsou tvář, renqing (laskavost), yuan (víra v osud určující vývoj mezilidských vztahů), xiao (úcta k rodičům vycházející z konfuciánských tradic), zhong yong (myšlení středu), suzhi (kvalita člověka) a *bao* (koncept reciprocity).

Klíčová slova:

Původní psychologie, Čína, guanxi

---

[2] Corresponding author: Václav Linkov, Centrum dopravního výzkumu, v.v.i., Líšeňská 33a, Brno, 60200 Email: linkov@email.cz

Abstract[3]

Indigenous psychologies study local phenomena through concepts and terminology native to the people in that given culture in order to provide a deeper understanding of the local culture. Indigenous psychologies began to spread in the 1970s in various non-Western countries. Chinese indigenous psychology began as a movement for the liberation of psychology in Chinese areas from Western influences. In this text, we review the culturally specific themes that are studied by Chinese indigenous psychologists.

One popular concept studied by many researchers is *guanxi*. *Guanxi* is a relationship between two people that is based on something that they have in common and that is maintained by the mutual exchange of favors. The possibility of receiving help is the main reason people seek to establish *guanxi*.

Another concept is that of "face". Face represents the evaluation of a person's behavior in a social situation. Chinese people are very concerned with saving face for themselves and their acquaintances. Face could be lost through incorrect behavior of a person or through the misbehavior of a family member. It is better to lose face in the presence of strangers than in the presence of people who are close.

Renqing is the will to help another person. If someone receives *renqing*, he or she should return it. It is hard to measure the value of a favor, so it can never be fully returned. Chinese people, therefore, do not like to receive *renqing* from someone.

Yuan is destiny that is focused on and responsible for relationships. A romantic relationship is considered to be based upon good or bad *yuan*. If the relationship does not go well, it is not the responsibility of the partners or the people who persuaded the couple to start the relationship (i.e., parents), but it is because of *yuan*. In this way, *yuan* helps to maintain social harmony.

Filial piety (*xiao*) binds children to their parents. Children should respect their parents and their parents can influence their children's decisions, including the selection of a romantic partner. Chinese parents enforce tight control of their children from early childhood.

---

[3] The English abstract is longer than Czech version because it was a requirement for Czech articles.

Zhong yong is the tendency to maintain a middle-of-the-road style of thinking and behavior. Everything should be perceived from many points of view and a decision should not be made too quickly. Extremes should be avoided.

Suzhi is the quality of a person – moral characteristics, abilities, and education. People with higher social status are expected to have more *suzhi*.

Bao is the concept of reciprocity. If someone does something good or bad, it should be returned. The reciprocity concept helps to maintain harmony in society.

Chinese indigenous psychology might serve as inspiration for researchers from other cultures. Nevertheless, researchers need to pay attention to the risk of the reification of their own cultures. Chinese indigenous psychologists are criticized for their overestimation of the role of culture on the behavior of Chinese people. Researchers who develop indigenous psychologies in their cultures should be aware of the political pressure to express the uniqueness of their own culture. In the case of Czech psychology, it is an open question as to whether it should develop its own indigenous psychology or work with researchers from culturally similar nations, like other Slavic cultures.

Keywords:

Indigenous psychology, China, *guanxi*

Introduction

Indigenous psychologies[4] study phenomena in specific cultures with the concepts and terminology that are used by the people in that culture. This approach allows for the better

---

[4] The translation of the term "indigenous psychology" into the Czech language is not yet settled. I used term „*domorodá psychologie*" in the past. It was borrowed from earlier publications (like Čeněk, Smolík & Vykoukalová, 2016). However, this translation has a negative connotation in Czech language. The term „*lokální*" ("local") might be suggested, but it makes the impression that it is less than "global". The usage of this word would also create problems for translating terms used in published works (e.g., Yang (2000) writes about „local indigenous psychology"). This is the reason why I chose the translation „*původní psychologie*".

understanding of the culture and the ability to get deeper knowledge about it. Indigenous psychologies started to gain prominence in non-Western countries in the 1970s as a reaction to Western (especially American) hegemony (Jahoda, 2016). This text contains descriptions of the most important themes that are researched by Chinese indigenous psychology. Focus will be on the concepts that are specific to the Chinese environment and help to understand Chinese culture.

The goals of Chinese indigenous psychology were summarized by Yang (1999). The hegemony of Western educational systems led to the acceptance of Western theories, concepts, and methods by social scientists from non-Western societies. This created westernized social sciences, which are incompatible with many local cultures and phenomena. Psychology in Chinese societies has gone through this process to create westernized psychology. In Taiwan, it is considered Americanized psychology. The Chinese indigenous psychology movement was developed as a movement for the Sinicization of this psychology (Yang, 1999, 2006). Chinese indigenous psychology flourished especially in Taiwan, where it began to develop after a conference about the Sinicization of social sciences in Tapei in 1981. Its protagonists believed that a change to the theoretical and methodological roots might create an approach to psychology that would allow for a better understanding of the social and psychological processes in Chinese culture (Hwang, 2005).

Indigenous psychologies created many manifests to describe authors' ideas about how to produce psychological research. This takes seriously both local specific phenomena in the researchers' countries and helps with the development of psychology as a global science (Hwang, 2019). Chinese indigenous psychology created such manifests as well. Yang (1999) thinks that Western psychology is an individualist psychology that investigates an isolated individual. Contrary to this, Chinese indigenous psychology should be collectivist psychology that investigates the individual in relation to their social environs and historical surroundings. Indigenous psychology researches individual behavioral schemes and processes in local cultures and their social contexts. According to Yang, research should begin with the researchers' imagination of their own experience, including their perceptions, feelings, thoughts, motives, and behaviors in a specific situation. Researchers might conduct unstructured qualitative research as a pilot study after mobilizing their tacit knowledge in this way. After such a qualitative investigation, they might design the subsequent research. Research in indigenous psychologies is not reserved for local scholars – a local researcher

might be "brainwashed" (Yang, 1999:187) by Western training such that a foreign researcher might be more sensitive for the capture of locally specific phenomena.

According to Yang's (1999) plan, indigenous psychology should begin with studying locally unique phenomena. It should move to research that involves more cultures only after learning how to conduct research from the local perspective. Local indigenous psychologies should be created first, followed by the indigenous psychologies of larger cultural entities, and finally global indigenous psychology should be derived based on them (Yang, 2000). Hwang (2013:11) thinks that the goal of indigenous psychologies should be the creation of a global psychology that is based on a series of theories that reflect both the universal structure of the human mind and the mentality of people in their local culture.

The vision for how indigenous psychologies might work was presented by Liu (2017a). Mainstream psychology is based on Western philosophy with Greek roots. Consequently, its main method is to divide problems into variables and analyze them separately. Asian psychologies and especially Chinese psychology might change this approach and introduce a holistic approach into psychological science. The dispute whether to use natural science epistemology is irrelevant for Asian psychology, despite its relevance in Western civilization. Western dualist philosophy, which contradicts the observed thing (i.e., phenomenon) and its real appearance (i.e., noumenon), is not suitable for Asian psychology. Chinese philosophy's holistic approach states that humans are able to learn both phenomenon and noumenon. Asian psychology should begin with the recognition that human behavioral laws are not universal, but dependent on the situation and social status of the involved people. The dimensions of reality in these theories should be enlarged by another dimension – the intentions and wishes of the researcher who created these theories. Researchers should not be neutral towards the things they research, but they should use research that is humanized to the society (Liu, 2017a). Social sciences should serve as a tool to prevent bad versions in the future (Liu, 2017b).

Themes of Chinese indigenous psychology

Guanxi

The term *guanxi* (關係) denotes a specific type of human relationship in Chinese society. It is based on a *guanxi* dyad, which is the relationship or connection between two people. These dyads form "*guanxi* nets" of people who are interconnected by *guanxi*. A person might use *guanxi* to reach their goals after establishing it. *Guanxi* is build on a base, which is common for two people who are in *guanxi* together. It might be the same birthplace, the same school both graduated from, the same (former) workplace, or common friends. Different types of bases might classify *guanxi* into *jia-ren guanxi* among members of the primary family; *shou-ren guanxi* among more distant relatives, friends, relationships between student and teacher, relationships between schoolmates, neighbors, and colleagues from a workplace; and *sheng-ren guanxi* between citizens of the same municipality or employees of a large company (Su & Littlefield, 2001). The *guanxi* base might also be the so-called anticipatory base, which is oriented to the future when both people in the emerging *guanxi dyad* want to do similar things in future. *Guanxi* is a way for Chinese people to cope with living in an environment where mutual trust does not exist between people. The more people can trust each other, the better *guanxi*. It is important to see that the partner shows clear signs of being devoted to the relationship and of doing everything in the best interests of the second person. Being useful to the second person is also important in a *guanxi* relationship. *Guanxi* emerges initially by two people who are strangers to each other searching for a *guanxi* base into which to establish the roots of a relationship. Their conversation touches everything related to life experience, friends, acquaintances, colleagues, and schoolmates. They want to find something that both have in common. If they are not successful in finding a common place, person, or organization, they start to talk about their future plans to create an anticipatory base. If a *guanxi* base is not found, *guanxi* cannot be established (Chen & Chen, 2004). Visiting clubs and drinking alcohol together might serve to establish and preserve *guanxi* between men in business relations (Bedford & Hwang, 2013).

