

系统合理化的动机属性: 困境与突破

曾昭携¹, 张跃¹, 杨沈龙², 郭永玉^{1*}

1. 南京师范大学心理学院, 南京 210097;

2. 西安交通大学人文与社会科学学院社会心理学研究所, 西安 710049

* 联系人, E-mail: yyguo@njnu.edu.cn

2023-03-01 收稿, 2023-05-03 修回, 2023-05-04 接受, 2023-05-06 网络版发表

国家自然科学基金(71971120)、国家留学基金(202206860017)和南京师范大学人文社科重大培育项目(211061AP2101)资助

摘要 系统合理化理论已提出20余年, 其研究领域既关涉人们对具体社会问题的看法, 也涉及宏观的社会态度. 系统合理化是其核心概念, 它是指捍卫、支持和合理化现状的心理倾向, 即便有时会牺牲自我和内群体利益. 该理论有助于我们理解人们如何以及为何将现有的社会系统合理化, 以维持或提高自尊以及维持或提高所处群体的地位. 为了满足认识性、存在性与关系性需要, 人们会进行系统合理化. 因此, 系统合理化是动机性的. 伴随其发展, 这一理论也遭遇了严厉批评. 这些批评可分为4类: 象征系统合理化的外群体偏爱并不是内隐的; 系统合理化并非动机性的; 系统合理化发挥作用的条件未得到解释; 并不存在自主、独立的系统合理化动机. 本文介绍了系统合理化理论及其发展、面临的理论和研究困境, 并通过梳理理论观点与认知神经科学研究的证据, 为回应批评、突破困境提供支持. 未来研究应更多关注社会认同过程和意识形态过程(如系统合理化)之间的复杂关系; 谨慎解释利用神经科学方法得到的研究结果; 进一步扩大系统合理化神经基础的研究范围; 同时关注其激活是否具有稳健的跨文化一致性.

关键词 系统合理化, 动机驱动, 心理需要, 背外侧前额叶皮层, 杏仁核

为什么有些女性会认为他们应当比男性获得更低的工资? 为什么受到不公对待的人会像他人一样认为错在自己? 为什么很多人(包括穷人)也会反对再分配? 诸如此类问题, 可以用一个共同动机过程加以解释, 即系统合理化(system justification). 系统的基本含义是社会那些制度化和非制度化的力量, 其控制个体的存在、指导个体的行为, 并且一般来说, 是一种权威^[1]. 它可以是国家、政府或文化等大的系统, 也可以是家庭或工作单位等小的系统; 个体通常处于多个重叠的系统^[2]. 系统合理化是指捍卫、支持和合理化现状的心理倾向^[3-5]. 系统合理化理论(system justification theory, SJT)认为, 个体进行系统合理化有助于增加其对现

状的满意度, 并满足潜在的认知性、存在性和关系性需要, 以减少不确定性、威胁和社会关系不和谐等感觉^[3,6,7]. 该理论被提出至今, 激发了广大研究者的兴趣, 同时也遭遇不少质疑. 最为尖锐的批评来自Owuamalam等人^[8]. 他们认为, 可以用社会认同动机来解释系统合理化现象, 系统合理化动机是有问题的, 并不具有特异性, 它应该被放弃. 此外, 依据系统合理化理论开展的研究也遭遇一些其他问题(如由于其内隐性质, 系统合理化的过程与结果无法分离)^[9]. 本文尝试从理论与政治神经科学研究中关于系统合理化的研究两方面出发, 提炼相关研究证据. 这在一定程度上有助于回应上述理论和研究问题, 丰富人们对系统合理化动机属

引用格式: 曾昭携, 张跃, 杨沈龙, 等. 系统合理化的动机属性: 困境与突破. 科学通报, 2023, 68: 3185-3195

Zeng Z X, Zhang Y, Yang S L, et al. The motivational nature of system justification: Dilemma and coping (in Chinese). Chin Sci Bull, 2023, 68: 3185-3195, doi: [10.1360/TB-2022-1306](https://doi.org/10.1360/TB-2022-1306)

性的理解,启发未来研究。

1 系统合理化理论及其发展

1994年,系统合理化理论由Jost和Banaji^[5]在*British Journal of Social Psychology*一期探讨刻板印象结构与功能的专刊中首次被提出。该理论的核心目标之一是理解人们如何以及为什么将现有的社会系统合理化(特别是当这种支持似乎与其他重要的动机相冲突时)以维持或提高自尊,以及维持或提高群体地位^[10-13]。该理论部分借鉴了马克思主义和女权主义的主导意识形态理论以及社会学的合法化理论^[14,15]。它还借鉴了认知失调理论^[16]和公正世界理论^[17]的观点。该理论提出,在社会生活中,存在着自我合理化与群体合理化的倾向,分别用以捍卫与合理化自我及内群体的利益和尊严。此外,人们还会表现出系统合理化的倾向,即捍卫与合理化现有社会、经济和政治安排——有时甚至牺牲自我和内群体利益^[3,5]。因此,系统合理化理论特别适用于解释本文最初提出的问题,即弱势群体成员中的保守主义倾向(即认为社会的传统机构应当被保留,社会和经济不平等是可接受的倾向)^[18]。毕竟,相比于通过实际行动改变糟糕的现状,改变自己对现状的看法(即将现状看作合理、公正的,而非不合理、不公正的)更容易。系统合理化动机的触发会使人们将实然看作应然,即将社会现状的某些方面(现实的情况)视为规范上的正确(即理想的情况),而无论现状是否符合自我和内群体的利益^[2]。实证研究发现,系统合理化程度高的个体往往具有较低的消极情绪、较高的现状满意度^[19,20],表明这种合理化过程能够给个体带来心理上的好处。

