

建構本土心理學理論後設思維的省思

葉光輝*

摘要

本文針對符碧真教授分享其轉換成為本土教育心理學研究者的心路歷程，並建構出相當值得教學實務參考理論的論述內容，閱讀後分別針對個人在（1）理論與實務的落差；（2）泛文化研究與文化系統研究取向差異，以及（3）反思性主位研究與反身性客位研究取向差異等三個關鍵議題，提出了自己衍生的想法，作為與符教授在本土心理學研究進路觀點上相互切磋的心得。文章最後更以「二元空性」觀點強調事物或現象本質的存在並不受到二元對立的限制，而是取決於評價者或研究者的主觀視角所框架，因此藉此文章希望鼓勵年輕的本土研究者對於主觀與客觀之間的複雜關係能進行深度省思，並期望本文有助於建立更開放、包容的學術生態與社會氛圍。

關鍵詞：理論與實務落差、泛文化研究、文化系統研究、反思性主位研究、反身性客位研究、二元對立、二元空性

葉光輝* 中央研究院民族學研究所/台灣大學心理學系
(ykh01@gate.sinica.edu.tw)

作為華人師資培育專家及實務現場的指導者，符碧真教授透過多年系統化的研究及實務觀察心得，寫下這篇發人深省的靶子論文，足以讓讀者給予最大的肯定。此篇內容不僅敘說一位從事教育或教育心理學者改弦更張，轉換成為本土心理學研究者的漫漫心路歷程，更從自身探索過程中帶出了相當值得參考的智慧結晶，文章內容值得教育及師資培育相關研究者與實務工作者細細閱讀。

人類的行為大多數是文化或是生物遺傳與文化因素交互作用下的產物，既然如此，在研究或探討人類教學現場的行為時，能不把文化差異這因素考慮在內嗎？教學心理學作為一項應用學科，若不把文化差異因素考慮進去的理論拿來應用，能夠發揮理論所陳述的功效嗎？答案是顯而易見的，這也正是符教授願意投入多年的心血鏗而不捨地想矯正台灣教育現場教學困境的根本原因。

或許有人會說，學術理論與實務應用本來就存在著落差，當將理論運用到實務現場時本來就該因應現場情境脈絡變動而有所調整；既然有這樣的認識，那為何不在建構及發展教學心理學理論時，就根據理論將應用於特定社會文化脈絡下的特徵屬性考量進去，藉以建構適合該社會文化脈絡的教學心理學理論呢？這不僅能夠讓理論在實務現場發揮功效，更可帶來理論觀點的創新、並建立起自己學術的主體性，可謂一舉數得，何樂而不為？符教授正是身體力行實踐這項一舉數得樂事的學者，由從事本土教育心理學的研究與教學實務過程中，逐漸培養出自己研究與教學的「內在動機」，樂在其中。

除了針對於符教授陳述自己學術發展變化的心路歷程與經驗分享給予肯定外，以下想提出幾點個人閱讀文章後的心得藉用來和符教授彼此切磋討論。

壹、談理論與實務的落差

符教授在文章中說到，培育台灣師資的過程中，師資生常向她抱怨理論觀點與實務應用之間落差大，甚而提出「理論無用論」，讓她感到相當大的困擾。她個人認為產生落差的來源有兩大原因，其中之一是由於「技術理性知識論」（epistemology of technical rationality）長期主導台灣師資培育的理論建構模式所造成。由於這種理論建構過程是在控制其他因素的情況下，建立變項與變項之間純淨的關係，它明顯與實務現場變因太多的現實狀況大不相同；由於這些可能變因常被排除在理論建構的考慮範圍外，因而實際狀況受這些變因影響造成實務結果常不如理論所預期，自然產生理論觀點與實務應用之間的鴻溝。實際上，早有學者已注意到理論在實務應用上的這點困境，因此建議在研究概念或測量工具的發展與編製時，就提醒應事先注意到對於情境或範疇特定性（situation or domain specific）的考量，例如廣受教育心理學界採用的知覺自我效能感（perceived self-efficacy）（Bandura et al., 1999），就有發展出針對不同特定範疇所界定的自我效能感概念及與其對應的測量工具，以縮減理論觀點與實務應用之間的落差。另外，用來探

討某些個體在人際互動中經常抱持著負面預期，預期自己將會遭到互動他人的拒絕而產生預期性焦慮，進而導致該個體習慣將注意力關注在負面的互動線索，產生對於拒絕相關線索過度敏感，而常將模糊、曖昧訊息解讀為拒絕訊號、並在情緒及行為上過度反應的傾向；對於這種人際互動上的心態傾向在心理學上學者會使用「拒絕敏感性」(rejection sensitivity) (Downey et al., 2004) 的概念來替代未針對任何應用情境所測量的「焦慮特質」作為研究預測變項。後續實徵研究結果也顯示：當運用拒絕敏感性概念在親密交往關係情境的研究時，它對於此關係最後是否會以分手告終的預測力，確實要比使用個體焦慮特質作為預測變項好很多 (Downey & Feldman, 1996)。上述這些研究結果都一再顯示，當建構研究概念或理論時，若能夠先將概念或理論所要應用的情境脈絡因素考慮進去，將會大大縮減理論觀點與實務應用之間的鴻溝或落差。理論所提出的主張觀點，原本就常是取用統計上的眾數原則所歸納出來，對於少數偏離眾數原則個案的情況，本就無法兼顧並習慣將它們當作誤差來處理，應用時自然會有不足之處。換言之，理論與實務間常存有落差，這是很自然的正常現象，實在無須抱怨。若使用者對理論提出的通則主張觀點相當嫻熟，自然能夠舉一反三，針對理論欲應用的特定情境脈絡，採取彈性調整策略，將這些特殊情境因素自行納入考量，自可以大大縮小理論觀點與實務應用之間的落差。

再者，符教授提及落差的另一可能原因，是由於從「WEIRD (怪異的)」樣本所建構的理論要應用到非怪異的族群或文化社會人民身上，就會如符教授所言，它無可避免地要遭遇兩道鴻溝的轉化，因此應用這些由「怪異」樣本研究結果所建構的理論於另一群不同文化社會之人民的實務現場時，難免也會出現較大落差的情況。這一主張理由也正是絕大多數非主流學者所大聲疾呼，應該倡導發展自己本土的心理學理論以強化其應用效力的核心訴求。實際上，社會認知心理學研究取向者強調探究及分析人的行為問題時，當事人的性格系統（人的因素）及其身處的環境脈絡（環境因素）兩者會彼此交互作用而對人的行為表現產生影響 (Bandura, 1986)。換言之，不單只是如符教授在第一項來源所提的屬於環境脈絡因素差異會影響個體的行為表現，導致實務現場觀察到的結果與理論預期有所不同外，被研究對象自身的性格系統差異也會導致個體在相同的實驗情境下表現出不同的行為，因而讓理論觀點的預測與實際結果有所落差。換言之，若肯定不同社會文化下個體的價值信念與行動目標存在著一定的差異，例如將判斷道德的信念 (moral beliefs) 區分成「權利本位」(rights-based) 與「義務本位」(duty-based) 兩類的差異 (Dworkin, 1978)，則由其所組織而成的性格系統自然有所差異，那麼接續受相同情境影響所表現出來的行為自然與其他社會文化下個體所表現出來的行為有所不同，當然也就不適合使用甲社會文化下樣本所建構的理論主張觀點來預測或詮釋乙社會文化下個體的行為表現了。更何況，若再將不同環境因素（也包括因生態環境不同或環境變遷的因素含括進來）與不同性格系統兩者交互作用影響所產生更複雜的動態變化考