Guanxi is preserved by exchanging favors (Leung, Heung, & Wong, 2006). If *guanxi* is to last, a few rules have to be followed. First, people should help those who helped them in the past and they should not endanger them. If they do not follow this, they lose face (Wong et al., 2007). Second, paying back a favor does not need to be immediate. It might take a long

time. The readiness to return a favor after a long period of time signals a good quality *guanxi*. Third, a favor that is returned should have real value for the person to whom it is returned. It is necessary to know the second person and be interested in their needs (if the person refuses the offered favor, like being invited to a club, it might lead to the end of the *guanxi* relationship, Bedford & Hwang, 2013). Fourth, a person wants to make the other side feel the obligation, so it is necessary to return more than had been received. The fact that the person returned more shows their willingness to stay in and maintain the *guanxi* relationship (Chen & Chen, 2004). On the other side, it is usually tolerated if the weaker partner returns less (Dunning & Kim, 2007).

The possibility to ask for help and receive it is the reason why people build and preserve *guanxi* (Hui & Graen, 1997). If their request is not heard or they receive less than expected, they might feel betrayed and the quality of the *guanxi* will worsen (Chen & Peng, 2008). If a person refuses to provide help and if they want to keep the *guanxi*, they need to explain that it was not possible due to some irrevocable reason such that the person is not responsible. The person should compensate and return the favor in some other way (Chen & Chen, 2004).

Guanxi influences many aspects of Chinese life, like how the Chinese split remunerations with their colleagues. The stronger the *guanxi* with someone, the larger the part of the reward would be given to that person. If two Chinese people do not have a *guanxi* relationship (e.g., they are strangers), they separate the reward in a manner that is beneficial to themselves (Zhang, 2006). Preventing the worsening of *guanxi* relationships is more important than equality and justice (Wang & Pak, 2015).

Face

Face (*mianzi*, 面子) is a cognitive response to the social evaluation of a person's behavior in specific situations (Hwang, 2006). There are two types of face. Social face is obtained through status that rises from talent and effort or through contacts. Moral face is a base for the moral integrity of a person. People might ignore their social face, but it is necessary to keep their moral face (Hwang, 2006).

Research about face focuses on saving and maintaining face. The effort to save face is related to lower agreeableness and higher neuroticism (Fung & Ng, 2006). People should try

to save face for their superiors. If superiors say or do something, their subordinates should not publicly criticize them, despite their opinion. If the person refuses to save face for another person, be it a superior or a colleague, it might destroy the relationship and any positive emotions between the two people might vanish (Hwang, 1998). People connect face-saving with just behavior and good results at work. For elderly people, saving face is tied to the behavior and successful career of their children; their own behavior is not as important. Chinese people evaluate strangers' behavior worse than if the same behavior were conducted by their relatives because it allows them to save their relatives' face (Hwang, 2006).

A loss of face might be caused by conducting a theft, the insufficient upbringing of children, the lack of filial piety, not keeping one's word, treason, espionage for foreign powers, spitting and throwing trash on the street, or speaking too loudly. These might be categorized as immoral behavior, bad habits (e.g., bad hygiene), incompetent behavior (e.g., failing to do something that is expected by others), and revealing personal issues (e.g., revealing bad intentions or spreading secrets in public). People may make an effort to save not only their own face, but also the face of their "larger self" – in other words, the group to which they belong, like their family (Hwang & Han, 2010).

Losing face is dependent on how the person loses it. This is influenced by whether higher or lower ranked people are present, if there is emotional support from other people, if the people are hostile, and how other people behave after the person loses their face. If people should lose face, they try to make it happen in a way that is the least hurtful. The best is to lose face in the presence of strangers whom the person need never meet again. Losing face in front of friends is better than losing it in front of family – friends do not lose face with the person, but the family does. When people were asked whether they would choose a doctor who was a stranger to them or a doctor who was related to them to treat a venereal disease, 91% selected the stranger. If they should decide who would treat them for gallstones, 92% would select a relative, because they might get better care. This was similar in a study where people chose whether they would go to a bank to borrow money for their children's tuition or borrow it from their family. If the reason they needed money was because they were being robbed, they would ask a relative. However, if the reason was that they were not able to earn enough money, they would go to a bank, because asking a relative would mean that they were unsuccessful in supporting their family and they would lose face in the presence of this relative (Han, 2016).

Renqing

Renqing (人情) is a concept employed in relationships that have an affective part, but where the relationship is not so close (e.g., relationships with neighbors, schoolmates, or colleagues).

The first meaning of the word *renqing* refers to empathy and willingness to help. A person who knows *renqing* is an empathic person who helps others if they visibly need it. *Renqing* is also a set of behavioral norms regarding how a person should behave when someone is in trouble (Hwang, 1987). In such a case, the person should feel sympathy and try to help – give *renqing* to someone in trouble. The meaning of such *renqing* is to do a favor or help. It is strongly related to the value of given things (Qian, Razzaque & Keng, 2007). *Renqing* is connected to the idea of equity and reciprocity. If a person receives *renqing*, then they should return it to the one who gave and return more than was given (Khan, Zolkiewski. & Murphy, 2016). Because it is not guaranteed that *renqing* will ever be reciprocated, people thoroughly consider whether to give it (Hwang, 1987). The willingness to give *renqing* is related to the will to maintain the relationship with the person in need (Shi et al., 2011). Khan, Zolkiewski, and Murphy (2016) define *renqing* in business relations as giving favors – like replying to a business partner's requests faster than to the requests of his competitors, and giving opportunities, like inviting a partner to speak at a business meeting.

If people have good face, it raises their status and the willingness of others to offer *renqing*. Saving or enhancing the face of another person is also a way to give *renqing*. That is another reason why the Chinese do not criticize others, especially superiors, or why they use vague formulations when they start a critique. People could enhance their face if they give *renqing*. They might lose face if they do not give *renqing* or not return it. If people are asked to give *renqing* or return it, they might employ a postponement strategy – do not answer and pretend to no to hear requests or not understand them. This gives an opportunity to save one's face and not give *renqing* simultaneously (Hwang, 1987).

It is impossible to pay back a debt in *renqing*, because empathy and help cannot be exactly quantified. It is possible to pay back money, but *renqing* can never be reimbursed. Because of this, the Chinese never want to owe *renqing* to anyone. This is especially true for rich people, who have a lot of wealth to lose (Hwang, 1987). *Renqing* is also not a good strategy in business. Experienced and successful businessmen consider the maintenance of the *renqing* rules as less important than less experienced businessmen do (Tsai, Chi & Hu, 2009).

Yuan

The Chinese traditionally believe that relationships between people are predetermined by destiny (Goodwin & Findlay, 1997). *Yuan* (緣) means destiny or predetermination in the context of a relationship. *Yuan* is responsible for the mutual attraction or dislike between people. *Yuan* is especially important in close relationships, but it has influence over relationships with friends and business partners. Long-term relationships are influenced by *yuanfen* (緣份). Incidental encounters (like travelling in the same train car with someone) are influenced by *jiyuan* (機緣) (Yang & Ho, 1988). The meanings of *yuan* and *yuanfen* have been in the process of being unified in recent decades. The word *yuan* is present in 10% of Chinese popular songs (Cheng & Yau, 2006).

Because the fate of relationships is predestined by *yuan*, it is impossible to escape it and people have to accept it. This allows those who helped to create the relationship – like parents who arrange marriages – to not be blamed for the bad fate of the relationship. Attributing the case of a bad relationship to *yuan* helps to maintain good relations with parents and other people, and it helps them to save face. Also, a good marriage can be attributed to *yuan*. This helps to lower the envy of others and helps to save their faces. If a successful marriage is caused by destiny, people in bad marriages do not need to be ashamed by their marriage (Yang & Ho, 1988). *Yuan* primarily serves to keep harmony and solidarity between people within a group (Goodwin & Findlay, 1997).

Yuan helps to protect the ego and maintain the self-esteem of people who live in unsuccessful relationships. If a bad marriage is caused by destiny, the individuals are not responsible. This helps to maintain harmony in the relationship, because the partner cannot be blamed either. Attributing a situation to *yuan* also helps single people and those who are coping with a break up (Lee, Lee, & Lee, 2012). An unmarried woman might say that she has not met a man with whom she would be united by destiny. Or she might say that *yuan* decided that she would stay unmarried. This helps to save her face and the face of her family. *Yuan* might work as a catalyst to maintain the relationship in its early phases. Because a good first impression is caused by destiny, it is good to stay in a relationship even if the good impression vanishes (Yang & Ho, 1988).

Filial piety

Filial piety (*xiaodao*, 孝道) is based on the Confucian belief that family is one body and children came from the bodies of their parents. Relationships in a family are hierarchical. Children should take care of their parents and they will be taken care of by their children when the time comes. In the past, filial piety involved respecting the parents' decision about one's occupation or marital partner (Hwang, 1999; Yeh & Bedford, 2004). This continues today to a certain extent. Zhang and Kine (2009) researched whether Chinese and American students differed in how they allow their parents to influence whom they date. American students would date even someone whom their parents hated and were against the relationship. Chinese students would respect their parents' will in such case. Close relationships to parents cause Taiwanese adolescents to seek parental help when being bullied in school more often than American adolescents do (Ma & Bellmore, 2016).