系统合理化理论最初是为了解释针对个体及其所属群体自身的消极刻板印象与对外群体的偏爱^[5]。自提出以来,该理论受到心理学、社会学界广泛关注,产生了重要的学术影响。在过去20余年中,社会学和心理学领域大约有3000篇文章提到了系统合理化这一术语,其数量逐年稳步增长。其研究领域扩展到:(1)对公平、正义、合法性、应得性和权力的评价^[21-23];(2)对贫困和不平等的归因和解释^[24,25];(3)对个人和群体的自发及有意的社会推理与判断^[26,27];(4)对社会、经济与政治问题的态度和意见^[28-30];(5)对某些社会政治结果或事件的合理化^[31,32];(6)成熟的政治和宗教意识形态^[33,34]。

2 系统合理化的动机属性及其研究困境

2.1 动机属性

系统合理化理论指出,人们并非总是会为所在系统进行辩护,即认为现状是公正、合理的^[2,3]。研究者发现,被激活认识性需要(epistemic needs)、存在性需要(existential needs)和关系性需要(relational needs)的个体更倾向于进行系统合理化^[3,6,7]。(1)对具有认识性需要的个体而言,他们需要减少不确定性和模糊性。Van Berkel等人^[35]在研究中招募了93名参与者,将其随机分配到高、低认知负荷条件下,高认知负荷下的参与者要听一段不同音调的录音,同时被要求计数并记录音调变化前的音调数量,低认知负荷条件下的参与者则不需要对音调数量进行记录。随后所有的参与者完成道德基础问卷调查与政治倾向的测量。结果发现,高认知负荷条件下的参与者对权威/等级价值观的认同程度显著高于低负荷条件,并且政治保守主义正向预测权威/等级认同,而政治保守主义被认为是维护系统的表现^[3,18]。(2)对具有存在性需要的个体而言,他们需要减轻威胁和不安全感(threat and insecurity)。Van de Vyver等人^[36]在2005年7月伦敦爆炸案发生前6周和发生后1个月对具有全国代表性($N=2031$)样本进行了调查,考察了威胁和政治意识形态对道德基础与偏见的影响。结果发现,爆炸案发生后,人们对内群体价值观的支持度上升,对公平互惠价值观的支持度下降,对穆斯林和移民的偏见增强。这表明,遭遇存在威胁的个体更倾向持保守的态度,这被视为是系统合理化的表现^[37]。(3)对具有关系性需要的个体而言,他们需要使社会关系协调,减少排斥感,实现共享现实感。Hess和Ledgerwood^[38]招募了59名参与者,通过实验室设计的虚拟抛球游戏创造了社会接纳组和社会排斥组,被分配到社会接纳组的参与者会在整个游戏过程中被虚拟的游戏伙伴所接纳,而社会排斥组的参与者会在几次抛球后被虚拟的伙伴排斥。随后,所有参与者完成新教工作伦理量表的调查。结果发现,被启动社会排斥感的参与者在在新教工作伦理量表上的得分,显著高于社会接纳组的参与者,表达了更强烈维护精英主义意识形态的倾向^[39]。以上结果表明,减少不确定性、威胁及社会关系不和谐的需要会影响系统合理化的强度。

2.2 批评与困境

在该领域研究蓬勃发展的同时,该理论也遭受了

质疑和批评^[3,8,40-43]。这些批评可概括为以下4类: (1) 作为系统合理化表现的外群体偏爱并不表明人们将现状内化, 而是反映了人们对群体之间客观差异和社会现实限制的意识层面的承认^[41,44,45]; (2) 尽管人们可能通过被动的社会化吸收系统合理化的相关信念, 但系统合理化不一定是动机性的^[44-46]; (3) 系统合理化理论未能正确说明系统合理化在何时、何地、对谁起作用、人们经常认为, 该理论不能解释社会变革的发生^[46-48]; (4) 除了上述4种批评, 近来研究者开展了多项实证研究, 尝试证明系统合理化动机并不存在这一观点。Owuamalam和Spears^[40]研究发现, 群体劣势条件下参与者的瞳孔面积比群体优势条件下参与者的瞳孔面积要大。此前研究发现, 与面临容易任务的参与者相比, 面临困难任务的参与者瞳孔会扩张^[49]。这一结果在不同的研究中得到了复制^[50,51]。因此可以认为, 群体劣势条件下的参与者付出了更多认知努力。然而这一现象只在群体身份凸显(实验1)或群体认同强烈(实验2)的情况以及高系统依赖情况下出现。类似地, 针对意大利女性^[52]和亚洲人群^[53]开展的另外两项研究也发现, 在群体认同凸显条件下, 人们会有更强烈的系统合理化表现。Owuamalam等人^[54]的另一项研究发现, 与对经济系统低认同的女性相比, 那些对未来性别平等抱有强烈希望(而非较低希望)的女性会更支持现有男性占优势的经济系统。研究者根据这些结果进一步质疑人们并不具有自主、独立的系统合理化动机。

此外, 就像一些其他社会心理过程, 系统合理化具有内隐属性, 以往采取全部依赖或部分依赖自我报告的研究方法, 会遇到系统合理化过程与结果难以分离、社会称许性与自我表现偏差的干扰等问题^[9]。这种方法上的缺陷也常给研究者带来结果难以解释的困扰。我们认为, 利用神经科学方法对系统合理化动机属性开展的研究也有助于应对上述批评和研究困境, 而已有的认知神经科学研究相关证据能够为此提供支持。

3 回应质疑: 理论观点的交锋

3.1 外群体偏爱并不会在内隐层面运作?

