



Indigenization of Social Science Methodology in Hong Kong

Milan Tung-Wen Sun

香港亞太研究所

Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies

The Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies was established in September 1990 to promote multidisciplinary social science research on social, political and economic development. Research emphasis is placed on the role of Hong Kong in the Asia-Pacific region and the reciprocal effects of the development of Hong Kong and the Asia-Pacific region.

Director : Yeung Yue-man, PhD(*Chic.*), Professor of Geography
Associate Director : Lau Siu-kai, PhD(*Minn.*), Professor of Sociology

HK\$30.00
ISBN 962-441-047-X

Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong

Indigenization of Social Science Methodology in Hong Kong

Milan Tung-Wen Sun

Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong

About the author

Dr. Milan Tung-Wen Sun is a Lecturer at the Department of Government and Public Administration, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Opinions expressed in the publications of the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies are the authors'. They do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute.

© 1995 Milan Tung-Wen Sun
ISBN 962-441-047-X

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the author.

Indigenization of Social Science Methodology in Hong Kong

Abstract

Since the 1970s, indigenization has been widely discussed among the Third World social scientists as a process through which a body of cultural- and national-specific knowledge can be developed in the respective countries. The discussion is seldom empirical, let alone comparative. This study attempts to analyze indigenization of social science methodology in Hong Kong by replicating Brown and Kim's Q study (1981) of indigenization in Korea. The results indicate that local social scientists generally accept the principle of indigenization, although they may disagree with each other about its process and purposes. Brown and Kim conclude that indigenization is redundant and that operationism is more fundamental: with proper operations, indigenization will take care of itself. However, this analysis reveals that indigenization is more than its procedural and operational considerations. At least from a regional perspective, indigenization revolves around the recognition of the role and contributions of the Third World scholars to the development of social science disciplines at large.

The late 1970s were the heyday of the movement for indigenization. The call for indigenization started with the Third World scholars revolting against "the implantation of social sciences perpetuating 'captivity' of mind" (Atal, 1981, p.189). For more than a decade, social scientists have examined and discussed periodically the necessity of indigenization in social sciences (Atal, 1981; Riggs, 1987; Brittain, 1989). As an assessment of the movement, Brittain (1989) argues that indigenization has been, and will continue to be, a significant factor in the development of social sciences in the Third World countries as well as in the more industrialized nations.

Nevertheless, questions remain. Is there any consensus regarding the concept of "indigenization"? Or, has the meaning of indigenization been altered over the past two decades? Has the discussion focused on the philosophical and epistemological level, or has it been operationalized in individual social science disciplines in many developing countries?

This study attempts to address these questions empirically through the use of Q methodology. Specifically, it is a replication of Brown and Kim's study (1981) of the indigenization in Korea, although in a different context (i.e., Hong Kong) twelve years later. The purpose of this study is to identify patterns of attitudes among Hong Kong social scientists regarding the indigenization of social science methodology in Hong Kong.

Indigenization Revisited

The movement of indigenization was triggered by the frustrations among Third World scholars in their attempts at using Western concepts and techniques to understand and solve local problems. The 1977 UNESCO Report, a declaration of the indigenous scholars, clearly specified the original intention of the indigenization movement:

It is not merely the fact of a linkage that is noteworthy, but more so the fact that in the case of the developing regions, it is a relationship of dependency: to put it in other words, it is a "vertical" relationship between the donors and the recipients, between patrons and clients.... Though practically all the Third World Countries are now politically independent, "self rule" in the field of social sciences remains still to be achieved. (p.8)

The attention was focused on the center-periphery relation in social sciences in which Western concept, methodology, and technique play the dominant role.

The seemingly reactive mode of indigenization is complicated by its implications and philosophical roots. The call for in-

digenization at least revolves round two domains of issues. The first domain involves the philosophical reconsideration of the essence of social sciences, issues such as what is the scientific status of the social sciences? Are social sciences culture bound? What should be the tenet of the social sciences — diversity or universality? And, what is the nature of the indigenization? These are all legitimate questions of this domain. The second domain ponders over the procedural consideration of indigenization, questions such as how to indigenize social sciences? Is there any prerequisite for indigenization to be successful? What is the purpose of indigenization — internationalism or multinationalism? They are crucial to this domain.

In the philosophical domain, Gellner (1984, p.583) examines the proponents and opponents of the scientific status of social sciences and rejects "the putative demonstrations of the impossibility of science in social spheres." On the ground that the development of social sciences can be characterized by "the various traits that figure prominently in diverse theories of science,"¹ Gellner (1984, p.584) concludes that "social studies are indeed scientific." A similar argument is provided by Hindess (1977):

Scientific knowledge is thought to be valid only if it conforms to the prescribed procedures.... Methodology lays down procedural rules for scientific practice which it derives by means of a "knowledge" provided by philosophy. Methodology is the product of philosophy and the sciences are a realization of their methodology. (p.4)

Thus, the employment of scientific methodology in social sciences should ensure that the results are scientific, regardless of the content and context of the problems examined.

