Michael H. Bond is a pioneer in the field of Chinese psychology. His professional and academic background enabled him to organize groups of psychologists from different places of the world to publish the first English book addressing *The Psychology of the Chinese People* (Bond, 1986), followed by two volumes of *Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (Bond, 1996, 2010).

In order to contrast Chinese psychology with that of other cultural groups, Bond (2012) argued that “we must develop measures of psychological constructs that are metrically equivalent across a host of cultural groups” in building models of interpersonal behavior.

In his paper entitled “How I am constructing culture-inclusive theories of social-psychological process in our age of globalization,” Bond (2012) indicated that some of these adduced constructs have a provenance outside the mainstream and are non-WEIRD productions; they are indigenous in origin, but are applicable pan-culturally. Sundararajan (2012) strongly opposed to the dimensional approach to studying cultures. In her paper “Indigenous psychology: Grounding science in culture, why and how?” she argued that such dichotomous dimensions as individualism versus collectivism, or independent versus interdependent self construal, may perpetuate the long shadows of Orientalism in psychology. Therefore, she cited Fiske’s (2002) words: “We Western psychology must transcend our ethnocentric framework and not just study how other cultures differ from the United States but explore what they are intrinsically” (p. 87), she further advocated the use of complex models of culture or the system approach to replace the dimensional one.

Taking his book, *Foundations of Chinese Psychology: Confucian Social Relations*, as an exemplar to challenge the approach of pan-cultural dimensions, K. K. Hwang (2012) illustrated in his article, “Critical Realism and multiple philosophical paradigms: The construction of culture-inclusive theories in psychology,” how he constructed the universal model of *Face and Favor* on the philosophical basis of evolutionary epistemology, then used the model to analyze the texts of pre-Chin Confucian classics by the hermeneutic method. He indicated that the Confucian ethics for ordinary people are isomorphic to the structure of the *Face and Favor* model, so it can be viewed as a culture-inclusive theory in psychology; moreover, the Three Bonds, which emerged after the Han Dynasty, should be carefully differentiated from the Five Cardinal Ethics (wu lun) in Confucianism as indicated by the method of critical theory.

Sundararajan (2012) also provided an elaborated analysis in her manuscript to indicate that the four interpersonal relationships in the *Face and Favor* model can be translated into Fiske’s relational models. From the perspective of structuralism, the *Face and Favor* model may represent the deep structure of universal mind in dealing with interpersonal interactions, while findings of Hwang’s cultural analysis may reflect the specific mentalities of people in Confucian society. In contrast with the ontological emptiness of pan-cultural dimensions, results of the system approach by multiple philosophical paradigms are congruent with the ontological realism and epistemological relativism advocated by the philosophy of Critical Realism.

Once an academic movement finds its philosophical ground, the movement has found a clear “way” for its future development, so it is fully matured. Findings of many empirical researches can be explained in terms of the theories thus
constructed, and the light of possible researches can be casted in the future. In his article, “Globalizing indigenous psychology: An East Asian form of hierarchical relationalism with world implications,” James Liu (2012) cited a series of empirical research done by indigenous psychologists in Taiwan and explained them in the context of Confucian relationalism. It is expected that papers presented at this conference may signify the coming of a new age for researches of indigenous psychologies in the future.