Xiadao, which is operationalized as the willingness to help the mother and marital partner, was researched by Wu et al. (2016). Taiwanese and Americans should decide which they would help in two situations – one was life-threatening and one was an everyday situation. They were asked to imagine that the lack of time allowed them to help only one: their mother or their marital partner. While 72.7% Taiwanese would help their mother in the life-threatening situation, only 25% Americans would do so. When they were asked about the social norm in their society, 77.2% Taiwanese (but only 23.9% Americans) thought it was to help the mother in the life-threatening situation. The authors asked also how close people feel to their mother and their marital partner. The Taiwanese felt that they were closer to their mother, while Americans felt closer to their partners. The feelings of closeness are the reason that they decide who they would save. If the Taiwanese should choose between their mother and a sibling, they choose the mother. If deciding between their mother and their own child, they choose both with the same probability. Americans always choose the younger relative.

Guan is a typical term for the Chinese attitude towards raising children. It means to lead and train children through continuous control, clear orders, and high expectations (Wang & Chang, 2010). Parents lead children toward prosocial behavior. Their main motivation is shame. If children do something that contradicts prosocial behavior, the parents show them that they should feel shame (Chen, 2010). Parents train children to feel ashamed from a very early age, often immediately after they start to walk and speak. Parents scold them, threaten them with punishment, give them defamatory nicknames, and try to show disagreement with

149

any available means. They think that strict discipline is necessary to establish a close relationship with their children (Fung, 2006).

Zhong yong

The Chinese tend to think that it is best to follow the doctrine of the mean – *zhong yong* (中庸). This means that they maintain balance and harmony by leading one's mind to a balanced state where the person seeks a compromise between opposite poles. A person should consider every situation from different perspectives and avoid extremes. This strategy helps to maintain harmony with other people. It is used more often with family and friends and people with whom the person has some ties rather than with complete strangers (Ji, Lee & Guo, 2010). The Chinese, more often than Americans, agree with statements like "I often agree with both contradicting opinions I hear" or "My opinions change in different situations" (Boucher, Peng, Shi, & Wang, 2009). Seo, Kim, Tam, and Rozina (2016) have shown a connection between the doctrine of the mean and the maintenance of harmony in a group. They found that Chinese Hongkongers evaluate their performance as worse when a large number of people is present. The number of people in the audience does not play role in one's performance evaluation for Americans. Luck is considered to be less positive in East Asian cultures than in Western cultures, because one's luck might erode the harmony in the society (Choi, Kim, & Uchida, 2016).

People who follow the doctrine of the mean have higher self-esteem and life satisfaction and they score lower on depression and anxiety scales. This led Yang et al. (2016) to test whether the doctrine of the mean helps to enhance the success of classical psychotherapy. One group of students with depression symptoms received standard group psychotherapy. The other group received group therapy of the same length and with the same psychotherapist, but they were additionally taught to think according to the doctrine of the mean. The second therapy was more successful for the mitigation of depressive symptoms mitigation.

Suzhi and *bao*

The term *suzhi* (素质）denotes the quality of a person. *Suzhi* relates to the personality and moral characteristics of a person, their abilities, and their education. It might be separated

into moral qualities (*de*, 德) – „inner *suzhi*" relates to ethics, self-cultivation, and helping others – and to talent (*cai*, 才) – „outer *suzhi*" relates to education, status, family background, abilities, and life experience. The Chinese separate people into those with low *suzhi* and those with high *suzhi*. Because *suzhi* is related to a social class, using the word "*suzhi*" avoids the overt usage of the term for class. People with higher social status are expected to have higher *suzhi*, which means that they are supposed to be more moral. The government uses the term *suzhi* when speaking about loyalty and the moral qualities of citizens (Wang, Lamond, Worm, Gao, & Yang, 2014).

The Chinese believe in the concept of reciprocity – *bao* (報). *Bao* denotes both positive and negative reciprocity. People should not owe a favor to anyone and they should return everything. This custom serves to avoid the worsening of relationships among people and to keep harmony in society. If someone does something wrong, it is not necessary to respond personally – the revenge might be conducted by supernatural powers, such as an illness (Leung, 2010:234).

Discussion and conclusion

Chinese indigenous psychology might be an inspiration for researchers from other cultures because it helps them obtain deeper knowledge into Chinese culture and get inspiration (Xie, Su, & Zhong, 2017). The concepts described above might inspire researchers to study similar phenomena in their own cultures and help in the creation of a more balanced global psychology. The creation of indigenous psychologies also brings some risks – particularly the tendency to over-emphasize the uniqueness of one's own culture, overestimate its influence, and, as a consequence, contribute to the excessive fragmentation of psychology.

Indigenous psychologies assume the existence of the concept of a local culture that might be psychologically examined. According to Allwood (2011), indigenous psychological researchers use the concept of culture that is borrowed from the anthropological studies of small groups from the first half of the 20th Century. These studies assume that there are

universal behavioral rules in such groups. Because they do not make a large effort to define "culture", they do not realize that this concept could not be used for a society with millions of people where different groups share different norms and patterns of behavior. Indigenous psychologists tend to reify the concept of culture as something that influences people's behavior and exists outside of these people. It is not something that is actively being created by people and changed continuously through interactions (Allwood, 2011; Sundararajan, 2019). Hwang's approach is criticized as too reductionist because it overestimates the role of cultures in the psychology of the individual. The image of culture as something homogenous and an influence on the behavior of people who live in it is essentialist. Indigenous psychological researchers suggest that we pay more attention to individuals and the differences between the people who are considered to belong to the same culture (Kirschner, 2018).

The connection to politics is one of the reasons for the reification of one's own cultures by indigenous psychologies. They decide what might be considered as local culture and what should be not considered as such (Allwood, 2011) and to what cultures local indigenous findings might be generalized. Chinese indigenous psychologists might consider Chinese psychology to be the source for other East Asian indigenous psychologies, and thus applicable to other East Asian nations. Indigenous psychologists might also consider their own culture to be representative for the whole society in their country, like how Chinese psychology considers Confucianism as representative of all of China (Sundararajan, 2019). Hwang (2019) and Liu (2017a) consider their approaches to be applicable to all "non-Western" cultures. Researchers from other cultures disagree. King and Hodgetts (2017) consider Liu's "Neoconfucian" epistemology to perhaps be applicable to Chinese society; however, in other cultures it might prove to be as problematic as the current hegemonical Western approach.

An unsolved dispute is the optimal number of indigenous psychologies: Should each culture develop its own characteristics with a certain degree of kinship that would lead to a common indigenous psychology (Hwang, 2016)? While East Asian cultures are relatively distinct and the existence of a Chinese indigenous psychology as an independent discipline makes sense, cultures that neighbor the Czech Republic are probably closer to Czech culture than the mutual closeness of East Asian countries. So it is questionable as to whether Czech psychologists should be inspired by Chinese indigenous psychology and try to create a Czech

indigenous psychology or an indigenous psychology for some large cultural entity, like European or Slavic.

It seems that nothing branded as "indigenous psychology" has been developed for Europe as a cultural entity that is different from non-European cultures. Smith (2005) thinks that it is not possible to apply to Europe a model of indigenous psychology development as a reaction to the mainstream, because academic psychology has a European origin. Smith considers Tajfel's social identity theory and Moscovici's theory of social representations to be European indigenous social psychologies. However, the term "original" would be more appropriate in both cases, because both are universal theories that originally developed in Europe, not theories that developed as applicable only to people with European cultural backgrounds as is found in indigenous psychologies, which means describing local behavior as different from behavior in other places (Poortinga, 2016).

An indigenous Slavic psychology of religion was suggested for Slavic countries by Pankalla and Kośnik (2018). They describe how people experienced Slavic pagan spirituality, which had a base built from the Slavic understanding of a soul that consists of three meanings: place, where the person resides; the object associated to the breath which gives life; and the afterlife existence of a person. The soul should be the root term for these theoretical categories of the Slavic indigenous psychology of religion, as well as its ontology and epistemology (Pankalla & Kośnik, 2018).

The purpose of indigenous psychologies is not to develop indigenous psychology for every culture. More likely, it is to accent the role of local culture in individual psychology (Hwang, 2016). It is not necessary to have indigenous psychology in every cultural group. Nevertheless, Chinese culture is a really unique culture and, as such, it deserves its own indigenous psychology.

Acknowledgements

References

Allwood, C.M. (2011). On the foundation of the indigenous psychologies. *Social Epistemology*, 25(1), 3–14.

Bedford, O., & Hwang, S.L. (2013). Building relationships for business in Taiwanese hostess clubs: the psychological and social processes of guanxi development. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 20, 297–310.

Boucher, H., C., Peng, K., Shi, J., & Wang, L. (2009). Culture and implicit self-esteem: Chinese are "good" and "bad" at the same time. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40, 24–45.

Čeněk, J., Smolík, J., & Vykoukalová, Z. (2016). *Interkulturní psychologie. Vybrané kapitoly [Cross-cultural psychology. Selected chapters]*. Praha: Grada.

Dunning, J.H., & Kim, Ch. (2007). The cultural roots of guanxi: An exploratory study. *The World Economy*, 30, 329–341.

Fung, H. (2006). Affect and early moral socialization: Some insights and contributions from indigenous psychological studies in Taiwan. In Kim, U., Yang, K.-S., & Hwang, K.-K. (2006, eds.). *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. Understanding People in Context* (pp. 175–196). New York: Springer.

Fung, H. H., & Ng, S.-K. (2006). Age differences in the sixth personality factor: Age differences in interpersonal relatedness among Canadians and Hong Kong Chinese. *Psychology and Aging*, 21, 810–814.

Goodwin, R., & Findlay, Ch. (1997). „We are just fated together"… Chinese love and the concept of *yuan* in England and Hong Kong. *Personal Relationships*, 4, 85–92.