It is precisely this method-context dichotomy which leads Gareau (1987) to conclude otherwise. Upon extensive literature review, Gareau demonstrates that "social science betrays geographic component" (p.597) and "social science sects tend to have their distinctive epistemologies and methodologies" (p.598). Due to the diversity, the lack of consensus, dissonance and contextual

determinism, it is concluded that social sciences are non-scientific (Gareau, 1987, p.604).

The debate over the scientific status of social sciences has a profound impact on indigenization. If knowledge generated through social science research is valid universally (i.e., it is a science), indigenization involves repeatedly verifying scientific rules and regulations in different cultural and national settings. Thus, indigenization becomes meaningless, or at best it becomes the internationalization of social sciences (Moore, 1966). Conversely, if social sciences are culture bound, the call for indigenization is legitimate through which "relevant" knowledge can be developed for solving local problems adequately and effectively. In a sense, multiple centers of social science study will evolve.²

There is a consensus among social scientists, center or periphery, that indigenization should be conceptualized as a means rather than as an end. Kumar (1979) identifies three levels of indigenization: structural, substantive, and theoretical. To treat indigenization as an end in itself aims at achieving the theoretical indigenization which "indicates a condition in which the social scientists of a nation are involved in constructing distinctive conceptual frameworks and methodologies which reflect their worldviews, social and cultural experience, and perceived goals" (Kumar, 1979, p.105). Kumar argues that it is problematic to become theoretically indigenized, thus, "transnational cooperation" (a means) should be encouraged rather than indigenization (1979, pp.114-116). Similarly, Riggs (1987) suggests that indigenization should be a means of attaining universal knowledge:

In an increasingly interdependent world it is important for us to share experience globally. In the long run what we seek is increasing relevance and rigour. However, in this transition period, it seems desirable to stress the importance of "indigenization." (p.608)

On the other hand, indigenization has been treated by some Third World scholars as an end in itself. Atal (1981, p.193) specifies four forms of indigenization in Asia: "(a) teaching in the

national language and use of local materials; (b) research by insiders; (c) determination of research priorities; and (d) theoretical and methodological reorientation." The need for theoretical and methodological reorientation:

is not so much an alternative which is really needed if one is to pursue the goal of a universal science — and not the setting up of "schools of thought", like sects, creating a priesthood and a blind following. Genuine efforts, which go beyond reactive rhapsodies, are... perhaps needed. (Atal, 1981, pp.193-194)

Implicitly, for some Asian social scientists, or Atal himself, indigenization should be an end rather than a means.

Questions have arisen about the conditions under which indigenization in the Third World can succeed. According to Gellner's analysis³ (1984), some Third World societies may not be science-capable; too-tight control over scientific study due to ideological or political reasons, and the lack of a research tradition and shared conceptual framework (paradigm). Pragmatically, social scientists in the Third World may lack funding, research facilities and training in conducting indigenous study. The dilemma is that efforts to overcome these problems (i.e., foreign aid, inviting foreign researchers, establishing external academic linkages, etc.) are often being criticized as retarding indigenization on the ground that they re-enforce the vertical center-periphery relationship in the social sciences.

Due to the complexity of the issues involved, the discussion of indigenization here can only be limited. The important point is that, as Atal (1981, p.190) reminds the students of social sciences, there is a definitional crisis: "indigenization means different things to different people." It is to this end — to identify the presumably different meanings of indigenization among Hong Kong social scientists — that the current study is directed.

Research Design

If indigenization is "a plea for self-awareness and rejection of a borrowed consciousness" (Atal, 1981, p.192) and "an attitude toward the national identity in the awareness of problems" (Kim, 1979, p.10), its success is determined more by individual conceptualizations toward indigenization among the social scientists in a nation than by a properly defined procedure. It is the consideration of how social sciences in the Third World *ought to be* developed.

Clearly, judgments concerning *what ought to be* are subjective in nature. They refer to opinions that are "synthetic and self-referential — it is the I, the subjective self" (Brown, 1986, p.58). To study the attitudes among Hong Kong social scientists about indigenization, this study employs Q methodology which:

[is] commonly and incompletely known as the Q-sorting technique — encompasses a distinctive set of psychometric and operational principles that, when combined with specialized statistical applications of correlational and factor-analytical techniques, provide researchers with a systematic and rigorously quantitative means for examining human subjectivity.⁴

Q methodology was first introduced by William Stephenson in 1935.⁵ It involves a set of procedures whereby a sample of opinion statements is ranked and sorted by individuals. Different from the conventional R methodology, a sample in Q refers to a collection of statements, and respondents become the variables. Opinions about an issue are first collected to form a concourse — the running together statements. From the concourse, a sample of statements is then assembled either structurally or unstructurally according to the specific design (Kerlinger, 1973; Brown, 1970). Respondents are asked to sort the statements on a continuum on the basis of their agreement or disagreement with individual statements. The result is called a Q sort which represents a respondent's attitude under a given condition of instruction.

