

**BIGSSS - Bremen International Graduate School of Social Sciences**  
Constructor University | P.O. Box 750 561 | 28759 Bremen | Germany

Masaryk University  
Academic Qualifications

To whom it may concern

| Prof. Dr. Klaus Boehnke  
Chair – BIGSSS Methods Center

Constructor University  
Campus Ring 1  
PO Box 750 561  
28759 Bremen  
Germany

Phone: + 49 (0)421 – 200 3401

| Fax: + 49 (0)421 – 200 3303

Email: [kboehnke@constructor.university](mailto:kboehnke@constructor.university)

URL : <https://constructor.university/faculty-member/klaus-boehnke>

September 4, 2023

## HABILITATION THESIS REVIEWER'S REPORT

Masaryk University

Applicant

Mgr. et Mgr. Václav Linkov, Ph.D.

Habilitation thesis

Cultural diversity in cultural-comparative  
psychological research and factors influencing it

Reviewer

Professor Dr. Klaus Boehnke

Reviewer's home unit, institution

Bremen International Graduate School of  
Social Sciences (BIGSSS)  
Constructor University  
Bremen, Germany

Thank you for the opportunity to act as reviewer of Dr. Linkov's habilitation thesis.

The thesis consists of a brief introduction, a general elaboration of the main focus of the work presented, namely "Psychology and Cultural Diversity," a collection of 9 academic journal articles (three of them not written in English, with a translation, however provided), and a conclusion.

The author makes the general thrust of his work fully overt in an initial commentary that reads "This habilitation thesis is a collection of journal articles connected by the reason, why they were written: to show the lack of cultural diversity in cross-cultural psychological research, the reasons that this lack of diversity might prevail, the societal practices that support it, and provide the alternatives that support more cultural diversity."

The current review commences with an ultrashort overview of the topics of the submitted articles. Article 1 addresses the topic of choice of culture, pointing to the fact that the selection of cultures included in comparative psychological research projects is

extremely limited if considered by the volume of research pertaining to the non-WEIRD world.

Article 2 points to the fact publishing research reports predominantly in English leads to a substantial volume of misinterpretations of research, because interpreting research findings within the confines of English language lexicology will lead to a considerable restraint in available interpretation schemata.

Article 3, published in *Theory & Psychology*, elaborates that the selection of a mathematical structure suitable to capture the phenomenon in question should be made after understanding the phenomenon well enough, and that imposing a particular mathematical model too early in the research process bears the danger of producing false results.

Article 4 lashes out (if this formulation is permitted) at something the candidate calls tokenism. This refers to the fact that psychologists trained in a certain type of mathematical-statistical approach often have a strong tendency to utilize that approach for all kinds of research they engage in, instead of adjusting their data analysis approach to the substance of their research project.

Article 5, co-authored by W.-L. Lu, once again addresses the question of consequences of the use of English as the language in which the vast majority of psychological research is published. This article addresses the aspect of language prestige.

Publications in English obviously have a higher prestige than publications in local languages. This, however, simultaneously leads to a restriction of research topics.

Article 6, written in Czech, addresses the question of what constitutes a population in cross-cultural comparison. The article's main point (expressed in other words by the candidate) is that equating culture with the nation state is often misleading, in particular, when large countries are part of the comparison (e.g., China), which are actually quite diverse but nevertheless subsumed under one label, that of the nation state.

Article 7, again written in Czech, focusses on Korean indigenous psychology. Based on the example of (South) Korean psychology, the article is a plea to include 'emic' (the term is not used) concepts in psychology training much earlier in order to avoid an overemphasis on 'Anglo' (also not used as a term) concepts, which bears the danger to explain local phenomena based on concepts alien to a local culture.

Article 8, once more written in Czech, turns to Chinese indigenous psychology. As Article 7, it is in principle a review article of indigenous psychology in an East Asian country, this time China. The overall thrust of the article is to call for comparative indigenous research across East Asia, without pressing these cultures into the procrustean bed of WEIRD psychology.

Article 9, the second one with co-authors, suggests the so-called Linguistic Diversity Index, designating it as a scientometric measure to enhance the relevance of small and minority groups, who are vastly underrepresented in psychology research. The central

plea of the paper is to allow for a certain kind of a bonus in the evaluation of academic publications written in other languages than English.

The entire habilitation thesis of Dr. Linkov can—without any derogatory connotation whatsoever—be called the oeuvre of a renegade. The reviewer wishes that he himself had had the courage to swim against the stream, the mainstream of psychological science in this case, much more often in his own career. The bibliometric scores of Dr. Linkov are not very impressive. He rarely published in high-impact journals. This, however, should not be accredited to him being a mediocre academic, but to the fact that he did always have the courage to express truths that the mainstream would rather not want to find in its own publication outlets all too often.

— What I missed in his multilateral fight against the shortcomings of mainstream psychology research in the field of culturally comparative studies is a discussion of sampling strategies both on the individual level (mostly convenience, haphazard samples) and on the culture-level (selection governed by the principle of ‘I know somebody there who knows somebody there’). Had that aspect also been covered (sorry if I overlooked it), my praise of the thesis would be yet greater.

In summary, it is clear that Dr. Linkov’s thesis fulfills the requirements to be awarded the habilitation degree without any reservations whatsoever.

— Kind regards

(Prof. Dr. Klaus Boehnke)