Han, K.-H. (2016). The feeling of „face" in Confucian society: From a perspective of psychosocial equilibrium. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7:1055. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01055

Hui, Ch., & Graen, G. (1997). Guanxi and professional leadership in contemporary sino-american joint ventures in mainland China. *Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 451–465.

Hwang, K.-K. (1987). Face and favor: The Chinese power game. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 944–974.

Hwang, K.-K. (1998). Guanxi and mientze: Conflict resolution in Chinese society. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 7, 17–37.

Hwang, K.-K. (1999). Filial piety and loyalty: Two types of social identification in Confucianism. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 2, 163–183.

Hwang, K.-K. (2005). From anticolonialism to postcolonialism: The emergence of Chinese indigenous psychology in Taiwan. *International Journal of Psychology*, 40, 228–238.

Hwang, K.-K. (2006). Moral face and social face: Contingent self-esteem in Confucian society. *International Journal of Psychology*, 41, 276–281.

Hwang, K.-K. (2012). *Foundations of Chinese Psychology. Confucian Social Relations*. New York: Springer.

Hwang, K.-K. (2016). Philosophical switch for the third wave of psychology in the age of globalization. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 58, 97–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12085

Hwang, K.-K. (2019). Enhancing cultural awareness by the construction of culture-inclusive theories. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2), 67–80. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000086

Hwang, K.-K., & Han, K.-H. (2010). Face and morality in Confucian society. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (pp. 479–498). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, X. (2010). Socio-emotional development in Chinese children. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (pp. 39–52). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chen, X.-P., & Chen, Ch. C. (2004). On the intricacies of the Chinese guanxi: A process of guanxi development. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, 21, 305–324.

Chen, X.-P., & Peng, S. (2008). Guanxi dynamics: Shifts in the closeness of ties between Chinese coworkers. *Management and Organization Review*, 4, 63–80.

Cheng, S. C. L., & Yau, O. H. M. (2006). *Yuan* (緣): The case of Chinese pop songs. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 11, 331–340.

Choi, E., Kim, Y.-Y., & Uchida, Y. (2016). The folk psychology of happiness in Korea. *Korean Journal of Culture and Social Issues*, 22, 165–182. https://doi.org/10.20406/kjcs.2016.05.22.2.165

Jahoda, G. (2016). On the rise and decline of 'indigenous psychology'. *Culture & Psychology*, 22, 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X16634052

Ji, L.-J., Lee, A., & Guo, T. (2010). The thinking styles of Chinese people. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (pp. 155–167). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Khan, A., Zolkiewski, J., & Murphy, J. (2016). Favour and opportunity: *renqing* in Chinese business relationships. *Journal of Business & Industrial Marketing*, 31(2), 183–192. https://doi.org/10.1108/JBIM-02-2014-0036

King, P., & Hodgetts, D. (2017). Gathering a few thoughts on 'Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy'. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 161–165. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12174

Kirschner, S. R. (2018). Indigenous psychology compared to what? Some complexities of culture, language and social life. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2), 98–106. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000110

Lee, Y.Ch., Lee, Y.-Ch., & Lee, Ch.-K. (2012). The study of relationships among undergraduate students' explanatory style, *yuan*-fen style, and breakup-dealing. In Wu, Y. (2012, ed.). *Advanced Technology in Teaching – Proceedings of the 2009 3rd International Conference on Teaching and Computational Science (WTCS 2009) Volume 2: Education, Psychology and Computer Science* (pp. 393–400). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer.

Leung, K. (2010). Beliefs in Chinese culture. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (pp. 221–240). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Leung, T.K.P., Heung, V.C.S., & Wong, Y.H. (2008). Cronyism. One possible consequence of guanxi for an insider: how to obtain and maintain it? *European Journal of Marketing*, 42, 23–34.

Liu, J.H. (2017a). Neo-Confucian epistemology and Chinese philosophy: Practical postulates for actioning psychology as a human science. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 137–149. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12168

Liu, J.H. (2017 b). Dialoguing Height Psychology into a life of interconnectedness: Response to commentaries by Hwang, Bhawuk, King & Hodgetts, Kashima, and Xie, Su, & Zhong. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology,* 20, 176–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12180

Ma, T.-L., & Bellmore, A. (2016). Connection or independence: Cross-cultural comparisons of adolescents' coping with peer victimization using mixed methods. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47, 109–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115605386

Pan, Z., Zhang, D., Hu, T., & Pan, Y. (2018). The relationship between psychological *Suzhi* and social anxiety among Chinese adolescents: the mediating role of self-esteem and sense of security. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health*, 12–50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13034-018-0255-y

Pankalla, A., & Kośnik, K. (2018). Religion as an invaluable source of psychological knowledge: Indigenous Slavic psychology of religion. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(3), 154–164. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000080

Poortinga, Y.H. (2016). Integration of basic controversies in cross-cultural psychology. *Psychology of Developing Societies*, 28(2), 161–182. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971333616657169

Qian, W., Razzaque, M.A., & Keng, K.A. (2007). Chinese cultural values and gift-giving behavior. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 24(4), 214–228.

Seo, M., Kim, Y.-H., Tam, K.-P., & Rozin, P. (2016). I am dumber when I look dumb in front of many (vs. Few) others: A cross-cultural difference in how audience size affects perceived social reputation and self-judgments. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47, 1019–1032. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022116659020

Shi, G., Shi, Y., Chan, A. K. K., Liu, M.T., & Fam, K.S. (2011). The role of *renqing* in mediating customer relationship investment and relationship commitment in China. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 40, 496–502.

Smith, P. B. (2005). Is there an indigenous European social psychology? *International Journal of Psychology*, 40, 254–262.

Su, Ch., & Littlefield, J.E. (2001). Entering Guanxi: A business ethical dilemma in mainland China? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 33, 199–210.

Sundararajan, L. (2019). Whither indigenous psychology? *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, 39(2), 81–89. https://doi.org/10.1037/teo0000115

Tsai, M.-H., Chi, S.-Ch. S., & Hu, H.-H. (2009). Salespeople's *renqing* orientation, self-esteem, and selling behaviors: An empirical study in Taiwan. *Journal of Business Psychology*, 24, 193–200.

Wang, D.-Ch., & Pak, Ch.-M. (2015). *Renqing* (personal relationship) and resource allocation: behaviour analysis of low income qualification assessment by village secretaries. *China Journal of Social Work*, 8(2), 107–121.

Wang, G. G., Lamond, D., Worm, V., Gao, W., & Yang, S. (2014). Understanding the indigenous Chinese concept of *suzhi* (素质) from an HRM perspective. A conceptual analysis. *Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management*, 5, 98–114.

Wang, Q., & Chang, L. (2010). Parenting and child socialization in contemporary China. In Bond, M. H. (2010, ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (pp. 53–67). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wong, Y.H., Leung, T.K.P., Hung, H., & Ngai, E.W.T. (2007). A model of guanxi development: Flexibility, Commitment and Capital Exchange. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 18, 875–887.

Wu, T.-F., Cross, S. E., Wu, Ch.-W., Cho, W., & Tey, S.-H. (2016). Choosing your mother or your spouse: Close relationship dilemmas in Taiwan and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47, 558–580. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022115625837

Xie, T., Su, D.Ch., & Zhong, N. (2017). Confucianism as canonic culture. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 170–175. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajsp.12175

Yang, K.S., & Ho, D.Y.F. (1988). The role of *yuan* in Chinese social life: A conceptual and empirical analysis. In Paranjpe, A. C., Ho, D. Y. F., & Rieber, R. W. (Eds.). *Asian contributions to psychology* (pp. 263–281). New York: Praeger.

Yang, K.S. (1999). Towards an indigenous Chinese psychology: A selective review of methodological, theoretical, and empirical accomplishments. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*, 41, 181–211.

Yang, K.S. (2000). Monocultural and cross-cultural indigenous approaches: The royal road to the development of a balanced global psychology. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 3, 241–263.

Yang, K.S. (2006). Indigenized conceptual and empirical analyses of selected Chinese psychological characteristics. *International Journal of Psychology*, 41, 298–303.

Yang, X., Zhang, P., Zhao, J., Zhao, J., Wang, J., Chen, Y.… Zhang, X. (2016). Confucian culture still matters: The benefits of zhongyong thinking (doctrine of the mean) for mental health. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 47, 1097–1113. https://doi. org/10.1177/0022022116658260

Yeh, K.H., & Bedford, O. (2004). Filial belief and parent-child conflict. *International Journal of Psychology*, 39, 132–144.

Zhang, S., & Kline, S. L. (2009). Can I make my own decision? A cross-cultural study of perceived social network influence in mate selection. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40, 3–23.

Zhang, Z.-X. (2006). Chinese conceptions of justice and reward allocation. In Kim, U., Yang, K.-S., & Hwang, K.-K. (2006, eds.). *Indigenous and Cultural Psychology. Understanding People in Context* (pp. 403–420). New York: Springer.

Linguistic Diversity Index: A Scientometric Measure to Enhance the Relevance of Small and Minority Group Languages

Václav Linkov[1] , Kieran O'Doherty[2], Eunsoo Choi[3], and Gyuseog Han[4]

Abstract

Current scientometric indexes do not encourage the linguistic diversity of sources cited in academic texts and researchers are not motivated to cite texts written in smaller languages. This diminishes the cultural diversity of the sources cited and limits the representation of small and indigenous cultures. This text proposes a scientometric measure designed to encourage the linguistic diversity of sources cited in articles, books, and papers. The Linguistic Diversity Index is based on two stipulations: (a) the more linguistically diverse the sources, the higher the score, and (b) the rarer the languages cited, the higher the score. If such a metric were used for the evaluation of social science and humanities journals, it would encourage the publication of papers that cite ideas from rarely represented cultural groups such as indigenous nations, ethnic groups from small countries, and other linguistic groups that have been omitted from mainstream scientific discourse. This might help to produce new research, which would help to improve the situation for these groups and create an epistemology that is more just to small cultural groups.