Q sorts are normally correlated and factor-analyzed. The resulting factors indicate clusters of respondents who have ranked the statements in essentially the same fashion. As Brown (1980, p.191) notes, "in Q methodology, the meaning and significance of items are determined by the subject, so that the observer acquires knowledge of their meaning *a posteriori*, i.e., after the subject has sorted them." Although the sample of statements is usually constructed according to some hypothetical meaning attached to them, the interpretation of Q factors is not constrained by their operational definition. As Stephenson stated:

In the case of Q-factor,... there is an operation (Q-sorting), and an operational definition of attitude in a general sense (Q-factors), but what is measured isn't dependent upon these, and what is measured isn't known until the factors have been found, after which they may be conceptualized as ways to measure this-or-that attitude. (Quoted from Brown, 1970, p.184)

What is tested in Q is the proposition made by the researcher which may be totally unrelated to the way the statements were structured.

The major concern of this study is to identify empirically the attitudes among Hong Kong social scientists about the issue of indigenization. A similar study was conducted by Brown and Kim (1981) to analyze the indigenization of social science methodology in Korea. In their study, the Q sample consisted of 36 statements selected from the concourse which included the considerations of (a) science and technology, (b) cultural relativity, (c) Korean scientists, and (d) indigenization (Brown and Kim, 1981, p.113). Dimensions addressed in Brown and Kim's study were similar to the foci identified through the above literature review. Therefore, their Q sample should be applicable to the situation in Hong Kong.

The original Q sample is reproduced here with only minor wording changes (i.e., Korea is replaced by Hong Kong; Korean is replaced by Hong Kong people, see Appendix).⁶ Eleven people were asked to sort the Q sample; they were six faculty members and five graduate students from different social science depart-

ments at The Chinese University of Hong Kong.⁷ These 11 Q sorts were inter-correlated and factor-analyzed (using the Principal Components Analysis) which resulted in four factors.⁸ Factor loadings and subjects' departmental and status backgrounds are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 Factor Loadings for Four Factors in Hong Kong

Q Sorts	Factor [@]				Department
	A	B	C	D	
1*	(.75)	.07	-.07	-.26	Political Science
2*	(.47)	(-.52)	.10	.19	Political Science
3*	(.35)	-.01	(.55)	-.29	Political Science
4	(.51)	(-.54)	-.09	-.01	Sociology
5	(.56)	(.50)	-.11	.15	Business Administration
6	.29	.25	-.25	(.43)	Anthropology
7	(.51)	-.03	-.06	-.13	Political Science
8	.24	.02	.28	(.33)	Political Science
9*	(.47)	.14	(-.33)	.08	Anthropology [#]
10*	(.66)	.02	-.25	-.14	Economics
11*	(.46)	.08	.21	-.32	Journalism and Communication [#]

[@] Factor loadings exceeding ± 0.33 are significant at the .05 level; those exceeding ± 0.43 are significant at the .01 level, using $1/\sqrt{N}$ ($N=36$ statements) as the standard error of a zero-order loading. Loadings significant at or above the 0.5 level are in parentheses.

* Faculty.

Westerner.

Factor Interpretation

Factor A

Factor A is a dominant factor on which, except two students,⁹ every subject has a positive and significant factor loading. Factor A represents an attitude which fuses several domains of arguments into a coherent pattern of thought regarding indigenization: the nature of social science and scientists, theory versus methodology, and Hong Kong researchers, society, and traits. Factor A can be understood by examining statements which are mostly agreed to by Factor A subjects.¹⁰

	A	B	C	D
5. While science knows no national boundary, scientists do.	4	-4	-4	-3
6. Whereas natural science inquires into relatively stable phenomena, social science deals with man, who is far more complicated and less stable than natural phenomena. Hence, social science differs from natural science in object, theme, methodology, and premise.	4	-2	1	4
13. Since any science of any age is a reflection of cultural processes, it is evident that social scientists in particular cannot be completely independent of the culture in which they were born.	4	-3	2	4
14. As almost every bibliography shows, the concepts, terms, and theories used in research are overwhelmingly foreign in origin.	4	-4	0	-1
30. It is not practical to conduct strict and thorough experiments in the social science because it is impossible to control all relevant variables.	3	-2	2	1

	A	B	C	D
32. If we are to reach an understanding of man and society, we must start from experience — specifically, from experience which has been localized.	3	0	-3	0
25. What we have to take into consideration when we introduce concepts that are foreign is how to translate, redefine, and adapt them.	2	-3	1	-2
1. Many Western tools of analysis are utterly inadequate for throwing light on our social problems.	-4	1	4	2

Factor A perceives that social sciences differ from natural sciences in that the former deal with man (no. 6). Due to the complexity and instability of the subject matter studied, "strict and thorough experiments" — synonymous with natural science — is not practical in social sciences (no. 30). On the other hand, scientists, and social scientists in particular, are nation/culture bound and "cannot be completely independent of the culture in which they were born" (nos. 5, 13).

Factor A recognizes that Hong Kong social science research is dominated by foreign concepts, terms, and theories (no. 14). The process of indigenization, according to Factor A respondents, involves (1) the translation, redefinition, and adaptation of foreign concepts (no. 25) and (2) the application of Western tools of research in analyzing local problems (many of which are adequate for throwing light on Hong Kong social problems, see no. 1) and localizing experiences (no. 32). What need to be indigenized, according to Factor A, are theories and concepts rather than methodology.