根据系统合理化理论, 处于优势和劣势地位的群体成员有时会以强化和合理化现有社会系统的方式进行思考、感受和行动, 而外群体偏爱群体间不平等合法化的一个例子。它指的是个体对非其所属群体的

偏爱, 是将不平等制度内化和永久化倾向的一种表现。研究表明, 这一过程可以在内隐层面运作^[6,55,56]。Essien等人^[57]开展的一项包含8个群体间领域与14个国家的元分析($N=715721$)发现, 弱势者在内隐联想测验(implicit association tests, IATs)中表现出对外群体偏爱, 但在自我报告(即外显)测量中表现出对内群体偏爱或没有群体间偏向, 这与系统合理化理论的预测一致。

3.2 系统合理化并非动机性的?

Jost等人^[58]提出系统合理化理论的首要原则: 人们是被激发去捍卫、证明和支持社会现状的各个方面, 包括现有的社会、经济、政治制度, 这种被激发的过程往往是内隐的, 而不是处于意识层面的外显过程。尽管如此, 系统合理信念的形成经历了主动作用的过程, 而非通过被动的社会学习内化而成。这得到大量研究证据的支持, 大致可以总结为5类: (1) 对包括政治保守主义在内的系统合理化信念的支持, 这些信念与自我欺骗和动机性社会认知的个体差异有关^[59]; (2) 除非有机会确认系统的优点^[60,61], 否则人们通常会针对整个社会系统的威胁、批评和挑战做出防御性反应^[27,37,62]; (3) 系统合理化过程表现出目标追求的几个典型特征^[63,64]; (4) 人们通过选择性、有偏见的信息加工来得出系统支持的结论^[65,66]; (5) 人们愿意在行为上付出努力, 以维护社会经济体系的合法性^[67]。

3.3 系统合理化发挥作用的条件未得到解释?

通过一系列研究, 研究者提出了一些影响系统合理化倾向的个体和情境的调节变量, 以解释系统合理化发挥作用的条件。个体因素包括了前文提到的认识性、存在性和关系性需要, 不再赘述。情境因素包括: (1) 系统威胁(system threat)。在社会系统的层面上, 威胁到一个人的系统合法性或有效性的事件, 如恐怖主义、气候变化、经济衰退和自然灾害, 会引起防御性反应, 以支撑对该系统的看法^[11,62,68,69]。(2) 系统依赖(system dependence)。系统合理化理论认为, 对一个人的生活有很大影响的系统也更可能会对其造成更大破坏, 这使得这个人在生存上更需要加强对该系统合法性的信心。与这一理论一致, van der Toorn等人^[23,70]发现, 对系统当局(如警察)感知的结果依赖与对其合法性和行动尊重的增加有关。(3) 系统不可脱离性与稳定性(system inescapability and stability)。系统合理化理论认为, 在系统和机构的层面上, 处于无法脱离或难以被改

变的社会政治系统中的人,更可能积极维护现状^[71-73]。研究发现,相对于认为向他国移民更容易的人,认为向他国移民更困难的人更支持其所处国家的性别不平等是合理的^[71]。此外,当人们认为其所处系统是稳定和不变时,他们更可能支持那些维持现有不平等的政策^[73,74]。

3.4 并不存在自主、独立的系统合理化动机?

系统合理化理论强调了这样一个事实:在这样的情况下(即弱势群体认同优势群体,而这无益于甚至有害于其自身利益)，“外群体偏爱”反映了一种类似于错误信念和内化自卑的意识形态过程^[58]。显然,这并不是说群体认同水平和系统合理化之间没有关系。Owumalam等人^[40,54]的研究恰恰表明,进一步探索社会认同动机和系统合理化动机究竟哪个更能解释系统合理化现象是十分必要的。此前已有研究得到了类似的结果,如Shayo^[75]研究发现,与富人相比,全世界的穷人对他们的国家(而非对他们的社会阶层)有更强烈的认同,而那些对国家有更强烈认同的人比那些没有认同的人更不支持经济再分配。在系统合理化理论的提出者Jost^[3]看来,这些证据凸显了社会认同和系统合理化过程是相互交织的。其他研究也发现了社会认同动机与系统合理化动机存在其他关联。如Osborne等人^[76]通过来自新西兰(研究1, $N=16147$)和美国(研究2, $N=1513$)的两个样本发现,对低地位和高地位群体成员来说,系统合理化与系统挑战的集体行动呈负相关,但与系统支持的集体行动正相关,包含群体认同的一些变量在其中起中介作用(而非调节作用)。最近,国内研究者提出,“社会不平等影响低地位者系统合理信念的双路径模型”^[77],或许能启发我们从另一个角度思考这一问题。该模型认为,社会认同动机与系统合理化动机哪个发挥主导作用,取决于人们对不平等的认知。具体而言,当人们认为不平等构成其个体(或群体)层面的现实性威胁时,“理性”的社会认同动机可能占据优势,而当人们认为不平等构成象征性威胁时,系统合理化动机可能占据优势,这些观点也得到了实证研究的支持^[78]。因此,我们认为,基于上述研究证据否定系统合理化动机存在的观点是不充分的,研究者应该着重探索社会认同过程和意识形态过程(如系统合理化)之间的复杂关系。