Research published in international social science journals is not culturally diverse. The vast majority of published studies come from affluent and developed countries, and small cultures and the cultures of indigenous people are neglected (Arnett, 2008). This might be because the cultural diversity of published research is not rewarded by the people who evaluate research. Scientometric indicators currently used in the evaluation of scientific research blind policy setters to many issues (Barré, 2019), of which cultural diversity is one. Current indicators do not reward cultural diversity, and therefore, this diversity does not exist as an important issue for people who use these indicators as evidence of research quality. This article aims to help diminish this problem by offering a scientific indicator that measures cultural diversity in academic texts.

Scientific output is variable, so it is not easy to measure (Pedersen et al., 2020). This is especially true when it comes to the measured output of the social sciences and humanities (Reale et al., 2018) because they are heterogenous (Fanelli & Glänzel, 2013). To measure this output, it is necessary to first evaluate "what is and is not desirable change in academic knowledge" (Hammersley, 2014, p. 351). In the social sciences and humanities, research concerns its influence on

society (Ochsner et al., 2013), so this desirable change might be to "produce improvements in relation to the stated goals of society" (Reale et al., 2018, p. 300). Such goals might be to improve the cultural capital of society (Donovan, 2008) and cultural diversity. Nevertheless, research in the social sciences is mainly evaluated by the same standards as research in the natural sciences: by the number of citations the research receives (Hoblík, 2020), which does not support cultural diversity.

The academic world is more dependent on English-language sources than it was 30 years ago. Scholars are forced to become part of the English-language publication system, which values themes relevant for the dominant cultures of the English-speaking world (Dahler-Larsen, 2018).

[1]CDV – Transport Research Centre, Brno, Czech Republic
[2]University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada
[3]Korea University, Seoul, Korea
[4]Chonnam National University, Gwangju, Korea

Corresponding Author:
Václav Linkov, CDV – Transport Research Centre, Líšeňská 33a, Brno 63600, Czech Republic.
Email: vaclav.linkov@hotmail.com

If scholars focus on themes that are specific for local cultures and of low interest for this larger academic world, they might be disadvantaged compared with those who work on themes that are highly cited in the English-speaking world. When scientific output is judged by the number of citations in citation databases, publications in languages other than English are discriminated against (Towpik, 2015). Articles written in English that are published in multilanguage journals are cited more often than articles written in other languages and published in the same journal (Diekhoff et al., 2013). Scientists want to increase their number of citations (Furnham, 2020), and this forces them to publish in English and not in their native language (López-Navarro et al., 2015). Journals have a similar motivation (Chavarro et al., 2018), so they follow the same pattern, abandoning local languages and publishing in English (Dinkel et al., 2004). For an increased citation rate, it is also beneficial to get co-authors from developed countries (Meneghini et al., 2008) and publish in journals in these countries (Strehl et al., 2016). The advantage for those who want to increase their citation count is to cite texts written in English. Gong et al. (2019) have shown that Chinese scholars' publications that cite more English-language sources are more cited than publications that cite more sources in Chinese. However, abandoning publishing in a native language and abandoning the citation of sources in non-English languages contribute to the impoverishment of native cultures (Filippov, 2016) and a decrease in cultural diversity. This can leave indigenous and small cultures less researched.

When diversity is mentioned in the context of scientometrics, it is usually diversity in disciplinary approaches (Zitt & Bassecoulard, 2008) and not cultural or linguistic diversity. This is because the prevalent methods of scientific evaluation were developed with a focus on "narrower" disciplines. Scientific disciplines differ according to their narrow focus (e.g., details and mechanisms) or wide focus (e.g., systems and larger processes). For example, cognitive psychology and experimental psychology are narrower; social psychology is broader. Some researchers in narrower fields think that the broader fields lack a solid basis upon which to build theories, whereas some of those in broader fields think that the narrow fields lack questions of real value and lose sight of the forest for the trees (Peterson, 2017). Research in the social sciences and humanities benefits from understanding specific cultures (Choi & Han, 2000), but researchers from narrow fields might consider the diversity of cultural experience to be less important than those from broad fields. Problems with the current indicators that were developed with such a narrow focus lead to the necessity of developing new and better indicators (Barré, 2019). Therefore, it might be beneficial if broader disciplines would use newly developed scientometric indexes that are different from those used in the narrower disciplines, so that these new indices would enhance the value of cultural diversity. This type of metric is proposed in this text.

Linguistic Diversity Index (LDI)

Research in the social sciences and humanities often studies phenomena that vary among cultures. If a researcher wants to study some culturally specific phenomenon in a particular cultural group, they need to improve their understanding of that culture (Linkov, 2014). This is best fulfilled if the researcher knows the opinions of the members of this cultural group and includes these members in the research. Indeed, the more widespread inclusion of the opinions of small cultural groups in the international research arena would allow them to influence the usage of the research questions and the methods created for larger groups, which are not necessarily fair in the treatment and assessment of these small groups (Urbánek & Čeněk, 2019). A good understanding of various cultural groups in published research should, therefore, be supported.

The managers of research institutions have to rely on the quantitative indicators of scientific output because they are not professionals in the specific fields (Kuleshova & Podvoyskyi, 2018). As Ruscio (2016) wrote, using citation-based measures of merit is quick: With the calculation of one number, the evaluation is done. The LDI—the scientometric measure proposed in the following paragraphs—is similarly an easy-to-compute number. It is based on two premises. First, the more culturally diverse the experience contained in the scientific text, the higher the quality of the text. Second, as Lewin (1930) argued, to construct scientific knowledge, it is equally important to study phenomena that are common and phenomena that are rare, even if they happen only once. When applied to culture, this means that studying cultures with a 100 million members—such as English- or Chinese-speaking cultures—is equally as important as studying cultures with just one member such as the last surviving member of an Indigenous nation. Therefore, the more a culture is omitted from scientific discourse, the better the text is because it provides the experience coming from that culture—even if that culture were to consist of one last, single person. LDI should, therefore, give value to languages of small local cultures.

Current scientific evaluation practices are based on how often a work is cited, so there are several well-developed databases that track the citations of scientific works. These databases might be used for assessing the cultural diversity of a scientific text by assigning the linguistic diversity of the cited sources. To reach the premises stated above, the LDI score is computed from the sources cited in the references of the evaluated text: (a) the more linguistically diverse the sources cited in the references, the higher the LDI score, and (b) the rarer the languages cited in the references, the higher the score. The LDI score would be computed this way:

1. Once a year will be computed how many citations of publications written in various languages were used in all publications written in language A for the preceding 5 years. All cited languages in publications

written in A will be ordered from the most cited language α_1 to the least cited language α_n: $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$. The order of languages shows how much a specific language is included in the publications in language A. Function ϕ_A, from the set of all languages to the set of natural numbers, is defined as giving a logarithm of order of language α_i as follows: $\phi_A(\alpha_i) = \log_2 i$. If the first most cited language in A-written texts is, for example, English, then $f_A(\text{English}) = 0$, and the ϕ_A of other languages will be nonzero.

2. Let's have language β and article/publication p and let's define $\lambda(p, \beta)$ as a ratio:

$$\lambda(p,\beta) = \frac{\text{Number of } p\text{'s references to sources written in the language } \beta}{\text{Number of all references in } p}.$$

3. Let's define $\Psi(p)$ as follows:

$$\Psi(p) = 1 + \log_{10}\left(\begin{array}{c}\text{number of languages in which} \\ \text{are written texts cited in } p\end{array}\right).$$

4. The LDI(p) of article p written in language A, which cites references from languages $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_m$, is defined as follows:

$$\text{LDI}(p) = \Psi(p) \times \left(\begin{array}{c}\lambda(p,\beta_1) \times \phi_A(\beta_1) + \cdots + \\ \lambda(p,\beta_m) \times \phi_A(\beta_m)\end{array}\right), \quad (1)$$

where $\Psi(p)$ will always be lower than 3 (there would never be more than 100 languages cited and $\log_{10} 100 = 2$). There would be less than 2,048 languages with written sources to be citable, so $\phi_A(\alpha_i)$ will always be lower than $\log_2 2048 = 11$ for any pair of languages A, α_i. The number in the brackets on the right in Equation 1 will be always lower than 11. The LDI will therefore be a number between 0 and 33 ($= 3 \times 11$). If an article cites only publications from the most cited language in the publications written in the language of that article, the LDI for the article will be 0. The LDI of an article will be higher for publications written in more uncommon languages cited in this article (the brackets on the right) and also for publications with cited sources written in more languages, $\Psi(p)$.

The LDI for a journal could be defined as the average of the LDIs of the articles it published in the previous year. The journal's LDI would therefore be a number between 0 and 33. Computing such an index will allow for the ranking of journals according to their inclusion of texts that cite sources from rare and/or multiple languages.