Statements with which Factor A respondents strongly disagree indicate a defense of the social conditions within which local research is conducted:

	A	B	C	D
9. We must consider the difficulty of applying to Hong Kong a design that is good for a relatively well organized and open society, since our society is still disorganized and has many elements of seclusion.	-4	2	-4	-3
20. Our biggest problem is a lack of modern research facilities.	-4	3	-2	-2
22. The unfamiliarity with Western concepts among Hong Kong researchers indicates that the influence of natural features on the birth of concepts cannot be ignored.	-4	0	-4	-2
17. Immaturity on the part of researchers and lack of consistent philosophy on the part of patrons of research is promoting philosophy on the part of patrons of research is promoting imitation of research conducted in the United States and other foreign countries.	-3	-1	2	0
36. Hong Kong people tend not to be hypothesis-oriented, and are also deficient in terms of multivariate and continuous thinking — consequently, they tend to fall into dogmatic judgments.	-3	3	3	3
31. Hong Kong researchers often give exaggerated interpretations to their results and statistics and seem to have contempt for precision. This has led to a retarding of scientific development.	-2	4	2	0

The development of social science knowledge in Hong Kong is not obstructed by social conditions (no. 9) and people's orientations (no. 36). Moreover, Hong Kong social science community is well equipped with sophisticated research facilities (no. 20) and highly qualified and well trained researchers (nos. 22, 17, 31).

Factor B

Factor B is a bipolar factor. The positive end of Factor B differs from the negative end (denoted as Factor -B) in the perceived problems of social science research in Hong Kong. In a sense, it is an attitude which criticizes the development of scientific knowledge in Hong Kong, but with different conclusions. Factor B perceives the problem as a methodological one:

	A	B	C	D
11. Social scientists find concrete problems in the real society in which they live, and their research can have meaning only when their answers to the problems are applicable to society with certainty.	1	4	0	3
12. It is necessary to train students in research methodology and to guide them to discard the descriptive method in favor of more experimental methods.	0	4	-3	1
27. Hong Kong researchers prefer the qualitative to the quantitative.	0	4	-1	0
31. Hong Kong researchers often give exaggerated interpretations to their results and statistics and seem to have contempt for precision. This has led to a retarding of scientific development.	-2	4	2	0
20. Our biggest problem is a lack of modern research facilities.	-4	3	-2	-2

To ensure that research is "applicable to society with *certainty*" (no. 11), Hong Kong social science researchers and students should pay more attention to research methodology (no. 12), quantitative research (no. 27), and the way in which research results are interpreted (no. 31). At least partially, the problem can be improved by modernizing local research facilities (no. 20).

Unlike Factor A, Factor B perceives certain Hong Kong characteristics as mediating against the development of scientific knowledge:

	A	B	C	D
36. Hong Kong people tend not to be hypothesis-oriented, and are also deficient in terms of multivariate and continuous thinking — consequently, they tend to fall into dogmatic judgments.	-3	3	3	3
9. We must consider the difficulty of applying to Hong Kong a design that is good for a relatively well organized and open society, since our society is still disorganized and has many elements of seclusion.	-4	2	-4	-3
33. We rely more on sentimental logic than on rational logic in defining and describing the questions with which we are faced.	-1	2	-4	-2

These statements were ranked very positively by Factor B respondents, compared with any other factor. The characteristics of Hong Kong people (no. 36) and society (no. 9) were perceived as obstacles to rationality (no. 33) — the cornerstone of modern scientific knowledge.

Factor -B views the problem of the development of social sciences in Hong Kong differently. It faults local researchers not for their methodological capability but for their failure in indigenizing foreign theories and concepts. This attitude can be examined by turning Factor B sort upside down:¹¹

	A	-B	C	D
4. In applying Western methodologies, Hong Kong researchers generally fail to penetrate the essence and merely imitate the outer trappings.	-1	4	-2	4
14. As almost every bibliography shows, the concepts, terms, and theories used in research are overwhelmingly foreign in origin.	4	4	0	-1
18. If we are to explain Hong Kong people, society, bureaucracy, voters, consumers, and parents on a level with engineering (involving prediction and control), we will inevitably have to indigenize the theoretical frame, concepts, and consciousness of problems.	0	4	4	-4
25. What we have to take into consideration when we introduce concepts that are foreign is how to translate, redefine, and adapt them.	2	3	1	-2
28. Ideas which inspire our social scientists to conduct research are generally Western in nature, whereas research projects dealing with urgent problems facing Hong Kong are sporadic.	0	3	3	1

Even though Hong Kong social science research is heavily influenced by Western theories and concepts (nos. 14, 28), the fundamental problem is not the application of Western methodologies *per se*, but researchers "generally (failing) to penetrate the essence" (no. 4) while applying foreign theories to analyze local problems. Factor -B respondents argue that efforts devoted to indigenization should focus on the theoretical level: "to translate, redefine, and adapt" foreign concepts (no. 25), and "to indigenize the theoretical frame, concepts, and consciousness of problems" (no. 18).