慮進去，那恐怕非要自己創造新的理論觀點，才能更細膩地詮釋這些動態變化歷程的現象了。在此處，個人想表達的是，社會認知研究取向的指導原則對於想從事本土心理學的研究者來說，應該是一個很適合用來思考自己本土研究議題的入手途徑，非常值得有志於從事華人本土心理學的年輕者參考採用。

貳、泛文化研究與文化系統研究

符教授既然宣稱自己從事的是「文化系統研究」而不是「泛文化研究」，而且理論建構也明確地區分華人文化系統與西方文化系統所衍生出來的「華人教育觀」與「西方教育觀」理論的對比，則接續下來較適當的實徵研究設計，就會是跨文化比較研究，藉以凸顯各自文化系統教育觀點下的實徵結果，確實如所區分理論的主張觀點具有顯著的文化差異，以說服讀者接納認可自己所提出的文化系統教育觀的差異在現象界具體存在。但較為可惜的是，符教授自己的實徵研究鮮少使用跨文化比較的方式來驗證她自己提出的理論觀點，若符教授自己能從事系列的跨文化比較實徵研究，由自己嚴謹的跨文化研究設計及結果來支持自己經文化系統觀取向所提出的東西方教育觀理論主張論點，會是更具說服性的。例如，符教授主張西方及華人的教育觀都相當重視努力的道德性，但兩個文化下個體對於努力這一行為之心理功能闡述的背後意義及運作機制並不相同，就很值得由此衍生出跨文化對比的研究假設，並採用跨文化樣本的研究設計來檢驗自己提出來的假設主張；若假設預測能獲得重複驗證的實徵研究結果，則其理論觀點更具說服性。

實際上，符教授從事華人本土教育心理學研究師承的黃光國教授，在其自身從事本土心理學研究的過程中，向來都引述著名文化心理學家 Richard Shweder 的「理一分殊」（one mind many mentality）觀點，作為自己本土學術研究的最高指導原則：即「不同文化社會下人們心理運作現象所展現的差異，應該是同一種心智下的多種心態反映；因此建構理論時除了強調不同文化表層行為內涵的分殊性外，也應考量其心理機制的泛文化普同觀點」（One mind, many mentalities; universalism without uniformity）（Shweder et al., 1998, p. 871）。換言之，根據 Shweder 的「理一分殊」主張觀點，從事本土心理學或社會科學研究時，所謂的泛文化系統與文化系統研究取向，基本上是一體的兩面，彼此是相互整合的，而不是二元對立的，也沒有孰優孰劣之分。它們就像是我們看到華人使用筷子、美國人使用刀叉、印度人使用右手當工具來吃飯，雖然反映了飲食習慣上文化系統思維的差異，但其共同的核心根本都是為了要滿足飢餓的心理需求，此後者正是屬於全人類共同的基本心理需求。換言之，理論建構過程中，不論強調的是較偏形式結構深層層面、泛文化普同性的「硬核」式理論模型（例如黃光國教授的自我曼陀羅理論模型），或是偏具體行為內涵層面、強調文化差異性的「軟核」式理論模型（例如黃光國教授的

華人人情面子的權力遊戲模型），都能對人類提供有用的知識建構，兩者之間是可以相互並存的，甚至是可以整合的，並無所謂孰對孰錯、優劣之分（葉光輝，1998）。所以一個優秀的本土社會科學或心理學理論建構，它既要能夠說明文化系統差異所衍生的慣習行為差異的問題，也要能夠同時回答泛（或跨）文化共同心理運作機制的核心問題（葉光輝，2011；Yeh, 2023），兩者要能夠相互整合，而不是偏失於任一端。

參、反思性主位研究取向與反身性客位研究取向

不同文化社會之個體的心理與行為存在著差異雖是自明的事實，然而其心理與行為表現超越文化差異的普遍性卻又是各社會科學領域共同追求的目標。本土心理學研究者該如何看待及探究不同文化間表層行為的差異及其與深層心理運作歷程間的關係呢？

「文化」為理解世界現象提供解釋框架，然而不同文化社會存有不同的認識論。各地文化的形成受到歷史、地理環境、語言、宗教和社會習俗等多種因素的影響，因此造成了差異性。例如，在印度牛被視為是神聖的動物，甚至有印度人認為牛糞能防輻射、牛尿能治百病，這是印度傳統文化觀念使然。儘管不同文化間有著獨特的語言、信仰、傳統、價值觀等特徵，但同時也存在一些人類心理與行為普遍共通的屬性。例如，所有的文化社會都有關於生死、婚姻、家庭、社會道德、人際關係等方面的規範和信仰；都有透過創造藝術、音樂、舞蹈、傳說故事等來表達和溝通的方式。這些共通點表明了人類的共同經驗和需求，促進了跨文化的交流和理解。因此，從事本土心理學研究時，在尊重和保持文化多樣性的同時，也應該關注不同文化間的共同性。

撇開西方主流心理學在知識支配的霸權不談，站在華人心理學知識分子的角度，會探問：學者為什麼需要構建本土心理學理論或進行本土心理學研究？這是因為現有的（尤其西方主流）理論和構念無法說明或解釋您觀察到或想要討論的本土心理與行為現象。研究者需要找出一種新的方式來描述或說明您想要討論的本土心理與行為現象，本土（新）理論或本土（新）構念是實現您需求的解決方案。所以心理及行為現象是現實的基礎，它需要被探索、反思和澄清，而不是以既有的理論和構念來直接套用，對於新現象的釐清及闡述才是需要建構新理論和新構念的前提。研究者如果不能捕捉存在於不同文化現象間的細微差異，就不會認為有創建新構念或理論來區分這些差異的必要性。然而闡述現象內容，至少可以有兩個切入點：一個是表面層次的現象，另一個是深層結構或機制層次的現象。若關注於表層現象，可找出文化間很多不同的現象差異，可以創造許多本土的心理構念和相應的理論來描述文化差異。它通常使用複數的 **Indigenous Psychologies** 來稱呼這種本土心理學；然而當關注的是深層機制層次的現象時，學者可能找不出文化差異，或者只能創建很少甚至只有普同的心理構念及相應的理論。這種情況下，還能將其命名為本土心理學（**Indigenous Psychology**）嗎？

「emic（主位）」和「etic（客位）」這兩個詞最早由語言學家肯尼斯派克（Kenneth Pike）在 20 世紀的 50 年代在人類學領域提出，用以描述研究人類行為和文化的兩種不同取向。主位取向研究法：指稱從被研究群體的社會內部來審視該社會成員的文化現象，使用對該文化成員有意義的內部概念、類別和意義進行探究。客位取向研究法：涉及從被研究群體的社會外部角度來分析及探究該社會文化，使用外來的類別和概念作為分析該社會文化現象的架構。底下介紹個人近期提出的反思性主位取向（reflective emic approach）與反身性客位取向（reflexive etic approach）兩種研究法（Yeh, 2023），用來做為與文化系統研究及泛文化研究相互對話的參考。反思性主位取向：指稱研究者經反思當前（或主流）心理學現有理論和構念，無法適當地解釋所研究（或本土）群體的文化心理與行為現象，因而重新建構新的理論或構念，以闡明所研究群體的特殊本土文化心理與行為現象。符教授提出的「修養的角色義務理論」（role obligation theory of self-cultivation）（Fwu, et al., 2021, 2022）就是一個反思性主位取向研究的例子。而達爾瑪（Daharma）是一個印度的研究主題（Bhangaokar, 2020），指的是印度文化佛法修行中獨特的概念。相對地，甘え（Amae）和超常偏見（Super-Ordinary Bias）則是日本文化社會中現象的概念，分別由土居健郎（Doi, 1992）和大橋龍太郎、山口祐樹（Ohashi & Yamaguchi, 2019）等提出。這些構念在各自社會的文化背景中形成，反映了各自文化獨特的價值觀念和行為模式。