Google Scholar might be a good citation database to calculate LDI because it is less biased toward languages other than English compared with other databases (Dahler-Larsen, 2018). Web of Science and Scopus, in 2018, contained documents written in only 51 languages (Vera-Bacdeta et al., 2019). The reason is that Web of Science and Scopus consist mostly of academic publications (Aksnes et al., 2019),

whereas Google Scholar has a wider range of texts (Kousha & Thelwall, 2008). For a meaningful evaluation of published research according to cited languages, it might also be suitable to use a larger set of resources such as texts published in the media or on the internet (Ravenscroft et al., 2017).

Both Ψ and ϕ in Equation 1 could be computed differently than proposed above. Any function that computes a value based on the number of cited languages could be used as Ψ and any function that computes a value based on the rarity of languages could be used as ϕ.

Example

Let us present an example of the computation of the LDI for the current text. First, we need an order of languages. For this purpose, we use an order of languages according to how often various languages were cited in documents written in English, indexed by Microsoft Academic, and published in the years 2015–2019. The order is therefore the same, as would be valid if Microsoft Academic were used as the database for computing LDI using the Algorithm 1 to 4 presented above. Microsoft Academic contains 11,886,288 documents published in English with publication years from 2015 to 2019. The order of languages according to how often sources written in these languages were cited in these 11,886,288 documents is presented in Table 1. There are five languages cited in the references in this text: English (46 times), Russian (3), Czech (3), Korean (1), and Polish (1). Altogether, there are 54 references. As we can see in Table 1, the rankings of these five languages are as follows: The most common language cited in English-written documents is English. Korean is the eighth most cited language in English-written documents according to Microsoft Academic, Polish is 10th, Russian is 12th, and Czech is 16th. If we use this as the order for the computation of ϕ (i.e., the order or other function that is computed based on rarity), the LDI of this text would be as follows:

$$\left(1+\log_{10} 5\right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c}\dfrac{46}{54} \times \log_2 1 + \dfrac{3}{54} \times \log_2 12 + \dfrac{3}{54} \times \log_2 16 + \\ \dfrac{1}{54} \times \log_2 8 + \dfrac{1}{54} \times \log_2 10\end{array}\right)$$

$$= \left(1+0.699\right) \times \left(\begin{array}{c}\dfrac{46}{54} \times 0 + \dfrac{3}{54} \times 3.585 + \dfrac{3}{54} \times 4 + \\ \dfrac{1}{54} \times 3 + \dfrac{1}{54} \times 3.322\end{array}\right)$$

$$= 1.699 \times \left(0 + 0.199 + 0.222 + 0.056 + 0.062\right)$$

$$= 1.699 \times 0.539 = 0.916.$$

Discussion

Explanation of LDI

The purpose of this article is to introduce a new scientometric index—the Language Diversity Index. This index is not

Table 1. First 20 Most-Cited Languages in Documents in the English Language Published During Publication Years 2015–2019 Contained in Microsoft Academic (A = English).

Languages ordered by number of citations in A	Number of times documents published in this language were cited in documents published in 2015–2019 in A = English
α_1 = English	326,005,701
α_2 = Japanese	4,222,865
α_3 = Spanish	487,191
α_4 = French	407,340
α_5 = German	372,443
α_6 = Portuguese	254,774
α_7 = Chinese (both simplified and traditional)	196,326
α_8 = Korean	161,571
α_9 = Italian	102,735
α_{10} = Polish	92,331
α_{11} = Persian	52,036
α_{12} = Russian	46,739
α_{13} = Indonesian	43,919
α_{14} = Dutch	28,283
α_{15} = Turkish	24,401
α_{16} = Czech	14,941
α_{17} = Finnish	14,423
α_{18} = Croatian	12,959
α_{19} = Catalan	7,717
α_{20} = Swedish	7,361

based on previously published indices and should solve a problem largely omitted in scientometric scientific discourse—the language diversity of sources, the lack of which results in the researchers' view of their research question. This is different than the issue of disciplinary diversity more often discussed by scientometric community (e.g., Zitt & Bassecoulard, 2008). The proposed index should contribute to the multidimensional evaluation of research as demanded by social science and humanities studies (Toledo, 2018). In the following paragraphs, we therefore focus on the explanation of this index and the role it should serve in scientific discourse.

Computation of the LDI of a document written in language A varies according to this language. First, how often were the publications written in various languages cited in documents written in A in the previous 5 years should be computed (this computation could be done only yearly). All cited languages are ordered according to how often they appear in the references of A-language documents. Function Φ_A then transforms each language's order to its logarithm, which is used as a value of this language in the computation formula. This formula consists of the rarity part, which computes the rarity of languages cited in the references as a product of these languages' value and their frequency in references, and the diversity part, which is the logarithm of the number of various languages of published documents in the references. Logarithms are used to make the final LDI value smaller. The logarithm in the diversity part has a larger base than the logarithm in the rarity part to give greater stress

on the rarity of languages than on the number of languages. This should give higher value to languages of small cultural groups.

Language A could be any language in which a document is published (Korean, Czech, Swahili, English, etc.). Because the order of cited languages depends on the language A, documents with the same reference list might have different LDIs, depending on the language in which the document is published. The order of languages used in the LDI computation depends on the database from which it is computed. Different databases have different coverage of various languages documents; the order of cited languages will therefore vary according to this coverage.

Scientometric indices should lead to desirable changes in scientific discourse (Hammersley, 2014). LDI has been created to support such desirable change—to encourage researchers to get closer to the communities they research, that members of these communities might have a greater chance of being included in scientific discourse, and that information between cultures can circulate more often without the intermediate role of English scientific discourse.

The suggested index might be helpful if the following propositions are valid:

Proposition 1: There is at least one language for which documents published in this language do not cite sources from all languages evenly.
Proposition 2: Lewin's (1930) opinion that sciences should study common phenomena as thoroughly as phenomena

happening only once, because it cannot be known in advance study which phenomenon might bring greater increase in knowledge, is valid. Therefore, a small language environment might bring breakthrough with the same probability as a large language environment.

Proposition 3: Studying a phenomenon happening in the concrete cultural environment might attain a better quality when the researcher knows the language spoken in that cultural community.

Proposition 4: Researchers change their behavior according to the currently used scientometric indices.

Proposition 5: LDI benefits those researchers citing rarer languages.

Proposition 1 is valid, because languages will be never known and knowledge distributed evenly. Propositions 2 and 3 depend on the values of the researcher. Proposition 4 is supported by the fact that researchers change their behavior to increase their citation-rate-based scientometric indices (López-Navarro et al., 2015). For example, in the humanities, more publications are in English and in peer-reviewed publications, to increase their scientometric ratings (Hammarfelt, 2017). Proposition 5 is a consequence of the LDI computation algorithm. If these propositions are valid, then LDI should change scientist's behavior to search language sources more equally across all languages, giving a more equal chance to discover scientific findings across all language environments, and this way, improve the quality of science.

Impact of Language Diversity on Scientific Discourse

In a monolingual, globalized scientific discourse, authors expect readers and reviewers to favor this discourse. They prefer to include references to the most internationally cited authors and remove references to the cultural heritage not shared by a globalized reader: "Authors prefer citations to recent thinkers who write in English: Austin, Grice, Searle, Wittgenstein . . . rather than Hegel, Husserl or Bergson" (Maingueneau, 2016, p. 116). This approach leads to "the impoverishment of scientific creation" (p. 116). Sharing the same global, English, scientific discourse decreases theoretical conflicts in the research community. This increases the danger of false consensus, when "researchers are (more and more as time passes) professionals who do their job and avoid challenging dominant assumptions" (Maingueneau, 2016, p. 118).

When scientific discourse is divided into more linguistically diverse communities, these multiple scientific discourses have different epistemological assumptions, allowing the creation of better science than when these discourses are merged into one in the global English discourse. The quality of science might be therefore improved when English serves not as a language of the production of knowledge but only as a language of transmission of knowledge among cultures

(Maingueneau, 2016). English is the dominant language in global, scientific discourse (Stockemer & Wigginton, 2019), which negatively affects social science and humanities studies. Nevertheless, it is supported by the current scientometric practices, which face numerous critiques. Researchers in the social sciences and humanities should not rely on "laissez faire attitude and wait for these criticisms to change the new reality of science accountability as this is very unlikely to happen" (Pajic et al., 2019, p. 89). Adopting the LDI proposed in this article might be one of the active strategies that researchers might employ.

A = English

Researchers in Western countries are currently not motivated to study non-Western populations because research evaluation practices favor research of Western cultures (Brady et al., 2018). This leads to "anglophone scientists neglecting foreign language publications" (Ammon, 2012, p. 338). Ammon (2012) thinks that the "major reason why publications in languages other than English do not often reach the global level is the Anglophones' disinclination to learn foreign languages" (p. 349). Computing LDI for language A being English might therefore create an incentive to learn foreign languages and study other cultures. It might help to create an incentive for the inclusion of more diverse group of scientists who are able to ask more variable questions as required by Rad et al. (2018). The resulting research might increase its interpretive power—the ability to understand the cultural contexts of individuals' behavior (Brady et al., 2018).

A = Some Language Other Than English

National research evaluation policies in smaller countries (e.g., in Eastern Europe) force researchers to publish in journals indexed in Web of Science and abandon publishing in their own language (Pajic, 2015). If journals are evaluated only by their impact factors, it motivates scholars to publish only in English because articles written in English get a higher number of citations than those written in other languages (Di Bittetti & Ferreras, 2017). As a result, journals stop publishing in local languages and switch their language to English, which "might hamper the intermediary role of science in the society at large" (Schuermans et al., 2010, p. 422). LDI could reach higher values both for local languages and languages of other countries, so if it is used in research evaluation, it will increase researchers' and journals' motivation to publish in the local language. Currently, authors lose the ability to write well in their native language because of writing only in English (Nygaard, 2019). If writing in their native language were more valued, they might improve this ability. This might help researchers to preserve the identity of the local language as a scientific language (Li, 2019).