Factor C

Factor C is also a bipolar factor which centers on the issue regarding the purpose of the social sciences. The positive end of Factor C emphasizes particularism in social sciences, the negative end (denoted as Factor -C) focuses on universalism:

	A	B	C	D
18. If we are to explain Hong Kong people, society, bureaucracy, voters, consumers, and parents on a level with engineering (involving prediction and control), we will inevitably have to indigenize the theoretical frame, concepts, and consciousness of problems.	0	-4	4	-4
19. Generally speaking, even scientific concepts are culture bound; and so it is apt that, when they are introduced to a different culture, they give birth to opposition and collision.	2	2	4	2
24. Truth must be understood by people who live in a society if it is to acquire human value. This is even more so for social science which is linked directly with the destiny of people who live in society.	2	0	4	-3
2. Theories of social science in particular are destined ultimately to be localized, i.e., they have their origin in the socio-historical consciousness rather than in the universal spirit.	1	-2	3	-3
34. Intuition and the capacity for synthesizing are characteristics of Hong Kong people, and if these could be further defined, it would greatly contribute to developing the recognition of problems and conceiving ideas for their solution.	1	-1	3	-1

The emphasis on particularism is demonstrated by Factor C's recognition that all scientific concepts are culture bound (no. 19), and social science theories in particular are based on "the socio-

historical consciousness rather than universal spirit" (no. 2). Indigenization is ultimately a process through which a particular knowledge — linked directly with the destiny of Hong Kong people (no. 24) — can be developed on the basis of localized theories and concepts and an understanding of the consciousness of local problems (no. 18), such as intuition and the capacity for synthesizing the characteristics of Hong Kong people (no. 34).

Conversely, Factor -C believes in the universalism of scientific knowledge. The following statements are the most agreed with by Factor -C respondents:

	A	B	-C	D
22. The unfamiliarity with Western concepts among Hong Kong researchers indicates that the influence of natural features on the birth of concepts cannot be ignored.	-4	0	4	-2
33. We rely more on sentimental logic than on rational logic in defining and describing the questions with which we are faced.	-1	2	4	-2
35. Science is an intellectual property owned jointly by mankind. Common conclusions are reached, therefore, regardless of the hypothesis the scientist started with and regardless of nationality.	3	3	4	4

Science should be universal and unified (no. 35) which emphasizes rational logic (no. 33). The difficulty of applying Western concepts, which are presumably to be universally valid, to Hong Kong may simply be because local researchers are unfamiliar with them (no. 22).

Factor D

In a nutshell, Factor D represents a critical attitude toward the social sciences development in Hong Kong. The following statements distinguish Factor D from the other factors:

	A	B	C	D
4. In applying Western methodologies, Hong Kong researchers generally fail to penetrate the essence and merely imitate the outer trappings.	-1	-4	-2	4
7. The Hong Kong people's attitude toward solving problems is not based on a scientific methodology, but on personification, adaptation to the supernatural, reliance on personal experiences, intuition, and blind obedience to authority.	-1	-1	-1	3
16. The organization and syntax of research papers are often illogical, indicating insufficient professional training on the part of the researchers. It is necessary for them to train themselves in the art of writing in a concise style.	-2	0	-3	2
21. There is a lack of tolerance for divergent opinions, a strong inclination to projection, and mental unrest (as evidenced in fortune telling) — all of which pose a serious obstacle to dealing with science and objective knowledge.	-3	-3	-3	1

Seemingly, Factor D reflects a dissatisfaction with the results of social science research in Hong Kong. These distinguishing statements were ranked disproportionately high by Factor D respondents relatively to the other factors. Statements 4 and 16 challenge Hong Kong social science research directly, and statements 7 and 21 can be interpreted as discontent with the attitude and the degree of tolerance in Hong Kong social science community. Seemingly, the problem of scientific development in Hong Kong

is not that of indigenization, but the immaturity of the local social science community:

	A	B	C	D
18. If we are to explain Hong Kong people, society, bureaucracy, voters, consumers, and parents on a level with engineering (involving prediction and control), we will inevitably have to indigenize the theoretical frame, concepts, and consciousness of problems.	0	-4	4	-4
24. Truth must be understood by people who live in a society if it is to acquire human value. This is even more so for social science which is linked directly with the destiny of people who live in society.	2	0	4	-3
25. What we have to take into consideration when we introduce concepts that are foreign is how to translate, redefine, and adapt them.	2	-3	1	-2

For Factor D respondents, social science does not have to link "directly with the destiny of the people who live in society" (no. 24). Thus, indigenization is neither inevitable (no. 18) nor necessary (no. 25).

Summary and Conclusion

In summary, Q sorts obtained from Hong Kong social science researchers and students were factor analyzed and four factors were revealed. Factor A is a dominant factor in which various aspects of indigenization are fused together. Generally speaking, Factor A distinguishes between natural and social sciences; it supports indigenizing theories and concepts and localizing experience, but not necessarily indigenizing methodology; it also idealizes Hong Kong society and traits. Factors B and C are bipolar

factors. The former centers on the process of indigenization: it should be pursued as an issue of operationalization which focuses on methodological matters (Factor B); or it should emphasize the localization of theories and concepts (Factor -B). The latter penetrates the essence of scientific knowledge: social sciences should be multinational (Factor C) or universal (Factor -C). Factor D, a student perspective, challenges the integrity of the social science community in Hong Kong. Except for Factor D, all the other factors indicate the acceptance of the principle of indigenization among Hong Kong social scientists, albeit through different procedures (Factor B versus -B) and for different purposes (Factor C versus -C).