反思性主位取向研究法雖然因對主流理論的局限進行反思而有其貢獻，但卻會被批評為存在「文化膠囊（cultural encapsulation）」的偏見（Wrenn, 1962），這指調的是它僅持單一文化觀點而對其他社會文化現象及知識的忽視所建構的理念，容易導致習慣以刻板化的印象來取代真實世界。當一個本土理論忽視了該社會中個體間的差異，或者通過將自己隔離在本土觀點之內而拒絕與其他（例如主流）文化觀點對話時，這也會是另一種「文化膠囊」的偏見。反思性主位取向研究法的局限性在於這些理論模型只能解釋存在於各自文化社會中眾數的心理及行為現象，它只是一種文化特定性的（cultural-specific）理論模型。這一限制將降低該理論模型應用於其他社會文化時的外部或生態效度。此外，它也無法應對及解釋因社會變遷帶來該社會民眾心理及行為改變的問題，因為這些理論通常是基於傳統或過去歷史背景脈絡，而不是當前社會環境狀況所建構的，因而無法用來預測未來的心理及行為變化趨勢。

此外，當將一個文化特定的本土理論應用於解釋所觀察到多元文化間現象的差異時，該理論通常假定在同一文化的人民內存有共識，而與跨文化人民間存有差異。但是，文化是一個潛在的假設性概念，它並不是對實體直接觀察到的，而是研究者從其表現中推斷出來的。在任一個給定的社會中普遍存在豐富而複雜的意義、信仰、實踐、符號、規範和價值觀可用來展示該文化潛在的屬性與特徵。但是，它們仍然不是文化自身。這意味著特定社會文化下成員的信仰和價值觀並不是完全相同的，而是多樣化的。Fischer

and Schwartz (2011) 的實徵研究就支持這一論點。他們分析了三組大數據集，包括在 67 個國家的 41,968 名參與者進行的施瓦茨價值觀調查 (Schwartz Value Survey)、在 19 個歐洲國家的 42,359 名參與者進行的人像價值觀問卷 (Portrait Values Questionnaire) 調查，以及在 62 個國家中的 84,887 名參與者進行的世界價值觀調查 (World Value Survey)，每組大數據集都測量了不同類型的價值觀。這三組大數據集的所有實徵結果都顯示：在不同國家之間，價值觀的優先順序存在更多的共識而非差異，並反駁了文化決定個人信仰和價值觀的主張。換句話說，一個國家內或文化內的個體差異比跨文化間的差異更加突出。這些結果提醒我們，一個好的本土理論除了要能夠描述文化層次的差異外，還應該要能夠解釋個體層次的差異，特別是在個體間思想或動機方面的差異 (Yeh, 2023)。

個人認為使用反身性客位取向研究法來構建本土理論，而不是反思性主位取向研究法，較可能幫助研究者達到同時兼顧文化和社會內個體間差異以及跨文化間差異現象的雙重目標。反身性客位取向研究法也是一種反思，但它是對自身文化現象與主流或他國文化現象之共同性的反思，並試圖提出一個可適用於全人類文化社會共用的新構念或理論，但也可用來說明文化間差異的現象。換言之，反身性客位取向研究法通過考慮如何將文化差異和個體差異整合到一個系統性的框架中，藉此來構建一個既能說明文化差異也能說明個體差異的本土理論。這也正是符合 Shweder「理一分殊」主張觀點的本土理論。

由於認識到反思性主位取向研究法的局限，個人早期建構的孝道雙元模型在其第二階段時期就以反身性客位取向研究法重新構思其理論觀點 (Tsao & Yeh, 2019; Bedford & Yeh, 2021)。反身性客位取向研究法也涉及到對本土文化特殊性的考量，但更進一步地深入反思已建立的本土理論（或構念）與主流心理學中現有的理論（或構念）之間的相似性和差異性，並通過公平地將這些相似性和差異性整合到一個更周全的系統性框架中來對待它們，這是一種對於反思性主位取向研究法進行後設省思的應用。以孝道雙元模型為例，近期由於孝道議題逐漸隨全球高齡化趨勢而廣受西方學界關注，為了更清晰傳達華人孝道心理學的研究成果，孝道雙元模型持續從心理學角度強化孝道概念在個體運作層次上的意義，並以「脈絡化性格」變項角度重新界定華人孝道概念。所謂「從心理學角度進行概念化」，只是回歸心理學這門學科的本質與特色——即透過可反映個別差異的內在心理運作機制來說明或解釋個體孝道相關行為、現象的成因。這除了將孝道視為華人所重視的「文化規範或文化價值觀」，也能從「性格」概念的角度來理解孝道心理與行為運作層面的意涵與機制 (曹惟純、葉光輝, 2022)。由於反身性客位取向研究法聚焦於父母與子女互動關係背後的心理機制，也兼顧華人文化表層的心理與行為內容，所以具有應用於任何文化的潛力。因受限於篇幅因素考量，有關個體的雙元孝道信念及行為如何在以「脈絡化性格」變項視角重新界定後，可對應到親子代間互動心理基模的兩種結構本質，以及它如何滿足子代的兩大類的基本心理需求、可用以反映華人社會文

化近代變遷趨勢，以及如何應用孝道雙元模型進行跨文化比較研究，都可以從曹惟純、葉光輝（2022）文章的 246-257 頁中有較詳細的說明，有興趣的讀者可以自行找來參閱。

事實上，最近幾項實徵研究已將孝道雙元模型的應用擴展到了華人以外的文化社會。例如，Rózycka-Tran 等（2021）應用了波蘭語版本的雙元孝道量表（Polish version of the Dual Filial-Piety Scale），證明了該量表的因素結構在跨不同性別和學生／員工群體中是不變的，並且在孝道信念上如預期地存在著性別差異。這結果擴展了孝道雙元模型的跨文化效度到東歐，並提供了東西方差異範式的一個參考對比。而 Nainee 等（2021）則應用了馬來西亞語版的雙元孝道量表（Malay version of the Dual Filial-Piety Scale），闡明了育兒方式、孝道信念和生活滿意度之間的關係對馬來西亞青少年的影響。此外，Lim 等（2022）應用了英文版雙元孝道量表於亞裔和高加索裔美國人，展示了孝道雙元模型對照顧年邁父母主題在跨文化上的適用性，以及在個人主義社會中反映重要孝道差異的潛力。Zheng 等（2021）還將孝道雙元模型應用於道德心理學，研究了孝道與利他行為之間的關係受到同理心、道德認同、感恩和負債感的中介效應，以及中國和印尼兩國參與者在這些中介效應上不同的調節效果。Qiao 等（2021）研究了中國及伊斯蘭社會中在孝道與道德解離之間的關係，如何受到黑暗三性格（dark triad）的中介作用，以及這些作用機制的文化差異。所有這些實徵證據皆支持孝道雙元模型具有跨文化的應用性，突顯了雙元孝道概念及理論的普同性和文化特定性的雙重特徵屬性。

肆、結語

採用文化系統取向來建構本土心理學理論並無不好、也非不妥，但它較易陷入二元對立的思維窠臼，例如會慣用以東、西方文化系統對立、發現與發明理論建構訴求對立、權利本位與義務本位兩者對立、縱向成就與非縱向成就目標二元對立等等來思考所探討的研究問題以及解讀所觀察到的現象。人們經常將觀察到的現象事物分為對立的二元，諸如美與醜、好與壞、對與錯、東方與西方等。這種二元對立的思考方式在進行社會比較的架構中司空見慣，但身為研究者同時也需要省思其分類標準的制定來源是屬於偏人為的或是存有絕對客觀標準的？以縱向成就與非縱向成就目標的二元差異為例，重要他人或社會期許的成就目標一定會跟個人期望的成就目標存在差異嗎？難道父母對子女期許的成就目標就不能跟子女自己期許的成就目標相一致，都是運動、才藝等領域的發展，或是都是學業上獲得好成績、找到好工作嗎？所以對於縱向及非縱向成就目標的判定究竟是研究者自己主觀的認定，還是它們確實存在著絕對客觀的判定標準？若任何分類概念確實不存在著絕對客觀的判定標準，則為了更周延地理解事物現象，研究者可以採取「二元相對」的角度來思考研究問題。即從某一視角來看，該目標可能被評價為縱向目標，但轉換另一個視角，同一目標可能被歸為非縱向目標的這一端，端視研究情境