When there is no incentive to learn and to read documents written in other foreign languages than English, researchers

might be motivated to ignore other foreign languages and cite only sources in their native language and in English because it increases their citations. As discussed by Gong et al. (2019), Chinese language texts receive more citations when they cite foreign language documents and this foreign language is nearly always English.

Several social science subdisciplines are centered on a particular cultural community and they use this community language as the communication language of their subdiscipline (Stockemer & Wigginton, 2019). LDI will motivate researchers to cite sources from smaller languages, which might increase the reputation of texts published in these languages, given that "the primary motivator of choosing English as a publication language is the belief that publishing in English will increase the reputation of one's work" (Stockemer & Wigginton, 2019, p. 645), LDI might lead to increased publishing in smaller languages and enhancing the quality of their scientific discourse.

Research production in non-Western countries is mostly read by local scholars and does not have the opportunity to influence global science (Tijssen et al., 2006) because inclusion of local and minority cultures in global science is not encouraged by the current system of scientific evaluation, and cultural diversity is not included in its notion of the quality of science (Pontille & Torny, 2010). Publishing in English in Western journals and publishing houses leads to situations in which local communities and languages are connected to the West, but they are not connected to each other (Neylon, 2020). This diminishes international cultural exchange. LDI is computed for each language separately, so it benefits local researchers who focus on connecting their language community to communities in small countries. Because LDI values the citing of various languages, researchers from other cultures are motivated to learn this culture's language, so texts written in this language might spread knowledge globally without the need for English to serve as mediator of knowledge. Scientific discourse written in the researcher's language will be also enriched by the usage of LDI because researchers will be motivated to include knowledge from more diverse set of cultures into their texts. Its usage might support cultural diversity in small non-Western cultures.

Benefits of the LDI

Current scientific evaluation practices do not promote cultural and linguistic diversity. LDI is designed to encourage linguistic diversity and cultural diversity in published academic texts. If the linguistic diversity of sources cited in academic texts increases, it will increase the chance that opinions, ideas, and the lives of linguistic and cultural minorities (in a specific country or globally) are included in published texts.

LDI acknowledges the fact that the same knowledge does not have the same value in two different language communities. Knowledge of Burmese is rarer in the Czech Republic than in Thailand, whereas the knowledge of Polish is rarer in Thailand than in the Czech Republic. That is the reason that the order of the languages of the cited sources would be computed separately for each language in which articles are published. The usage of LDI might, therefore, encourage linguistic diversity in all academic texts in all language environments.

The humanities are heterogenous (Fanelli & Glänzel, 2013), which makes their measurement by scientometric indices more difficult. However, they are generally more dependent on the language used by the studied population than natural sciences. Computing scientometric indices from the number and rarity of languages cited in a text is more effective for judging humanities when compared with the indices that measure the number of citations at a certain time. Research in the humanities might take a long time to be cited; sometimes, it takes more than 10 years to get citations (Ardanuy et al., 2009). When research is evaluated according to the number of citations it gets in the preceding few years, texts in the humanities cannot be compared because many of them (despite being quality work) would not yet have citations. LDI overcomes this problem because all of the necessary information for its computation is already in the text.

Research evaluation practice should take into consideration differences between scientific disciplines; otherwise, it risks epistemic injustice between disciplines. Current scientometric practices are better suited for laboratory sciences than for the humanities because they serve more disciplines aimed to create facts than disciplines aimed to enhance understanding (Lohkivi et al., 2012). Evaluation practices should be improved to better conform to epistemic aims of disciplines, which creates understanding between cultures by sharing knowledge contained in sources written in those cultures' languages. LDI might enhance the value of research, which needs sources from small and minority languages in disciplines like cultural psychology and therefore creates a more epistemic just environment for them.

LDI is designed to enhance linguistic diversity, which is not the same as cultural diversity. Nevertheless, in most of the world, separate cultural groups are usually separate linguistic groups. This is especially true for Indigenous nations in many countries. These Indigenous nations do not have their own academic literature, but if citations of nonacademic texts would be included in the computation of LDI, it would benefit the texts written in these Indigenous languages when they are being cited in academic texts. Such an inclusion might benefit those indigenous minorities.

Limitations of the LDI

No scientometric index is perfect. LDI has some weak points that are inevitable when it is computed from the number of languages in the references. First, the definition of a separate language can be a political, rather than an academic, issue. Serbian and Croatian are nearly the same language, but they

are considered distinct because the countries where they are spoken are separate. On the contrary, different Chinese dialects are considered to belong to one language despite being mutually incomprehensible. Researchers who read in a language with an existing similar language that is considered separate because of political issues will have an advantage when computing LDI. Second, it would be easy to increase the LDI by citing papers that the researcher never read because they do not understand the language of these papers. However, this problem could be resolved by employing field/site visits, a research evaluation method where the evaluator speaks with the researchers about their experience and research strategies (Pedersen et al., 2020). LDI should be used together with other methods of measuring scientific quality. If not used together with other scientometric indices, LDI might lead researchers to pursue linguistic diversity at the expense of other aspects of scientific quality.

Another one of LDI's limitations is that bibliometric databases do not cover enough documents in smaller languages (Ochsner et al., 2017). Given the current databases' coverage, the usage of LDI might be limited by this fact. If LDI is used for the evaluation of scientific research, companies producing these databases should work on improving the coverage of smaller languages. Another problem is that some databases might not identify the document's language with good precision. Correct identification of the document language is necessary for LDI to be effective.

Conclusion

Research quality is not equivalent to being cited (Feist, 2016). It consists of several dimensions such as scientific quality, plausibility, originality, and societal value. Citation indicators (i.e., indicators for how often a text is cited) are "of little help in the evaluation of the . . . societal value of research" (Aksnes et al., 2019, p. 12). One aspect of the societal value of research is the representation of ideas, values, and opinions from minority and remote cultures such as language communities whose languages are rarely mentioned in the society. There is a lack of scientometric indicators to evaluate this representation of the minority and remote language communities in scientific discourse. This article offers such an indicator to measure the rarity of cultural influence in a scientific discourse based upon the citations of the sources published in various languages.

Even if many scientists consider the quantitative measurements of scientific output impossible (Funk, 2016), some sort of measurement is inevitable because of its usability for governmental authorities. It is, therefore, worth using such measures, which support positive changes in society. Focusing on the improvement of bibliometric measures changes the behavior of scientists. Focus on being cited means that more citations are used when writing articles, and journals might require more citations (Weingart, 2005). Focusing on citing linguistically variable sources might lead to more such sources being cited by scientists and required by journals. If some journals adopt the increase of LDI as a goal, it might lead to the increase of linguistic diversity of opinions, views, and ideas cited in the published articles. This might lead to the increased presence of values and the views of indigenous, minority, and small cultural communities. Such a development might help in the production of scientific texts that help to develop a more just and better world.

Author Contributions

V.L. presented the idea, developed the algorithm for computation of LDI and the example in the article, created conceptualization of the text, wrote the first version of the manuscript, and participated in the manuscript rewriting and revisions. K.O., E.C., and G.H. participated in the manuscript rewriting and revisions. All authors have approved the final version of the article.

ORCID iD

Václav Linkov https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8473-1465

References

Aksnes, D. W., Langfeldt, L., & Wouters, P. (2019). Citations, citation indicators, and research quality: An overview of basic concepts and theories. *SAGE Open*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019829575

Ammon, U. (2012). Linguistic inequality and its effects on participation in scientific discourse and on global knowledge accumulation—With a closer look at the problems of the second-rank language communities. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *3*, 333–355. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2012-0016

Ardanuy, J., Urbano, C., & Quintana, L. (2009). A citation analysis of Catalan literary studies (1974–2003): Towards a bibliometrics of humanities studies in minority languages. *Scientometrics*, *81*, 347–366.

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

Barré, R. (2019). Les indicateurs sont morts, vive les indicateurs! Towards a political economy of SandT indicators: A critical overview of the past 35 years. *Research Evaluation*, *28*, 2–6. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvy029

Brady, L. M., Fryberg, S. A., & Shoda, Y. (2018). Expanding the interpretive power of psychological science by attending to culture. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *115*(45), 11406–11413. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1803526115

Chavarro, D., Rafols, I., & Tang, P. (2018). To what extent is inclusion in the Web of Science an indicator of journal "quality"? *Research Evaluation*, *27*, 106–118. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvy001

Choi, S. H., & Han, G. (2000). Munhwashimrihakjok yonkubangpoplon [Methodology of cultural psychology]. *Korean Journal of Social and Personality Psychology*, *14*, 123–144.

Dahler-Larsen, P. (2018). Making citations of publications in languages other than English visible: On the feasibility of a PLOTE-index. *Research Evaluation*, *27*, 212–221.