On a comparative basis, Factor A, which is an attitude which fuses several aspects of indigenization into a coherent pattern of thought, breaks into two themes. The first theme is concerned with cultural relativity, the idealization of social characteristics and the indigenization of theories and concepts, three closely related arguments. The notion of cultural relativity is supported by the emphasis on particularism — culture-specific knowledge — in Factor C, but it is opposed by the assertion made by Factor B that adherence to scientific research procedure will ultimately result in scientific knowledge which should not be culture bound.

The second theme specifies the emphasis on social science in the Third World: what needs to be indigenized are theories and concepts rather than research methodologies. This view actually reflects a bottom-up approach for the development of social science knowledge (i.e., the development of culture-specific knowledge is to achieve a body of universally valid knowledge). Thus, this latent attitude of Factor A is opposed by Factor C which advocates particularism in the evolution of social sciences. This line of reasoning may contradict Factor B's argument of indigenizing scientific research methodology. But, Factor B is supporting the objective of developing universal knowledge — although through a different approach (i.e., indigenizing methodology).

Since no prior conceptualization were imposed on the interpretation, these factors are operant categories which represent

indigenous attitudes. When assessing the factors revealed in their Korean study, Brown and Kim (1981) conclude:

The operant factors of this study, although specific to the concerns of Korean social scientists, are no more or less operational than any other factors emerging from any other study on any other topic performed on any other respondents anywhere else in the world. (p.136)

The question is what conclusion can be drawn when two sets of indigenous attitudes, Hong Kong and Korea, are analyzed together?

Brown and Kim (1981, p.133) state in their study that the principle of indigenization is accepted by all of the Korean factors, except one. This observation is generally supported by the findings of this study — except Factor D. Indigenization, if defined as the self-awareness among the Third World scholars of the influence of cultural and national elements in the development of social sciences *in any specific society individually*, has achieved its aim. Nevertheless, Brown and Kim (1981) reach a rather different conclusion:

[T]he necessary prerequisite for the proper study of Korean society (or any society for that matter) is not indigenization per se, but operationalization, and with suitable operations indigenization will take care of itself. (p.134)

To analyze local problems adequately, any rigorous social science study has to take into considerations social, cultural, and national characteristics in its research design, hypothesis making, interpretation, and conceptualization. In the process of achieving this end, scientific research procedure is more important than indigenization. From this viewpoint, indigenization can be interpreted as redundant in an operational sense, “for what is essential to the culture under examination is contained in the operations” (Brown and Kim, 1981, p.135). The call for indigenization might have served its purpose retrospectively.

From a regional perspective, or may be for the Third World social scientists in general, the concern over indigenization may

have broader implications. At least for Hong Kong and Korean social scientists, they have demonstrated a concern which goes beyond the national or cultural boundary: pondering over the importance of cultural relativity in the development of social sciences. Prospectively, indigenization symbolizes the efforts of the Third World scholars at defining their role and making their contributions to the disciplines at large. This bring us back to Brittain's (1989) conclusion:

[The] important force in guiding the social sciences into the twenty-first century is the recognition of the parochial nature of much of social science knowledge and consequently the need for indigenization; a related factor is the increasing emphasis upon the social sciences in the developing countries and the realization that social scientists from such countries can play just as important a role in formulating and executing a new strategy for the support of the social sciences as their more established colleagues in the industrialized countries. (p.113)

Notes

1. These traits include (1) the presence of well-articulated hypotheses and their systematic testing, (2) precise quantitative measurements, and the operationalization of concepts, (3) careful observation by publicly checkable methods, (4) sophisticated and rigorous conceptual structures, and great insights, and (5) shared paradigms, at any rate over sizeable communities of scholars, and persisting over prolonged periods (Gellner, 1984, p.584).
2. This is what Gareau called “multinational version of social sciences.” See Gareau (1984).
3. Gellner (1984) specifies three different ideas of the so called “science-capable” society. Citing Emile Durkheim (1954), the first idea is that any society is “an essential pre-condition of science and, indeed, of all thought” (p.570). The second idea

comes from Karl Popper (1966) which states that only an open society — where “men subject each other’s views to criticism, and which either possesses institutional underpinning for such a practice, or at least lacks the institutional means for inhibiting it” (p.570) — is science-capable. The third idea, citing Thomas Kuhn (1970), suggests that “science is made possible only by the presence of social-conceptual control sufficiently tight to impose a paradigm on its members at most... time, notwithstanding the fact that paradigms are not logically, so to speak objectively, binding” (p.573).

4. This is quoted from Richard G. Niemi, in his “series Editor’s Introduction” for McKeown and Thomas’s book (1988). For detailed discussion of the theoretical and methodological foundations of Q methodology, see also Brown (1980).
5. See Stephenson (1935).
6. The complete Q sample used in this study is available upon request from the author.
7. Different from the conventional survey research, Q methodology does not require a large sample size (Stephenson, 1953). The concerns of the representativeness, which is heavily emphasized in survey sampling, is exercised in Q through the selection of Q statements. Usually, Q methodology is associated with variance designs which provide a conceptual framework for the research in thinking about a problem so as to prevent loose ends that are unaccounted for.
8. Factors B and C are rotated for reducing factor correlations, Factors A and D are unrotated factors. Factor correlations range from -0.267 (Factors A and B) to 0.274 (Factors A and D).
9. Even for these two subjects, factor loadings are positive and somewhat high.
10. In Q Methodology, the factor interpretations depend on the way Q statements are sorted in which the inherent structure of the attitude can be revealed. The following presentation of the statements and their factor scores is to demonstrate how

the interpretation was made, so that readers can judge its merit by looking at the “evidence.”