脈絡的框架意義來評估（例如如果我們可以特別選取親子雙方都對認同在學業上獲得好成績、找到好工作為共同成就目標，或都認同在運動、才藝等領域求發展為共同成就目標的樣本為研究對象）。這種相對性提醒我們，分類概念的二元對立結果通常只是人為的、是研究者自己主觀認定的，並非絕對的、可能與被研究者的觀點有落差，它也會受到外在情境脈絡條件因素的影響而變動其評價或分類結果，換言之，二元屬性彼此之間甚至是可以相互流動、交換的，即所謂如陰陽關係般相互辯證的。因此，研究者實在不需要太過受限於這些概念分類架構的局限。如果能採用如前面提及的社會認知研究取向的思維，即在從事本土心理學或社會科學研究議題時，應該能夠同時兼顧研究對象的性格系統（人的因素）及其身處的環境脈絡（環境因素）兩者會彼此交互作用，進而對人的行為表現產生複雜的影響，而且還會隨著時間演進，這些交互影響作用也會跟著產生動態的變化歷程，而不是如文化系統取向研究者，以屬於靜態觀、偏本質論的視角來看待研究議題，則學術研究發展將會是如歷程觀的演進過程，生生不息。更進一步思考，任何評價與分類都會受到環境脈絡的影響，因此基本上都是相對於的環境脈絡條件所做的評估與分類，因而非絕對、客觀的。這時候，「二元空性」的觀點顯得特別適用。所謂二元空性，指的是世間事物的存有並不受到對錯、好壞、優劣、東西方等二元對立屬性的約束。如果一個事物反映出這些二元對立的評價，其實只是映射出評價者或研究者的視角和框架立場，而接收者或互動者是可以擁有自己不同或獨特的視角和評價立場。所謂二元對立的評價與分類，基本上屬於「空性」存有的一環。這種「空性」存在於評價或分類主體的心態與心境之中。由於每個人都有不同的價值觀、文化背景、經歷等，對事物的看法也會因此而有不同看法，換言之，二元對立的評價或分類基本上是「無常的」、「非恆定的」。因此，二元對立的評價或分類結果並不是客觀存在的事實，而是受當事人主觀因素影響的相對性評價或分類結果。

最後，本文強調研究者應從更寬廣的視角度來看待二元對立的觀點，期使研究者能夠更靈活地來思考自己的研究議題、建構自己的本土理論。這種開放性的觀點有助於打破僵化的思考模式，促使研究者更寬容地接受多元的觀點。至於二元空性觀點強調事物或現象本質的存在並不受到二元對立的約束，而是取決於評價者或研究者的主觀視角。呼籲這種研究心態和心境的用意是一個深層次的省思，它反映了對於主觀與客觀之間複雜關係的深度省思。總的來說，本文訴求強調研究者在面對事物或現象時應更謹慎思考，並呼籲寬容地接納不同的理論觀點。這樣的呼籲是建議性的，有助於建立更開放、包容的學術生態與社會氛圍。

參考文獻

- 曹惟純、葉光輝（2022）。孝道心理學研究：從本土理論到全球應用。載於楊中芳（主編），*華人本土心理學三十年：本土研究取徑及理論*（233-270頁）。五南出版社。
- 葉光輝（1998）。一種、兩種還是多種道德：如何界定道德判準的判準。*本土心理學研究*，**9**，187-204。
- 葉光輝（2011）。談如何建構一個好的本土心理學理論。*本土心理學研究*，**36**，139-153
- 葉光輝（2020）。包容與整合：再談本土化研究的多重哲學典範。*本土諮商心理學學刊*，**11**（4），59-66。
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. (1999). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, *13*(2), 158-166. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-8391.13.2.158>
- Bedford, O., & Yeh, K. H. (2021). Evolution of the conceptualization of filial piety in the global context: From skin to skeleton. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*: 570547. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.570547>
- Bhangaokar, R. (2020). The development of communal and spiritual dutifulness in India: Upholding dharma, offering Seva. In L. A. Jensen (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of moral development: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 327-349). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190676049.013.18>
- Doi, T. (1992). On the concept of amae. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, *13*, 7-11. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355\(199221\)13:1<7::AID-IMHJ2280130103>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355(199221)13:1<7::AID-IMHJ2280130103>3.0.CO;2-E)
- Downey, G., Mougios, V., Ayduk, O., London, B. E., & Shoda, Y. (2004). Rejection sensitivity and the defensive motivational system: Insights from the startle response to rejection cues. *Psychological Science*, *15*(10), 668-673. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00738.x>
- Dworkin, R. (1978). *Taking rights seriously*. Harvard University Press.
- Fischer, R., & Schwartz, S. H. (2011). Whence differences in value priorities? Individual, cultural, or artifactual sources. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *42*(7), 1127–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110381429>
- Lim, A. J., Lau, C. Y. H., & Cheng, C.-Y. (2022). Applying the dual filial piety model in the United States: A comparison of filial piety between Asian Americans and Caucasian

- Americans. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 786609.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.786609>
- Nainee, S., Tan, S. A., Tan, C. S., Gan, S. W., & Tan, J. P. (2021). Asian “Guan” parenting and life satisfaction among adolescents in Malaysia: The mediating role of filial piety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 746540. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.746540>
- Ohashi, M. M., & Yamaguchi, S. (2019). Super-ordinary bias among Japanese: Is it unique to Japanese culture? In K. H. Yeh (Ed.), *Asian indigenous psychologies in the global context* (pp. 169-193). Palgrave Studies in Indigenous Psychology. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96232-0_8
- Qiao, X., Lv, Y., Aldbyani, A., Guo, Q., Zhang, T., & Cai, M. (2021). Chaos may prevail without filial piety: A cross-cultural study on filial piety, the dark triad, and moral disengagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 738128.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.738128>
- Rózycka-Tran, J., Jurek, P., Olech, M., & Dmochowski, T. (2021). A measurement invariance investigation of the Polish version of the Dual Filial-Piety Scale (DFPS-PL): Student-employee and gender differences in filial beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 713395.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713395>
- Shweder, R. A., Goodnow, J., Hatano, G., LeVine, R., Markus, H., & Miller, P. (1998). The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, Vol. 1*, (pp. 865–937). John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsao, W. C., & Yeh, K. H. (2019). Indigenous implications and global applications of the dual filial piety model: A psychological re-conceptualization of ‘Xiao’. In K.-H. Yeh (Ed.), *Asian indigenous psychologies in the global context* (pp. 195-219). Palgrave Studies in Indigenous Psychology. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96232-0_9
- Wrenn, C. G. (1962). The culturally encapsulated counselor. *Harvard Educational Review*, 32(4), 444-449.
- Yeh, K.-H. (2023). Constructing indigenous psychological theories from a global perspective: Taking filial piety model as an example. *Review of General Psychology*, 27(3), 275–281.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680231152191>
- Zheng, W., Guo, Q., Huang, T., Lu, J., & Xie, C. (2021). The prosocial outgrowth of filial beliefs in different cultures: A conditional mediation model Analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 748759. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.748759>

Reflections on Metacognition in Constructing Indigenous Psychological Theory

Kuang-Hui Yeh*

Abstract

This essay examines Professor Fu Bi-zhen's account of her transformation into an indigenous educational psychologist and the development of an indigenous theoretical model that is valuable for teaching practices. Following her narrative, it delves into three pivotal themes: (1) the gap between theory and practice, (2) distinctions between pan-cultural and cultural systemic research, and (3) the contrast between reflective emic and reflexive etic approach. The personal insights of these three themes are presented as a basis for the dialogue with Professor Fu, fostering mutual exchanges on indigenous psychological research perspectives. The essay concludes, by emphasizing the concept of "binary vacuity" which asserts the essence of things or phenomena is not constrained by binary oppositions but rather depends on the subjective perspective of the evaluator or the researcher, it aims to encourage young researchers to deeply reflect on the complex relationship between subjectivity and objectivity, with the hope of fostering a more open, inclusive academic environment and societal atmosphere.