4 突破困境:来自神经科学研究的支持

随着心理生理学和神经生物学研究技术的发展,

对个体意识形态差异的研究也逐渐发生了转向。与依赖自我报告的研究方法相比,采取神经科学方法研究系统合理化具有独特优势:一方面,神经科学技术在技术的复杂性和相对精确性、测量的客观性方面有明显优势,较少受到社会称许性和自我表现偏差的影响;另一方面,系统合理化作为一种动机过程,是内隐、不可直接观察的^[3,58],相较于传统的问卷调查与行为实验,通过神经科学方法对系统合理化开展研究,可以帮助分解参与复杂认知操作的多种神经系统、区分独立的心理机制^[9]。来自社会认知神经领域的研究表明,背外侧前额叶皮层(dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, dlPFC)、杏仁核(amygdala)与系统合理化之间存在潜在的联系,它们也分别与激活系统合理化的认知性需要和关系性需要相关联。

4.1 背外侧前额叶皮层与系统合理化

经验开放性是一种与认识性需要、政治保守主义(一种系统合理化信念)有着显著负相关的人格特质^[76,79]。具体而言,经验开放性与一系列保守的反应呈负相关^[80-82],包括投票给保守的政党^[83]和支持保守的政策立场^[84]。研究表明,dlPFC与经验开放性高度相关^[85,86]。这意味着dlPFC与系统合理化存在潜在关联,使用神经科学方法的研究为此猜想提供了证据支持。如功能性神经影像学研究表明,dlPFC中的额叶活动与处理同反对派候选人相关的政治信息有关^[87-89]。基于经颅磁刺激(transcranial magnetic stimulation, TMS)的证据表明,dlPFC活性降低与社会认知过程(如刻板印象和惩罚)有关^[90,91]。以上研究利用不同神经研究方法为我们理解dlPFC与系统合理化的关系提供了间接证据。最近的一些研究为我们理解dlPFC激活与否和政治意识形态之间的关联提供了更为直接的证据。如Chawke和Kanai^[92]使用经颅随机噪声刺激(transcranial random noise stimulation, tRNS)刺激考察了dlPFC激活与政治保守主义的关系。tRNS被认为能够调节皮质兴奋性^[93]。在一项2(刺激类型: tRNS、假刺激) \times 2(观看视频类型: 保守派、自由派)的被试间设计实验中,他们发现,无论参与者最初的政治倾向和观看的视频属于哪一派别,dlPFC脑区活动的增强都增加了其保守倾向。Nam等人^[94]对脑部病变患者与无脑损伤者进行的对照研究也支持了上述结果。他们比较了原发性额叶损伤者($n=18$)和无脑损伤者($n=18$)的政治意识形态倾向(自由派、保守派),结果发现,更高比例的dlPFC损伤

与政治保守主义有关, 即使在人口学变量进行调整后, 也是如此。

4.2 杏仁核与系统合理化

杏仁核是一个小的杏仁状结构, 位于大脑颞叶的两侧, 它与处理上文提到的关系性需要有关^[95]。总的来说, 杏仁核可以被理解为一个警报系统, 个体通过它在社会或物理环境中获取动机相关的信息^[96,97]。Kumaran等人^[98]结合功能磁共振(functional magnetic resonance imaging, fMRI)和结构(基于体素的形态测量, voxel-based morphometry, VBM)神经成像技术考察了大脑在人们对等级制度理解中的作用。他们让参与者了解一个虚拟的社会等级制度的成员, 该制度由一个虚构公司中处于不同地位等级的7个人组成。他们发现, 在识别给定等级制度中, 每个主人公地位等级这项任务上的表现较好(即与等级制度中的其他成员进行配对比较, 判断哪个人拥有更大的权力), 与双侧杏仁核的灰质体积较大有关。另一方面, 杏仁核体积与学习非社会性等级制度(给定材料为具有不同水平贵重矿物星系的信息)没有关系。换言之, 相较于学习非社会性等级结构知识, 那些拥有较大杏仁核的人更善于学习社会性等级结构知识, 更擅长处理包含了社会关系的信息。此外, Kanai等人^[99]进一步提出, 对于理解社会环境, 杏仁核可能是关键的大脑结构之一。他们的研究发现了右侧杏仁核体积与政治保守主义之间的正相关关系。这些发现共同表明, 杏仁核结构可能与理解等级社会系统 and 对其形成的意识形态倾向(即政治保守主义)有关。Nam等人^[100]的研究为理解杏仁核与社会等级知识、意识形态倾向之间的关系提供了更直接的解释。他们的两项独立的神经影像学研究发现, 较大的双侧杏仁核体积与相信现有社会秩序是合法和可取的倾向呈正相关。这些结果对处于有利地位和不利地位的群体成员都是如此。此外, 在后续的追踪研究中, 他们还发现, 杏仁核体积较大的人不太可能参与抗议运动, 这表明杏仁核不仅与人们如何理解社会等级结构、形成维护现状的政治意识形态有关, 还与对人们促进变革的行为抑制存在积极联系。