11. The most disagreed with statements of Factor B will become the most agreed with statements of Factor -B.

References

- Atal, Yogesh (1981). “The Call for Indigenization,” *International Social Science Journal* 33(1):189-197.
- Brittain, J. Michael (1989). “Cultural Boundaries of the Social Sciences in the 1990s: New Policies for Documentation, Information and Knowledge Creation,” *International Social Science Journal* 41(1):105-114.
- Brown, Steven R. (1970). “On the Use of Variance Design in Q Methodology,” *The Psychological Record* 20(2):179-189.
- (1980). *Political Subjectivity: Applications of Q Methodology in Political Science*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- (1986). “Q Technique and Method,” in William D. Berry and Michael S. Lewis-Beck, eds, *New Tools for Social Scientists*, pp.57-76, Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Brown, Steven R. and Kim Ki Jeong (1981). “Indigenization of Methodologies,” *Social Science and Policy Research* 3(3):109-139, Seoul: The Institute of Social Sciences, Seoul National University.
- Durkheim, Emile (1954). *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, trans. by Joseph W. Swain, New York: Free Press.
- Gareau, Frederick H. (1984). “The Multinational Version of Social Science,” *International Social Science Journal* 35(2):379-389.
- (1987). “Expansion and Increasing Diversification of the Universe of Social Science,” *International Social Science Journal* 39(4):595-606.
- Gellner, Ernest (1984). “The Scientific Status of the Social Sciences,” *International Social Science Journal* 36(4):567-586.
- Hindess, Barry (1977). *Philosophy and Methodology in the Social Sciences*, Brighton: The Harvester Press.

- Kerlinger, Fred N. (1973). *Foundations of Behavior Research*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Chapter 34, "Q Methodology."
- Kim, Jae-Un (1979). "Problems Concerning Indigenization of Methodology for Education and Psychology," *Korea Journal* 19(11):10-19.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kumar, Krishna (1979). "Indigenization and Transnational Cooperation in the Social Sciences," in Krishna Kumar, ed., *Bonds Without Bondage*, pp.103-120, Honolulu: East-West Cultural Learning Institute.
- McKeown, Bruce and Thomas, Dan (1988). *Q Methodology*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Moore, Wilbert E. (1966). "Global Sociology: The World as A Singular System," *The American Journal of Sociology* 11(5):475-482.
- Nowak, Stefan (1984). "Philosophical Schools and Scientific Working Methods in Social Science," *International Social Science Journal* 36(4):587-601.
- Popper, Karl (1966). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Riggs, Fred W. (1979). "The Group and the Movement: Notes on Comparative and Development Administration," *Public Administration Review* 36(6):648-654.
- (1987). "Indigenous Concepts: A Problem for Social and Information Science," *International Social Science Journal* 39(4):607-617.
- Stephenson, William (1935). "Technique of Factor Analysis," *Nature* 136:297.
- (1953). *The Study of Behavior*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO (1977). *Inter-Regional Co-operation in the Social Sciences*, Paris: UNESCO, Reports and Papers in Social Sciences, 36.

Appendix Q Statements and Factor Arrays

	A	B	C	D
1. Many Western tools of analysis are utterly inadequate for throwing light on our social problems.	-4	1	4	2
2. Theories of social science in particular are destined ultimately to be localized, i.e., they have their origin in the socio-historical consciousness rather than in the universal spirit.	1	-2	3	-3
3. Since we do not have a sufficient quantity of experimental tools, we are forced to spend most of our time reading research reports produced by others.	-2	-2	-1	-4
4. In applying Western methodologies, Hong Kong researchers generally fail to penetrate the essence and merely imitate the outer trappings.	-1	4	-2	4
5. While science knows no national boundary, scientists do.	4	-4	-4	-3
6. Whereas natural science inquires into relatively stable phenomena, social science deals with man, who is far more complicated and less stable than natural phenomena. Hence, social science differs from natural science in object, theme, methodology, and premise.	4	-2	1	4
7. The Hong Kong people's attitude toward solving problems is not based on a scientific methodology, but on personification, adaptation to the supernatural, reliance on personal experiences, intuition, and blind obedience to authority.	-1	-1	-1	3
8. We are confronted with the task of resolving problems which arise as an aftermath of cultural collision in the process of digesting scientific methodology.	1	1	1	-1