Keywords: the gap between theory and practice, pan-cultural research, cultural systemic research, reflective emic approach, reflexive etic approach, binary opposition, binary vacuity

Kuang-Hui Yeh* Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica; Department of Psychology,
National Taiwan University (ykh01@gate.sinica.edu.tw)

As a Chinese teacher training expert and instructor in the field, Professor Bih-Jen Fwu wrote this thought-provoking paper based on years of systematic research and practical observation, warranting the highest affirmation from readers. This article not only describes the lengthy journey of a person involved in education or educational psychology who transitions to become an indigenous psychology researcher but also highlights the valuable insights gained from her own exploration process. The article's content merits careful reading by researchers and practitioners in education and teacher training

Most human behaviors are products of the interaction between cultural factors and biological genetic factors. When studying or exploring human behavior in educational settings, should we not consider cultural differences? As an applied discipline, can teaching psychology fulfill its purpose if it neglects cultural differences? The answer is clear, which is also the fundamental reason why Professor Fwu is dedicated to investing many years of hard work and persevering in addressing the challenges of on-site teaching in Taiwan's education system.

Some people may argue that there is a gap between academic theory and practical application. When applying theory in practical settings, it should be adapted to the changes in the context. Given this understanding, why not consider the distinctive attributes of the theory within specific social and cultural contexts when developing teaching psychology theory, in order to create a theory that fits the social and cultural environment? This approach will not only allow the theory to fulfill its role in practical scenarios but also introduce innovation to theoretical perspectives and establish one's own academic subjectivity. It can be said that it achieves multiple goals at once. Why not pursue this? Professor Fwu is a scholar who embraces this rewarding endeavor of achieving multiple goals simultaneously. Through his research and teaching practice in indigenous educational psychology, he has gradually fostered his own "intrinsic motivation" for research and teaching, and he finds joy in it.

Along with acknowledging Professor Fu's insights about his own academic journey and experiences, I would like to share a few of my personal reflections after reading the article and use them as a basis for discussion with Professor Fwu.

I. Discussing the Gap Between Theory and Practice

Professor Fwu stated in the article that during the training of teachers in Taiwan, teacher trainees often expressed concerns to her about the significant gap between theoretical viewpoints and practical applications, even suggesting that "theory is useless," which troubled her greatly. She personally believes that two main factors contribute to this gap. One factor is

that the "epistemology of technical rationality" has long dominated the theoretical construction model of teacher training in Taiwan. Since this theoretical construction process aims to establish a pure relationship between variables while controlling for other factors, it is markedly different from the actual situation, where numerous variables exist in the field. Because these potential variables are frequently excluded from consideration in theoretical construction, real-world outcomes are often influenced by them, leading to practical results that frequently do not align with theoretical expectations. This discrepancy naturally creates a gap between theoretical viewpoints and practical applications. In fact, some scholars have already recognized this dilemma in the practical application of theories. Therefore, it is recommended that when developing and compiling research concepts or measurement tools, one should consider the specifics of the situation or domain in advance. For instance, the idea of perceived self-efficacy (Bandura et al., 1999), commonly used in educational psychology, has developed a self-efficacy concept defined for different specific categories and corresponding measurement tools to bridge the gap between theoretical viewpoints and practical applications. Additionally, it explores how some individuals tend to hold negative expectations in interpersonal interactions, anticipating rejection from others and experiencing anticipatory anxiety. This, in turn, leads to a tendency to focus on negative interaction cues, becoming overly sensitive to signs of rejection, and often interpreting vague and ambiguous messages as signals of rejection, which results in emotional and behavioral overreactions. In addressing this mentality in interpersonal interactions, psychological scholars employ the concept of "rejection sensitivity" (Downey et al., 2004) instead of "anxiety traits," which are not applicable in specific contexts, as a predictive variable for research. Subsequent empirical research results also show that when the concept of rejection sensitivity is applied in studies of intimate relationship situations, its predictive power for whether a relationship will end in a breakup is significantly greater than using individual anxiety traits as a predictive variable (Downey & Feldman, 1996). The research findings repeatedly suggest that when constructing research concepts or theories, considering the contextual factors relevant to the applied concepts or theories can significantly narrow the gap between theoretical viewpoints and practical applications. The viewpoints proposed by the theory are often summarized by the majority principle in statistics. For the minority of cases that deviate from this principle, they cannot be accounted for and are treated as errors, leading to inherent shortcomings in the application. In other words, a gap often exists between theory and practice. This is a natural and normal phenomenon, and there is truly no need to complain. Suppose the user is quite familiar with the general viewpoints proposed by the theory. In that case, they will naturally be able to draw inferences from one example and adopt a flexible adjustment strategy

for the specific context in which the theory is to be applied. Taking these special contextual factors into account can significantly reduce the gap between theoretical viewpoints and practical applications.

Additionally, Professor Fwu mentioned another possible reason for the gap. When applying the theory derived from the "WEIRD" sample to non-WEIRD ethnic groups or culturally diverse individuals, as Professor Fwu stated, it will inevitably face two gaps. Thus, when utilizing theories developed from the research results of the "WEIRD" sample in the practical context of a different cultural group, a significant gap is unavoidable. This argument aligns with the primary concern of many non-mainstream scholars who advocate for the development of their own indigenous psychological theories to enhance their applicability. In fact, researchers in social cognitive psychology emphasize that when investigating and analyzing human behavioral issues, the personality system (human factors) of the individual involved and the environmental context (environmental factors) in which they exist interact and influence human behavior (Bandura, 1986). In other words, not only do the differences in environmental context factors mentioned by Professor Fwu in the first source affect individual behavior—leading to discrepancies between observed results and theoretical expectations—but also the variances in the personality systems of the subjects can cause individuals to behave differently within the same experimental setting, thus creating a gap between the predictions of theoretical viewpoints and the actual outcomes. To put it differently, if it is established that individuals from different social cultures have distinct differences in value beliefs and action goals, such as the distinction between moral beliefs categorized as "rights-based" and "duty-based" (Dworkin, 1978), then the personality systems they possess will also differ, leading to different behavioral expressions under identical circumstances compared to individuals from other social cultures. Naturally, it is inappropriate to apply the theoretical propositions developed from samples in social culture A to predict or interpret the behavior of individuals in social culture B. Moreover, considering the more complex dynamic changes caused by the interaction between various environmental factors (including those arising from different ecological contexts or environmental shifts) and different personality systems, we may need to formulate new theoretical perspectives to interpret these dynamic changes more effectively. Here, I wish to convey that the guiding principles of social cognitive research orientation should be a suitable avenue for researchers interested in engaging in indigenous psychology to contemplate their research topics, offering valuable insight for young scholars eager to explore Chinese indigenous psychology.