5 总结与展望

本文对系统合理化理论发展至今所遭遇的最为严厉的批评和系统合理化研究者遭遇的研究困境进行了阐述, 从理论与神经科学研究证据两方面对批评进行

回应, 并尝试指出突破困境的方向。首先, 我们结合问卷调查和行为实验的证据, 对外群体偏爱并不会在内隐层面运作、系统合理化并非动机性的、系统合理化发挥作用的条件未得到解释、并不存在自主独立的系统合理化动机4类问题进行了逐一回应。尽管如此, 相较于社会认同理论这般经典的理论, 系统合理化理论仍处于发展的早期阶段, 出现一些冲突的经验证据是意料之中的。其他研究者所提出的问题对确定未来的研究方向和研究问题是十分有益的。其次, 我们尝试从神经科学研究中汲取有益观点为回应批评、突破困境提供支持。现有神经科学研究的证据表明, 人们维护(抑或抗拒)社会现状的倾向可能具有神经生物基础, 仍有关键的研究问题尚待解决, 将神经科学的理论、方法应用于研究人们的社会行为是有前景的。例如, 能够激活系统合理化反应的存在性需要是否有其所对应的神经基础? 研究得到了一些间接证据, 如在Izuma等人^[101]的研究中, 他们结合改进的自由选择范式^[102,103], 使用25 min、1 Hz的重复经颅磁刺激(repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation, rTMS), 来暂时降低参与者后内侧额叶皮层(posterior medial frontal cortex, pmFC)内的神经元活动。结果发现, 与假刺激(不激活认知失调的刺激)或不同脑区的控制刺激相比, 对pmFC的刺激显著减少了人们的认知失调反应。根据认知失调理论, 当其他手段失效时, 个体可能通过调整信念来解决其面临的认知失调^[16,104], 因此这一过程有可能会激活人们的系统合理化^[12,18,105]。

尽管如此, 利用神经科学方法对系统合理化的神经基础研究还处于起步阶段, 部分研究的相关性结果不应以还原主义的方式来解释^[97]。换言之, 不应将作为复杂心理活动的系统合理化与某些大脑结构和皮层的神经活动看作是同一的。大脑和行为之间的关系常常不是一对一的。比如, 虽然杏仁核常被认为主要是对消极刺激的反应^[106,107], 但Tritt等人^[108]发现, 系统合理化偏好与奖励相关的神经活动(即反馈相关负性, feedback-related negativity, FRN)有关, FRN可能是杏仁核(以及腹侧纹状体、尾状体、内侧前额皮层和眶额皮层)响应奖励的活动指标^[109]。这一结果提出了一种可能性, 即杏仁核和系统合理化之间的关联也可能是由对奖赏的敏感性所驱动(而非单纯是对消极刺激的反应)。因此, 不同类型社会变革行动背后蕴含奖励(对社会现状有建设性作用)与威胁(对社会现状有危害)的区别, 或许是杏仁核结构与系统合理化关系的调节因素。Os-

borne等人^[76]的研究为此观点提供了旁证。他们在新西兰($N=16147$)和美国($N=1513$)开展的两项调查研究发现,系统合理化与挑战现存系统集体行动呈负相关关系,而与支持系统的集体行动呈正相关关系。前者可认为是威胁性质的,后者可认为是奖励性质的。这些发现强调了在解释大脑与行为相关性时考虑潜在的调节和情境因素的重要性。

结合前文提到的奖励与威胁过程,未来的研究应当扩大对系统合理化神经基础的研究范围,从目前神经结构与系统合理化的研究扩展至神经功能与系统合理化的关系研究。比如,最近的一项研究发现了系统合理化能够缓和人们被弱势情境所激发的负面情绪。Goudarzi等人^[20]使用电生理技术对诱发的情绪反应与系统合理化关系的研究发现,在观看无家可归者的视频之后,那些经济系统合理化偏好更强烈的人表现出较低的生理唤醒和较低的负面情绪。未来的研究可利用神经科学方法进一步探究,系统合理化对情绪的抑制效应是否会反映在相关脑区功能(如外侧前额叶, lateral prefrontal cortex)的抑制上。外侧前额叶皮层被认为可能具有情绪调节的功能,外侧前额叶的激活是参与实施情绪调节策略与调节情绪生成区域加工过程神经回路的一部分^[110,111]。此外,未来研究可在此基础上对这种负面情绪的缓解是否会抑制人们做出帮助弱势者