	A	B	C	D
9. We must consider the difficulty of applying to Hong Kong a design that is good for a relatively well organized and open society, since our society is still disorganized and has many elements of seclusion.	-4	2	-4	-3
10. Perhaps due to our lack of scholarly tradition, our research is small in scale and sporadic.	-1	1	0	2
11. Social scientists find concrete problems in the real society in which they live, and their research can have meaning only when their answers to the problems are applicable to society with certainty.	1	4	0	3
12. It is necessary to train students in research methodology and to guide them to discard the descriptive method in favor of more experimental methods.	0	4	-3	1
13. Since any science of any age is a reflection of cultural processes, it is evident that social scientists in particular cannot be completely independent of the culture in which they were born.	4	-3	2	4
14. As almost every bibliography shows, the concepts, terms, and theories used in research are overwhelmingly foreign in origin.	4	-4	0	-1
15. There is more of a reliance on intuition or a single experience than on sustained observation in becoming aware of problems or conceiving ideas for their solution.	-2	-1	-1	-4
16. The organization and syntax of research papers are often illogical, indicating insufficient professional training on the part of the researchers. It is necessary for them to train themselves in the art of writing in a concise style.	-2	0	-3	2
17. Immaturity on the part of researchers and lack of consistent philosophy on the part of patrons of research is promoting imitation of research conducted in the United States and other foreign countries.	-3	-1	2	0

	A	B	C	D
18. If we are to explain Hong Kong people, society, bureaucracy, voters, consumers, and parents on a level with engineering (involving prediction and control), we will inevitably have to indigenize the theoretical frame, concepts, and consciousness of problems.	0	4	4	-4
19. Generally speaking, even scientific concepts are culture bound; and so it is apt that, when they are introduced to a different culture, they give birth to opposition and collision.	2	2	4	2
20. Our biggest problem is a lack of modern research facilities.	-4	3	-2	-2
21. There is a lack of tolerance for divergent opinions, a strong inclination to projection, and mental unrest (as evidenced in fortune telling) — all of which pose a serious obstacle to dealing with science and objective knowledge.	-3	-3	-3	1
22. The unfamiliarity with Western concepts among Hong Kong researchers indicates that the influence of natural features on the birth of concepts cannot be ignored.	-4	0	-4	-2
23. Greater importance is attached to a subjective attitude than to an objective one.	-3	3	0	-4
24. Truth must be understood by people who live in a society if it is to acquire human value. This is even more so for social science which is linked directly with the destiny of people who live in society.	2	0	4	-3
25. What we have to take into consideration when we introduce concepts that are foreign is how to translate, redefine, and adapt them.	2	-3	1	-2
26. We need descriptive basic research on a large scale with "Hong Kong people and Hong Kong society" as the objects of study. This is essential in all sectors of social science.	2	2	1	-1

	A	B	C	D
27. Hong Kong researchers prefer the qualitative to the quantitative.	0	4	-1	0
28. Ideas which inspire our social scientists to conduct research are generally Western in nature, whereas research projects dealing with urgent problems facing Hong Kong are sporadic.	0	3	3	1
29. Universal or general knowledge alone cannot become the purpose of science. In order to solve a particular problem facing an individual or society, particular knowledge should also be held as another purpose of science.	3	1	-2	3
30. It is not practical to conduct strict and thorough experiments in the social science because it is impossible to control all relevant variables.	3	-2	2	1
31. Hong Kong researchers often give exaggerated interpretations to their results and statistics and seem to have contempt for precision. This has led to a retarding of scientific development.	-2	4	2	0
32. If we are to reach an understanding of man and society, we must start from experience — specifically, from experience which has been localized.	3	0	-3	0
33. We rely more on sentimental logic than on rational logic in defining and describing the questions with which we are faced.	-1	2	-4	-2
34. Intuition and the capacity for synthesizing are characteristics of Hong Kong people, and if these could be further defined, it would greatly contribute to developing the recognition of problems and conceiving ideas for their solution.	1	-1	3	-1
35. Science is an intellectual property owned jointly by mankind. Common conclusions are reached, therefore, regardless of the hypothesis the scientist started with and regardless of nationality.	3	3	4	4

	A	B	C	D
36. Hong Kong people tend not to be hypothesis-oriented, and are also deficient in terms of multivariate and continuous thinking — consequently, they tend to fall into dogmatic judgments.	-3	3	3	3

Source: Brown, Steven R. and Kim Ki Jeong (1981). "Indigenization of Methodologies," *Social Science and Policy Research* 3(3):116-117. Seoul: The Institute of Social Sciences, Seoul National University.

香港社會科學方法論本土化

孫同文

（中文摘要）

發展中國家的社會科學學者長久以來一直關注著「本土化」的議題。相對於科學的普遍性原則，「本土化」強調發展出一套與各國特有國情與文化緊密相關之理論知識的過程。本文複製 Brown 和 Kim（1981）在韓國的研究，並嘗試以之分析有關香港社會科學方法論本土化的論述。結果顯示，「本土化」的精神和原則大體上已為本地的社會科學家所接受，但他們對於本土化的過程和目的卻存有不同的體驗。Brown 和 Kim 原文宣稱，「本土化」是多餘而無需強調的，因為在發展各國獨特的社會科學方法論過程中，本土化可以經由嚴格遵守「操作論」（operationalism）的要義而獲得實踐。本文則認為，「本土化」不僅僅局限於步驟和操作方面的考慮，其意義涵蓋著發展中國家的社會科學學者如何體認自己在整個社會科學學科的發展中所擔當的重要角色和產生的貢獻。