II. Pan-cultural research and cultural system research

Since Professor Fwu claims that she is engaged in "cultural system research" rather than "pan-cultural research," and the theoretical construction also clearly distinguishes the comparison between the "Chinese views on education" and the "Western education view" theory derived from the Chinese cultural system and the Western cultural system, the more appropriate empirical research design that follows would be a cross-cultural comparative study to highlight the empirical results under the educational viewpoints of each cultural system. Indeed, the advocated viewpoints of the theory have significant cultural differences, which should convince readers to acknowledge that the differences in the educational viewpoints of the cultural system she proposes exist in the phenomenal world. However, it is unfortunate that Professor Fwu's own empirical research rarely uses the cross-cultural comparison method to verify her theoretical viewpoints. If Professor Fwu could conduct a series of cross-cultural comparative empirical studies and utilize her own rigorous cross-cultural research design and results to support her theoretical claims regarding the Eastern and Western educational views proposed through the cultural system perspective, it would be more convincing. For example, Professor Fwu argues that both Western and Chinese educational views place great importance on the morality of effort; however, the meaning and operating mechanism behind the psychological function of effort behavior, as explained by individuals in the two cultures, differ. It would be worth deriving a cross-cultural comparative research hypothesis from this and employing a cross-cultural sample research design to test the hypothesis. If the hypothesis's predictions yield consistent empirical research results, then its theoretical viewpoint would be more convincing.

In fact, Professor Fwu's research on Chinese indigenous educational psychology was taught by Professor Kwang-Kuo Hwang. In his own research on indigenous psychology, Professor Hwang has consistently cited the "one mind, many mentalities" view of the famous cultural psychologist Richard Shweder as the highest guiding principle for his own indigenous academic research: that is, "the differences in people's psychological operation phenomena in different cultural societies should be the reflection of multiple mentalities under the same mind; therefore, when constructing theories, in addition to emphasizing the differences in the connotations of different cultural surface behaviors, the pan-cultural universal view of their psychological mechanisms should also be considered" (One mind, many mentalities; universalism without uniformity) (Shweder et al., 1998, p. 871). In other words, according to Shweder's "one mind, many mentalities" viewpoint, when conducting indigenous psychology

or social science research, the so-called pan-cultural system and cultural system research orientation are essentially two sides of the same coin, which are mutually integrated, not in binary opposition, and there is no distinction between superior and inferior. They are like the Chinese using chopsticks, Americans using knives and forks, and Indians using their right hands as tools to eat. Although these reflect the differences in cultural systems regarding eating habits, their common core is to satisfy the psychological needs of hunger, which are fundamental psychological needs for all humanity. In other words, in the process of theoretical construction, whether it is a "hard-core" theoretical model that emphasizes the deep level of formal structure and pan-cultural universality (such as Professor Kwang-Kuo Hwang's self-mandala theory model), or a "soft-core" theoretical model that stresses the specific behavioral connotation level and cultural differences (like Professor Kwang-Kuo Hwang's Chinese power game model of face and favor), both can provide valuable knowledge construction for humans. The two can coexist and even integrate, and there is no right or wrong, superior or inferior (Ye, 1998). Therefore, an excellent indigenous social science or psychology theory construction should be able to explain the problems of habitual behavioral differences derived from cultural system variations, and at the same time be able to answer the core questions of pan- (or cross-) cultural common psychological operating mechanism (Yeh, 2011, 2023). The two should integrate with each other rather than lean toward one end or the other.

III. Reflective Emic Research Orientation and Reflexive Etic Research Orientation

It is an evident fact that there are differences in the psychology and behavior of individuals across various cultural societies; however, the universality of their psychological and behavioral manifestations, despite these cultural differences, is a common goal pursued by all fields of social science. How should indigenous psychology researchers view and explore the differences in surface behaviors among diverse cultures and their relationship with underlying psychological processes? "Culture" provides an explanatory framework for understanding phenomena around the globe, but different cultural societies possess distinct epistemologies. The development of local cultures is influenced by numerous factors, including history, geographic environment, language, religion, and social customs, all of which contribute to these differences. For instance, in India, cows are considered sacred animals, and some Indians even believe that cow dung can prevent radiation and cow urine can cure all diseases. This belief is rooted in traditional Indian cultural concepts. Although different cultures possess unique characteristics—such as language, beliefs, traditions, and values—there are also universal

commonalities in human psychology and behavior. For example, all cultural societies have norms and beliefs regarding life and death, marriage, family, and social morality, among other aspects of life. They also share personal relationships; all have ways of expressing themselves through creation and communicating through various forms of art, music, dance, and legends. These commonalities reflect the shared experiences and needs of human beings, fostering cross-cultural communication and understanding. Therefore, when conducting indigenous psychology research that respects and maintains cultural diversity, we should also focus on the commonalities across different cultures.

Setting aside the hegemony of Western mainstream psychology in knowledge domination, from the perspective of Chinese psychology intellectuals, one would ask: Why do scholars need to construct indigenous psychology theories or conduct indigenous psychology research? This is because the existing (especially Western mainstream) theories and constructs cannot adequately explain or interpret the indigenous psychological and behavioral phenomena we observe or wish to discuss. Researchers must seek a new way to describe or explain the indigenous psychological and behavioral phenomena we want to analyze. Indigenous (new) theories or constructs offer solutions to meet these needs. Therefore, psychological and behavioral phenomena form the foundation of reality. They need to be explored, reflected upon, and clarified rather than directly applied to existing theories and constructs. The clarification and explanation of new phenomena are prerequisites for constructing new theories and constructs. If researchers fail to capture the subtle differences among various cultural phenomena, they may not see the necessity of creating new constructs or theories to differentiate these differences. However, there are at least two entry points for explaining the content of the phenomenon: one is the phenomenon at the surface level, and the other is at the deeper structural or mechanistic level. When we concentrate on surface phenomena, we may identify numerous differences between cultures and develop many indigenous psychological concepts and corresponding theories to describe these cultural variations. This is often referred to in the plural as Indigenous Psychologies; however, if we focus on phenomena at the deeper mechanism level, scholars may discover that cultural differences are less significant, or may only create a few, or even just a few common psychological concepts and corresponding theories. In this case, can it still be termed indigenous psychology?

The words "emic" and "etic" were first proposed by linguist Kenneth Pike in the field of anthropology in the 1950s to describe two different approaches to studying human behavior and culture. Emic approach: refers to examining the cultural phenomena of members of the society from the social interior of the group being studied, using internal concepts, categories,

and meanings that are meaningful to the members of the culture to explore. Etic approach: involves analyzing and exploring the social culture from the perspective of the social exterior of the group being studied, using external categories and concepts as the framework for analyzing the social and cultural phenomena. Below are two research methods that I recently proposed: the reflective emic approach and the reflexive etic approach (Yeh, 2023), which are used as references for dialogue with cultural system research and pan-cultural research. Reflective emic orientation: refers to researchers who, after reflecting that current (or mainstream) psychology's existing theories and construct cannot appropriately explain the cultural psychology and behavioral phenomena of the studied (or indigenous) group, therefore reconstruct new theories or constructs to explain the special indigenous cultural psychology and behavioral phenomena of the studied group. Professor Fwu's "role obligation theory of self-cultivation" (Fwu, et al., 2021, 2022) is an example of reflective subject orientation research. Daharma is an Indian research topic (Bhangaokar, 2020), referring to a unique concept in the practice of Buddhist teachings in Indian culture. In contrast, Amae and Super-Ordinary Bias are concepts of phenomena in Japanese cultural society, proposed by Doi Kenro (Doi, 1992) and Ohashi Ryutaro, Yamaguchi Yuki (Ohashi & Yamaguchi, 2019), respectively. These concepts are formed in the cultural context of their respective societies and reflect the unique values and behavioral patterns of each culture.