Di Bittetti, M. S., & Ferreras, J. A. (2017). Publish (in English) or perish: The effect on citation rate of using languages other than English in scientific publications. *Ambio*, *46*, 121–127. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0820-7

Diekhoff, T., Schlattmann, P., & Dewey, M. (2013). Impact of Article language in multi-language medical journals—A bibliometric analysis of self-citations and impact factor. *PLOS ONE*, *8*(10), Article e76816. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0076816

Dinkel, A., Berth, H., Borkenhagen, A., & Brähler, E. (2004). On raising the international dissemination of German research: Does changing publication language to English attract foreign authors to publish in a German basic psychology research journal? *Experimental Psychology*, *51*, 319–328. https://doi.org/10.1027/1618-3169.51.4.319

Donovan, C. (2008). The Australian Research Quality Framework: A live experiment in capturing the social, economic, environmental, and cultural returns of publicly funded research. *New Directions for Evaluation*, *118*, 47–60.

Fanelli, D., & Glänzel, W. (2013). Bibliometric Evidence for a Hierarchy of the Sciences. *PLOS ONE*, *8*(6), Article e66938. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066938

Feist, G. J. (2016). Intrinsic and extrinsic science: A dialectic of scientific fame. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *11*, 893–898.

Filippov, I. S. (2016). Kak ucheniye gumanitarnogo profilya otsenivayut naukometriyu [How scientists in the humanities assess scientometrics]. *Siberian Historical Research, 2016/3*, 6–27. https://doi.org/10.17223/2312461X/13/1

Funk, D. A. (2016). Naukometriya v otsenke kachestva publikatsiy v sotsialnykh i gumanitarnikh naukakh [Scientometrics and evaluation of publications in social sciences and humanities]. *Siberian Historical Research, 2016/1*, 8–26. https://doi.org/10.17223/2312461X/11/2

Furnham, A. (2020). What I have learned from my Google Scholar and H Index. *Scientometrics*, *122*, 1249–1254.

Gong, K., Xie, J., Cheng, Y., Lariviere, V., & Sugimoto, C. R. (2019). The citation advantage of foreign language references for Chinese social science papers. *Scientometrics*, *120*, 1439–1460.

Hammarfelt, B. (2017). Four claims on research assessment and metric use in the humanities. *Bulletin of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, *43*(6), 33–38.

Hammersley, M. (2014). The perils of "impact" for academic social science. *Contemporary Social Science: Journal of the Academy of Social Sciences*, *9*, 345–355.

Hoblík, J. (2020). Hodnota hodnocení: K mechanismům akademického hodnocení [Value of evaluation: On academic evaluating mechanisms]. *ERGOT. Revue Pro Filosofii a Společenské Vědy*, 2020(1). https://ergotsite.wordpress.com/2020/11/26/hodnota-hodnoceni-k-mechanismum-akademickeho-hodnoceni/

Kousha, K., & Thelwall, M. (2008). Sources of Google Scholar citations outside the Science Citation Index: A comparison between four science disciplines. *Scientometrics*, *74*, 273–294. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-008-0217-x

Kuleshova, A. V., & Podvoyskyi, D. G. (2018). Paradoksy publikatsionnoi aktivnosti v pole sovremennoi rossiyskoi nauki: genesis, diagnoz, trendy [Paradoxes of Publication Activity in the Field of Contemporary Russian Science: Genesis, Diagnosis, Trends]. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes, 2018/4*, 169–210.

Lewin, K. (1930). The conflict between Aristotelian and Galileian modes of thought in contemporary psychology. *Journal of General Psychology*, *5*, 141–177.

Li, X. (2019). What is the publication language in humanities? The case of Translation Studies scholars. *English Today*, *35*(2), 42–49. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078418000202

Linkov, V. (2014). Několik poznámek k vytváření interkulturních psychologických výzkumů [Few notes on conducting cultural comparisons in psychological research]. *Psychologie a Její Kontexty, 5/2*, 101–108.

Lohkivi, E., Velbaum, K., & Eigi, J. (2012). Epistemic injustice in research evaluation: A cultural analysis of the humanities and physics in Estonia. *Studia Philosophica Estonica*, *52*, 108–132. https://doi.org/10.12697/spe.2013.6.2.05

López-Navarro, I., Moreno, A. I., Quintanilla, M. Á., & Rey-Rocha, J. (2015). Why do I publish research articles in English instead of my own language? Differences in Spanish researchers' motivations across scientific domains. *Scientometrics*, *103*, 939–976. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1570-1

Maingueneau, D. (2016). Monolingualism and creativity. Scientific discourse and linguistic diversity in human and social sciences. *MÈTODE Science Studies Journal*, *6*, 115–119. https://doi.org/10.7203/metode.6.4552

Meneghini, R., Packer, A. L., & Nassi-Calo, L. (2008). Articles by Latin American Authors in prestigious journals have fewer citations. *PLOS ONE, 3/11*, Article e3804. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0003804

Neylon, C. (2020). Research excellence is a neo-colonial agenda (and what might be done about it). In E. Kraemer-Mbula, R. Tijssen, M. L. Wallace, & R. McLean (Eds.), *Transforming research excellence* (pp. 92–115). Cape Town: African Minds, New Ideas from the Global South.

Nygaard, L. P. (2019). The institutional context of "linguistic injustice": Norwegian social scientists and situated multilingualism. *Publications*, *7*, Article 10. https://doi.org/10.3390/publications7010010

Ochsner, M., Hug, S., & Galleron, I. (2017). The future of research assessment in the humanities: Bottom-up assessment procedures. *Palgrave Communications*, *3*, Article 1720. https://doi.org/10.1057/palcomms.2017.20

Ochsner, M., Hug, S. E., & Daniel, H.-D. (2013). Four types of research in the humanities: Setting the stage for research quality criteria in the humanities. *Research Evaluation*, *22*, 79–92. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvs039

Pajic, D. (2015). Globalization of the social sciences in Eastern Europe: Genuine breakthrough or a slippery slope of the research evaluation practice? *Scientometrics*, *102*, 2131–2150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-014-1510-5

Pajic, D., Jevremov, T., & Škoric, M. (2019). Publication and citation patterns in the social sciences and humanities: A national perspective. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *44*, 67–94. https://doi.org/10.29173/cjs29214

Pedersen, D. B., Grønvad, J. F., & Hvidtfeldt, R. (2020). Methods for mapping the impact of social sciences and humanities—A literature review. *Research Evaluation*, *29*, 4–21.

Peterson, D. (2017). The depth of fields: Managing focus in the epistemic subcultures of mind and brain science. *Social Studies of Science, 47/1*, 53–74.

Pontille, D., & Torny, D. (2010). The controversial policies of journal ratings: Evaluating social sciences and humanities. *Research Evaluation, 19/5*, 347–360.

Rad, M. S., Martingano, A. J., & Ginges, J. (2018). Toward a psychology of Homo sapiens: Making psychological science more representative of the human population. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *115*, 11401–11405. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1721165115

Ravenscroft, J., Liakata, M., Clare, A., & Duma, D. (2017). Measuring scientific impact beyond academia: An assessment of existing impact metrics and proposed improvements. *PLOS ONE, 12/3*, Article e0173152. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0173152

Reale, E., Avramov, D., Canhial, K., Donovan, C., Flecha, R., Holm, P., . . .Van Horik, R. (2018). A review of literature on evaluating the scientific, social and political impact of social sciences and humanities research. *Research Evaluation*, *27*, 298–308.

Ruscio, J. (2016). Taking advantage of citation measures of scholarly impact: Hip hip h index! *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *11*, 905–908.

Schuermans, N., Meeus, B., & De Maesschalck, F. (2010). Is there a world beyond the Web of Science? Publication practices outside the heartland of academic geography. *Area*, *42*(4), 417–424. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-4762.2010.00938.x

Stockemer, D., & Wigginton, M. J. (2019). Publishing in English or another language: An inclusive study of scholar's language publication preferences in the natural, social and interdisciplinary sciences. *Scientometrics*, *118*, 645–652. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2987-0

Strehl, L., Calabró, L., Souza, D. O., & Amaral, L. (2016). Brazilian science between national and foreign journals: Methodology for analyzing the production and impact in emerging scientific communities. *PLOS ONE, 11/5*, Article e0155148. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0155148

Tijssen, R. J. W., Mouton, J., van Leeuwen, T. N., & Boshoff, N. (2006). How relevant are local scholarly journals in global science? A case study of South Africa. *Research Evaluation, 15/3*, 163–174.

Toledo, E. G. (2018). Research assessment in humanities and social sciences in review. *Revista Española de Documentación Científica*, *41*(3), Article e208. https://doi.org/10.3989/redc.2018.3.1552

Towpik, E. (2015). IF-mania: *Journal Impact Factor* nie jest właściwym wskaźnikiem oceniania wyników badań naukowych, indywidualnych uczonych ani ośrodków badawczych [IF-mania: *Journal Impact Factor* is not a proper mean to assess the quality of research, individual researchers, nor scientific institutions]. *NOWOTWORY Journal of Oncology*, *65*, 465–475.

Urbánek, T., & Čeněk, J. (2019). Adaptace a ekvivalence testových metod: inspirace pro psychologické testování minorit v ČR [The adaptation and equivalence of test methods: An inspiration for psychological assessment of minorities in the Czech Republic]. *Československá Psychologie, 63/1*, 142–154.

Vera-Bacdeta, M.-A., Thellwall, M., & Kousha, K. (2019). Web of Science and Scopus language coverage. *Scientometrics*, *121*, 1803–1813. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03264-z

Weingart, P. (2005). Impact of bibliometrics upon the science system: Inadvertent consequences. *Scientometrics*, *62*, 117–131.

Zitt, M., & Bassecoulard, E. (2008). Challenges for scientometric indicators: Data demining, knowledge-flow measurements and diversity issues. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, *8*, 49–60. https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00092