的神经活动进行探索,这种负面情绪与助人倾向的正相关关系在以往的行为研究中已得到验证^[76,112]。

就系统合理化这一基本心理过程本身而言,其激活是否具有跨文化一致性也值得关注。而对这一问题的探索同样可以借助神经科学的方法。从进化论的观点来看,大脑是可塑的,其演化会受到个体所处社会群体状况的影响,社会脑假说(the Social Brain Hypothesis)的提出也从侧面支持了这一观点^[113]。如前文所述,背外侧前额叶皮层与系统合理化存在着潜在关联,其所在的前额叶区域在大脑部位中发育成熟所需时间是最长的^[114,115],这意味着它有条件受到个体所处主客观环境的影响^[116]。而大脑功能结构的多样性又与人们的社会行为直接相关,如Powell等人^[117]对40名健康成年人前额区域的体积扫描发现,个体的意向性或者说心理理论(一种对他人意图和心理状态进行归因以预测他人行为的能力)与其眶额皮层的体积呈显著正相关。van der Toorn等人^[118]的研究则提供了更为直接的证据,可说明系统合理化的激活及其行为后果会受到不同社会文化环境的影响。他们发现,对美国人来说,系统具有合理性意味着强调公平,而匈牙利人则认为系统合理性基于对平等的强调。然而,大脑结构功能的可塑性与系统合理化激活的跨文化差异之间并不对等,这需要研究者进一步探索以提供更多证据。

参考文献

- 1 Arnold M W, Steve Biko: No Fears Expressed. Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers, 1987
- 2 Friesen J P, Laurin K, Shepherd S, et al. System justification: Experimental evidence, its contextual nature, and implications for social change. *Br J Soc Psychol*, 2019, 58: 315–339
- 3 Jost J T. A quarter century of system justification theory: Questions, answers, criticisms, and societal applications. *Br J Soc Psychol*, 2019, 58: 263–314
- 4 Jost J T, Federico C M, Napier J L. Political ideologies and their social psychological functions. In: Freedman M, Tower L, Stears M, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. 232–250
- 5 Jost J T, Banaji M R. The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *Br J Soc Psychol*, 1994, 33: 1–27
- 6 Hoffarth M R, Jost J T. When ideology contradicts self-interest: Conservative opposition to same-sex marriage among sexual minorities—A commentary on Pinosof and Haselton (2016). *Psychol Sci*, 2016, 28: 1521–1524
- 7 Gries T, Müller V, Jost J T. The market for belief systems: A formal model of ideological choice. *Psychol Inquiry*, 2022, 33: 65–83
- 8 Owumaliam C K, Rubin M, Spears R. Is a system motive really necessary to explain the system justification effect? A response to Jost (2019) and Jost, Badaan, Goudarzi, Hoffarth, and Mogami (2019). *Brit J Soc Psychol*, 2019, 58: 393–409
- 9 Jost J T, Nam H H, Amodio D M, et al. Political neuroscience: The beginning of a beautiful friendship. *Polit Psychol*, 2014, 35: 3–42
- 10 Kay A C, Gaucher D, Peach J M, et al. Inequality, discrimination, and the power of the status quo: Direct evidence for a motivation to see the way things are as the way they should be. *J Pers Soc Psychol*, 2009, 97: 421–434
- 11 Milojevic P, Greaves L, Osborne D, et al. Stability and change in political conservatism following the global financial crisis. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 2015, 41: 127–139
- 12 Sengupta N K, Osborne D, Sibley C G. The status-legitimacy hypothesis revisited: Ethnic-group differences in general and dimension-specific