While the reflective subject-oriented research method contributes by examining the limitations of mainstream theories, it faces criticism for being biased due to "cultural encapsulation" (Wrenn, 1962). This term describes the notion that it offers only a single cultural perspective while neglecting other social and cultural phenomena and knowledge, which can lead to the tendency of substituting the real world with stereotyped impressions. When an indigenous theory overlooks the differences between individuals in society or refuses to engage with other cultural perspectives—including mainstream ones—by remaining confined to the indigenous viewpoint, it also exemplifies a bias of "cultural encapsulation." The reflective subject-oriented research method's limitation lies in the fact that these theoretical models can predominantly explain psychological and behavioral phenomena within their specific cultural contexts. Consequently, they represent culture-specific theoretical models. This limitation diminishes the external or ecological validity of the theoretical model when applied to different social cultures. Additionally, these theories struggle to address and explain the psychological and behavioral changes in a society resulting from social transformations, as they typically rely on traditional or historical contexts rather than contemporary social environments, making them inadequate for predicting future trends in psychological or behavioral changes.

Furthermore, when a culture-specific indigenous theory explains observed differences in multicultural phenomena, it usually assumes that there are commonalities among people of the same culture and differences among people of different cultures. However, culture remains an underlying hypothetical concept that is not directly observed for an entity but rather inferred by researchers from its manifestations. In any given society, rich and complex meanings, beliefs, practices, symbols, norms, and values can illustrate the underlying attributes and characteristics of the culture. However, these elements are still not the culture itself. This indicates that the beliefs and values of members of a particular social culture are not identical but rather diverse. Fischer and Schwartz (2011)'s empirical research supports this argument. They analyzed three large data sets, including the Schwartz Value Survey conducted on 41,968 participants in 67 countries, the Portrait Values Questionnaire survey with 42,359 participants in 19 European countries, and the World Value Survey involving 84,887 participants in 62 countries, each measuring different types of values. All empirical results from these three large data sets show that consensus in the priority of values between different countries is greater than the differences, refuting the claim that culture determines personal beliefs and values. In other words, individual differences within a country or culture are more prominent than cross-cultural differences. These results remind us that a good indigenous theory should be able to explain individual-level differences in addition to describing cultural-level differences, especially differences in individual thoughts or motivations (Yeh, 2023).

I believe that using a reflexive etic approach to construct indigenous theories, rather than a reflective emic approach, is more likely to help researchers achieve the dual goals of considering both individual differences within culture and society and cross-cultural differences. The reflexive etic approach is also a form of reflection, but it reflects on the commonalities between one's own cultural phenomena and mainstream or foreign cultural phenomena. It attempts to propose a new concept or theory that can be applied to all human cultural societies, while also explaining the phenomenon of cultural differences. In other words, the reflexive etic approach seeks to integrate cultural differences and individual differences into a systematic framework, thereby constructing an indigenous theory that can explain both cultural differences and individual differences. This theory also aligns with Shweder's "one mind, many mentalities."

Recognizing the limitations of the reflective emic approach, the dual filial piety model constructed by individuals in the early stage reconceptualized its theoretical viewpoints in the second stage through a reflexive etic approach (Bedford & Yeh, 2021; Tsao & Yeh, 2019). The reflexive etic approach also considers the particularity of local culture, but it goes a step further

by reflecting deeply on the similarities and differences between established indigenous theories (or constructs) and existing theories (or constructs) in mainstream psychology, integrating these similarities and differences into a more comprehensive systematic framework. This embodies an application of the reflective emic approach to meta-reflection. Taking the filial piety dual model as an example, the issue of filial piety has recently attracted wide attention from Western academic circles due to the global aging trend. To more clearly convey the research results of Chinese filial piety psychology, the filial piety dual model continues to emphasize the significance of the concept of filial piety at the individual operational level from a psychological perspective and redefines the concept of Chinese filial piety through the lens of the "contextualized personality" variable. The so-called "conceptualization from a psychological perspective" is simply a return to the essence and characteristics of psychology as a discipline—that is, to explain or interpret the causes of individual filial piety-related behaviors and phenomena through the internal psychological mechanisms that reflect individual differences. In addition to viewing filial piety as a "cultural norm or cultural value" that Chinese people hold dear, it can also illuminate the implications and mechanisms of filial piety at the psychological and behavioral operational levels through the lens of the concept of "personality" (Tsao & Yeh, 2023). The reflexive etic approach emphasizes the psychological mechanisms behind the interaction between parents and children, while also considering the psychological and behavioral content present in the surface of Chinese culture; thus, it has the potential for application to any culture. Due to space limitations, details on how individual dual filial piety beliefs and behaviors, once redefined through the "contextualized personality" variable perspective, can correspond to the two structural essences of the psychological archetype of parent-child interaction, how they can fulfill the two major basic psychological needs of offspring, and how they reflect modern trends in changes in Chinese social culture, as well as guidance on applying the filial piety dual model for cross-cultural comparative research, can be found in Tsao & Yeh's (2022) article, pages 246-257. Interested readers may refer to it independently.

In fact, several recent empirical studies have expanded the application of the dual filial piety model to cultures beyond the Chinese context. For example, Rózycka-Tran et al. (2021) utilized the Polish version of the Dual Filial-Piety Scale and demonstrated that the factor structure of the scale was invariant across genders and student/staff groups, confirming the anticipated gender differences in filial piety beliefs. This finding enhances the cross-cultural validity of the dual filial piety model in Eastern Europe, providing a comparative reference for the East-West difference paradigm. Nainee et al. (2021) employed the Malaysian version of the

Dual Filial-Piety Scale to explore the relationship between parenting style, filial piety beliefs, and life satisfaction among Malaysian adolescents. Additionally, Lim et al. (2022) utilized the English version of the Dual Filial Piety Scale with Asian and Caucasian Americans, illustrating the cross-cultural relevance of the dual filial piety model regarding caregiving for elderly parents and its potential to reveal significant filial piety differences in individualistic societies. Zheng et al. (2021) also applied the dual filial piety model within moral psychology, examining the relationship between filial piety and altruistic behavior, which was mediated by empathy, moral identity, gratitude, and a sense of indebtedness, while also analyzing the differing moderating effects of these mediators between Chinese and Indonesian participants. Qiao et al. (2021) investigated how the relationship between filial piety and moral disengagement in Chinese and Islamic societies was mediated by the dark triad, along with cultural differences in these mechanisms. All of this empirical evidence supports the cross-cultural applicability of the dual filial piety model, highlighting the dual characteristics of the concept and theory of dual filial piety: universality and cultural specificity.

IV. Conclusion

It is not inappropriate to use the cultural system orientation to construct an indigenous psychology theory; however, it is easy to fall into binary opposition thinking. For instance, people often tend to frame research problems and interpret observed phenomena in terms of the opposition between Eastern and Western cultural systems, the construction of discovery versus invention theories, rights-based versus obligation-based frameworks, and the binary distinction between vertical achievement and non-vertical achievement goals. Individuals frequently categorize observed phenomena into binary oppositions, such as beauty and ugliness, good and bad, right and wrong, East and West, and so on. This binary opposition approach is prevalent within the framework of social comparison, but as researchers, we must reflect on whether the criteria for classification are artificial or based on an entirely objective standard. Taking the binary distinction between vertical and non-vertical achievement goals as an example, can the achievement goals expected by significant others or society differ from those expected by individuals? Is it not possible for the achievement goals that parents expect of their children to align with the goals that the children set for themselves—such as development in sports and talents versus obtaining good grades in school and securing a good job? Thus, is the determination of longitudinal and non-longitudinal achievement goals a subjective choice made by the researcher, or is there truly an objective standard for such classifications? If there are no

absolutely objective criteria for any classification concept, researchers might approach the understanding of phenomena more comprehensively through a "binary relativity" perspective. From one perspective, a goal may be assessed as a longitudinal objective, while from another perspective, it may be classified as a non-longitudinal goal, depending on the significance of the research context (for instance, if we can specifically select samples where both parents and children agree that achieving good grades and finding a good job are common achievement goals, or both agree that pursuing development in sports and talents are common achievement goals to study). This relativity reminds us that the binary oppositions resulting from classification concepts are usually artificial and subjectively determined by the researchers themselves. They are not absolute and may differ from the views of the subjects. External contextual factors can also affect their evaluation or classification results. In other words, binary attributes can flow and exchange with each other; they are dialectical, like the relationship between yin and yang. Therefore, researchers should not be overly limited by the constraints of these conceptual classification frameworks. Suppose we can adopt the thinking of the social cognitive research orientation mentioned above. In that case, when engaging in indigenous psychology or social science research topics, we should consider the personality system (human factors) of the research object alongside its environmental context (environmental factors). The two will interact with each other, having a complex impact on people's behavioral performance and evolving over time. These interactive effects will produce a dynamic change process, rather than viewing the research topic from a static and essentialist perspective, as researchers with a cultural system orientation might. Thus, academic research development will resemble an evolutionary process, much like the process view, which continues indefinitely. Further consideration reveals that the environmental context will influence any evaluation and classification; thus, it is fundamentally an evaluation and classification made in relation to the conditions of that context and, therefore, not absolute or objective. At this time, the view of "binary vacuity" seems particularly applicable. The so-called binary vacuity refers to the fact that the existence of things in the world is not constrained by binary opposite attributes such as right or wrong, good or bad, superior or inferior, East or West. If a thing reflects these binary opposite evaluations, it actually only reflects the perspective and framework position of the evaluator or researcher, while the receiver or interactor can have his own unique perspective and evaluation position. The so-called binary opposite evaluation and classification is fundamentally a part of the existence of "vacuity." This "vacuity" exists in the mentality and state of mind of the evaluation or classification subject. Because everyone has different values, cultural backgrounds, experiences, etc., they will have varying views on things. In other words,

binary opposite evaluation or classification is fundamentally "impermanent" and "non-constant." Therefore, binary oppositional evaluations or classifications are not objective facts but rather relative assessments or classifications influenced by the subjective factors of the parties involved.

Finally, this article emphasizes that researchers should approach the binary opposition viewpoint from a broader perspective, allowing them to think more flexibly about their research topics and develop their own indigenous theories. This open-minded approach helps to break rigid thinking patterns and encourages researchers to be more accepting of multiple viewpoints. Regarding the binary vacuity view, it stresses that the essence of things or phenomena is not limited by binary opposition but is instead shaped by the subjective perspective of the evaluator or researcher. The aim of advocating for this research mindset is to promote deep reflection on the complex interplay between subjectivity and objectivity. Overall, this article urges researchers to contemplate more carefully when examining things or phenomena and advocates for tolerance in accepting different theoretical perspectives. Such a call is thought-provoking and aids in fostering a more open and inclusive academic environment and social atmosphere.

Reference

- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A., Freeman, W. H., & Lightsey, R. (1999). Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 13(2), 158-166. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0889-8391.13.2.158>
- Bedford, O., & Yeh, K-H. (2021). Evolution of the conceptualization of filial piety in the global context: From skin to skeleton. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12: 570547. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.570547>
- Bhangaokar, R. (2020). The development of communal and spiritual dutifulness in India: Upholding dharma, offering Seva. In L. A. Jensen (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of moral development: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 327-349). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190676049.013.18>
- Doi, T. (1992). On the concept of amae. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 13, 7-11. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355\(199221\)13:1<7::AID-IMHJ2280130103>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0355(199221)13:1<7::AID-IMHJ2280130103>3.0.CO;2-E)
- Downey, G., Mougios, V., Ayduk, O., London, B. E., & Shoda, Y. (2004). Rejection sensitivity and the defensive motivational system: Insights from the startle response to

- rejection cues. *Psychological Science*, 15(10), 668-673. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00738.x>
- Dworkin, R. (1978). *Taking rights seriously*. Harvard University Press.
- Fischer, R., & Schwartz, S. H. (2011). Whence differences in value priorities? Individual, cultural, or artifactual sources. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42(7), 1127–1144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110381429>
- Lim, A. J., Lau, C. Y. H., & Cheng, C. Y. (2022). Applying the dual filial piety model in the United States: A comparison of filial piety between Asian Americans and Caucasian Americans. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 786609. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.786609>
- Nainee, S., Tan, S. A., Tan, C. S., Gan, S. W., & Tan, J. P. (2021). Asian “Guan” parenting and life satisfaction among adolescents in Malaysia: The mediating role of filial piety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 746540. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.746540>
- Ohashi, M. M., & Yamaguchi, S. (2019). Super-ordinary bias among Japanese: Is it unique to Japanese culture? In K. H. Yeh (Ed.), *Asian indigenous psychologies in the global context* (pp. 169-193). Palgrave Studies in Indigenous Psychology. Palgrave Macmillan Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96232-0_8
- Qiao, X., Lv, Y., Aldbyani, A., Guo, Q., Zhang, T., & Cai, M. (2021). Chaos may prevail without filial piety: A cross-cultural study on filial piety, the dark triad, and moral disengagement. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 738128. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.738128>
- Rózycka-Tran, J., Jurek, P., Olech, M., & Dmochowski, T. (2021). A measurement invariance investigation of the Polish version of the Dual Filial-Piety Scale (DFPS-PL): Student-employee and gender differences in filial beliefs. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 713395. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.713395>
- Shweder, R. A., Goodnow, J., Hatano, G., LeVine, R., Markus, H., & Miller, P. (1998). The cultural psychology of development: One mind, many mentalities. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology*, Vol. 1, (pp. 865–937). John Wiley & Sons.
- Tsao, W.-C., & Yeh, K.-H. (2019). Indigenous implications and global applications of the dual filial piety model: A psychological Re-conceptualization of ‘Xiao’. In K.-H. Yeh (Ed.), *Asian indigenous psychologies in the global context* (pp. 195-219). Palgrave Studies in Indigenous Psychology. Palgrave Macmillan Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96232-0_9

- Tsao, W.-C., & Yeh, K.-H. (2022). Research on filial piety psychology: From indigenous theory to global application. In C.-F. Yang & J.-H. Chang (Eds.), *Thirty years of Chinese indigenous psychology, Volume 1: Indigenous research approaches and theories*, (pp. 233-270). Wu-Nan Book Inc. (in Chinese)
- Wrenn, C. G. (1962). The culturally encapsulated counselor. *Harvard Educational Review*, 32(4), 444-449.
- Yeh, K.-H. (1998). One, two, or multiple moralities: How to define the criteria of moral standards. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 9, 187-204. [https://doi.org/10.6254/IPRCS.199806_\(9\).0005](https://doi.org/10.6254/IPRCS.199806_(9).0005) (in Chinese)
- Yeh, K.-H. (2011). On how to construct a good indigenous psychological theory. *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 36, 139-153. (in Chinese) <https://doi.org/10.6254/2011.36.139>
- Yeh, K.-H. (2020). Inclusion and integration: Revisiting the multiple philosophical paradigms of indigenized research. *Journal of Indigenous Counseling Psychology*, 11(4), 59–66. <http://jicp.heart.net.tw/article/JICP11-4-07.pdf> (in Chinese)
- Yeh, K.-H. (2023). Constructing indigenous psychological theories from a global perspective: Taking filial piety model as an example. *Review of General Psychology*, 27(3), 275–281. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680231152191>
- Zheng, W., Guo, Q., Huang, T., Lu, J., & Xie, C. (2021). The prosocial outgrowth of filial beliefs in different cultures: A conditional mediation model analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 748759. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.748759>