- legitimacy. *Br J Soc Psychol*, 2015, 54: 324–340
- 13 Sibley C G, Overall N C, Duckitt J. When women become more hostilely sexist toward their gender: The system-justifying effect of benevolent sexism. *Sex Roles*, 2007, 57: 743–754
 - 14 Jost J T. Negative illusions: Conceptual clarification and psychological evidence concerning false consciousness. *Polit Psychol*, 1995, 16: 397–424
 - 15 Jost J T, Burgess D, Mosso C. Conflicts of legitimation among self, group, and system: The integrative potential of system justification theory. In: Jost J T, Major B, eds. *The Psychology of Legitimacy: Emerging Perspectives on Ideology, Justice, and Intergroup Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001. 363–388
 - 16 Festinger L. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1957
 - 17 Lerner M J. *The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion*. New York: Springer, 1980
 - 18 Jost J T. *A Theory of System Justification*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2020
 - 19 Li W, Wu J, Kou Y. System justification enhances life satisfaction of high- and low-status people in China. *Soc Psychol Pers Sci*, 2020, 11: 588–596
 - 20 Goudarzi S, Pliskin R, Jost J T, et al. Economic system justification predicts muted emotional responses to inequality. *Nat Commun*, 2020, 11: 383
 - 21 Brandt M J, Reyna C. Individual differences in the resistance to social change and acceptance of inequality predict system legitimacy differently depending on the social structure. *Eur J Pers*, 2017, 31: 266–278
 - 22 O'Brien L T, Major B N, Gilbert P N. Gender differences in entitlement: The role of system-justifying beliefs. *Basic Appl Soc Psychol*, 2012, 34: 136–145
 - 23 van der Toorn J, Tyler T R, Jost J T. More than fair: Outcome dependence, system justification, and the perceived legitimacy of authority figures. *J Exp Soc Psychol*, 2011, 47: 127–138
 - 24 Ali S, Ohls C, Parker G, et al. Rationalizing poverty in New York: Tales from the middle class. *J Poverty*, 2018, 22: 310–333
 - 25 Godfrey E B, Wolf S. Developing critical consciousness or justifying the system? A qualitative analysis of attributions for poverty and wealth among low-income racial/ethnic minority and immigrant women. *Cult Divers Ethn Minor Psychol*, 2016, 22: 93–103
 - 26 Jost J T, Kivetz Y, Rubini M, et al. System-justifying functions of complementary regional and ethnic stereotypes: Cross-national evidence. *Soc Just Res*, 2015, 18: 305–333
 - 27 Kay A C, Jost J T, Young S. Victim derogation and victim enhancement as alternate routes to system justification. *Psychol Sci*, 2005, 16: 240–246
 - 28 Yang S L, Guo Y Y, Hu X Y, et al. Do lower class individuals possess higher levels of system justification? An examination from the social cognitive perspectives (in Chinese). *Acta Psychol Sin*, 2016, 48: 1467–1478 [杨沈龙, 郭永玉, 胡小勇, 等. 低阶层者的系统合理化水平更高吗?——基于社会认知视角的考察. *心理学报*, 2016, 48: 1467–1478]
 - 29 Tan X, Liu L, Huang Z, et al. Working for the hierarchical system: The role of meritocratic ideology in the endorsement of corruption. *Polit Psychol*, 2017, 38: 469–479
 - 30 van der Toorn J, Jost J T, Packer D J, et al. In defense of tradition: Religiosity, conservatism, and opposition to same-sex marriage in North America. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 2017, 43: 1455–1468
 - 31 Kay A C, Jimenez M C, Jost J T. Sour grapes, sweet lemons, and the anticipatory rationalization of the status quo. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 2002, 28: 1300–1312
 - 32 Laurin K. Inaugurating rationalization: Three field studies find increased rationalization when anticipated realities become current. *Psychol Sci*, 2018, 29: 483–495
 - 33 Jost J T, Federico C M, Napier J L. Political ideology: Its structure, functions, and elective affinities. *Annu Rev Psychol*, 2009, 60: 307–337
 - 34 Jost J T, Hawkins C B, Nosek B A, et al. Belief in a just God (and a just society): A system justification perspective on religious ideology. *J Theor Philos Psychol*, 2014, 34: 56–81
 - 35 Van Berkel L, Crandall C S, Eidelman S, et al. Hierarchy, dominance, and deliberation. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, 2015, 41: 1207–1222
 - 36 Van de Vyver J, Houston D M, Abrams D, et al. Boosting belligerence. *Psychol Sci*, 2016, 27: 169–177
 - 37 Jost J T, Hunyady O. Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Curr Dir Psychol Sci*, 2005, 14: 260–265
 - 38 Hess Y D, Ledgerwood A. Bolstering system-justifying beliefs in response to social exclusion. *Group Process Intergroup Relat*, 2014, 17: 494–508
 - 39 Cheung R M, Noel S, Hardin C D. Adopting the system-justifying attitudes of others: Effects of trivial interpersonal connections in the context of social inclusion and exclusion. *Soc Cogn*, 2011, 29: 255–269
 - 40 Owuamalam C K, Spears R. Do humans possess an autonomous system justification motivation? A Pupillometric test of the strong system justification thesis. *J Exp Soc Psychol*, 2020, 86: 103897
 - 41 Brewer M B. The importance of being we: Human nature and intergroup relations. *Am Psychol*, 2007, 62: 728–738
 - 42 Caricati L, Sollami A. Contrasting explanations for status-legitimacy effects based on system justification theory and social identity theory. *J*

- [Theor Soc Psychol](#), 2018, 2: 13–25
- 43 Jost J T, Badaan V, Goudarzi S, et al. The future of system justification theory. [Br J Soc Psychol](#), 2019, 58: 382–392
- 44 Owuamalam C K, Rubin M, Spears R. Revisiting 25 years of system motivation explanation for system justification from the perspective of social identity model of system attitudes. [Br J Soc Psychol](#), 2019, 58: 362–381
- 45 Rubin M, Hewstone M. Social identity, system justification, and social dominance: Commentary on Reicher, Jost et al., and Sidanius et al. [Polit Psychol](#), 2004, 25: 823–844
- 46 Huddy L. Contrasting theoretical approaches to intergroup relations. [Polit Psychol](#), 2004, 25: 947–967
- 47 Reicher S. The context of social identity: Domination, resistance, and change. [Polit Psychol](#), 2004, 25: 921–945
- 48 Owuamalam C K, Rubin M, Spears R. Addressing evidential and theoretical inconsistencies in system-justification theory with a social identity model of system attitudes. [Curr Dir Psychol Sci](#), 2018, 27: 91–96
- 49 Hess E H, Polt J M. Pupil size in relation to mental activity during simple problem-solving. [Science](#), 1964, 143: 1190–1192
- 50 Kahneman D, Beatty J. Pupil diameter and load on memory. [Science](#), 1966, 154: 1583–1585
- 51 Querino E, dos Santos L, Ginani G, et al. Cognitive effort and pupil dilation in controlled and automatic processes. [Transl Neurosci](#), 2015, 6: 168–173
- 52 Owuamalam C K, Caricati L, Spears R, et al. Further evidence that system justification amongst the disadvantaged is positively related to superordinate group identification. [Acta Psychol](#), 2023, 232: 103813
- 53 Owuamalam C K, Tan C M, Caricati L, et al. Cultural group norms for harmony explain the puzzling negative association between objective status and system justification in Asia. [Eur J Soc Psychol](#), 2022, 53: 1–23
- 54 Owuamalam C K, Caricati L, Rubin M, et al. Why do women support socio-economic systems that favour men more? A registered test of system justification- and social identity-inspired hope explanations. [Euro J Soc Psychol](#), 2021, 51: 1073–1095
- 55 Rudman L A, Feinberg J, Fairchild K. Minority members' implicit attitudes: Automatic ingroup bias as a function of group status. [Soc Cogn](#), 2002, 20: 294–320
- 56 Uhlmann E, Dasgupta N, Elgueta A, et al. Subgroup prejudice based on skin color among Hispanics in the United States and Latin America. [Soc Cogn](#), 2002, 20: 198–226
- 57 Essien I, Calanchini J, Degner J. Moderators of intergroup evaluation in disadvantaged groups: A comprehensive test of predictions from system justification theory. [J Pers Soc Psychol](#), 2021, 120: 1204–1230
- 58 Jost J T, Banaji M R, Nosek B A. A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. [Polit Psychol](#), 2004, 25: 881–919
- 59 Wojcik S P, Hovasapian A, Graham J, et al. Conservatives report, but liberals display, greater happiness. [Science](#), 2015, 347: 1243–1246
- 60 Cutright K M, Wu E C, Banfield J C, et al. When your world must be defended: Choosing products to justify the system. [J Consum Res](#), 2011, 38: 62–77
- 61 Brescoll V L, Uhlmann E L, Newman G E. The effects of system-justifying motives on endorsement of essentialist explanations for gender differences. [J Pers Soc Psychol](#), 2013, 105: 891–908
- 62 Ullrich J, Cohrs J C. Terrorism salience increases system justification: Experimental evidence. [Soc Just Res](#), 2007, 20: 117–139
- 63 Jost J T, Napier J L, Thorisdottir H, et al. Are needs to manage uncertainty and threat associated with political conservatism or ideological extremity? [Pers Soc Psychol Bull](#), 2007, 33: 989–1007
- 64 Jost J T, Liviatan I, van der Toorn J, et al. System justification: How do we know it's motivated? In: Bobocel D R, Kay A C, Zanna M P, et al., eds. *The Psychology of Justice and Legitimacy*. London: Psychology Press, 2010. 173–203
- 65 Hennes E P, Ruisch B C, Feygina I, et al. Motivated recall in the service of the economic system: The case of anthropogenic climate change. [J Exp Psychol-Gen](#), 2016, 145: 755–771
- 66 Haines E L. Placating the powerless: Effects of legitimate and illegitimate explanation on affect, memory, and stereotyping. [Soc Justice Res](#), 2000, 13: 219–236
- 67 Ledgerwood A, Mandisodza A N, Jost J T, et al. Working for the system: Motivated defense of meritocratic beliefs. [Soc Cogn](#), 2011, 29: 322–340
- 68 Napier J L, Mandisodza A N, Andersen S M, et al. System justification in responding to the poor and displaced in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. [Anal Soc Issues Public Policy](#), 2006, 6: 57–73
- 69 Vainio A, Mäkinen J P, Paloniemi R. System justification and the perception of food risks. [Group Process Intergroup Relat](#), 2014, 17: 509–523
- 70 van der Toorn J, Feinberg M, Jost J T, et al. A sense of powerlessness fosters system justification: Implications for the legitimation of authority, hierarchy, and government. [Polit Psychol](#), 2015, 36: 93–110
- 71 Laurin K, Shepherd S, Kay A C. Restricted emigration, system inescapability, and defense of the status quo. [Psychol Sci](#), 2010, 21: 1075–1082
- 72 Proudfoot D, Kay A C, Mann H. Motivated employee blindness: The impact of labor market instability on judgment of organizational inefficiencies. [Organ Behav Hum Dec](#), 2015, 130: 108–122

- 73 Chernyak-Hai L, Halabi S, Nadler A. “Justified dependency”: Effects of perceived stability of social hierarchy and level of system justification on help-seeking behavior of low-status group members. *Group Process Intergroup Relat*, 2014, 17: 420–435
- 74 Laurin K, Gaucher D, Kay A. Stability and the justification of social inequality. *Eur J Soc Psychol*, 2013, 43: 246–254
- 75 Shayo M. A model of social identity with an application to political economy: Nation, class, and redistribution. *Am Polit Sci Rev*, 2009, 103: 147–174
- 76 Osborne D, Jost J T, Becker J C, et al. Protesting to challenge or defend the system? A system justification perspective on collective action. *Eur J Soc Psychol*, 2019, 49: 244–269
- 77 Zhang Y, Ding Y, Yang S L, et al. Exploring the effect of social inequality on system-justifying beliefs of the disadvantaged (in Chinese). *Adv Psychol Sci*, 2022, 30: 1637–1650 [张跃, 丁毅, 杨沈龙, 等. 社会不平等如何影响低地位者的系统合理信念. *心理科学进展*, 2022, 30: 1637–1650]
- 78 Zhang Y. The effect of risk inequality on system-justifying beliefs among low-status population (in Chinese). Doctor Dissertation. Nanjing: Nanjing Normal University, 2022 [张跃. 风险不平等对低地位者系统合理信念的影响. 博士学位论文. 南京: 南京师范大学, 2022]
- 79 Howard C, Sibley C G, Osborne D. When women support the status quo: Gender moderates the relationship between openness to experience and system-justifying beliefs. *Group Process Intergroup Relat*, 2022, 25: 1037–1063
- 80 Carney D R, Jost J T, Gosling S D, et al. The secret lives of liberals and conservatives: Personality profiles, interaction styles, and the things they leave behind. *Polit Psychol*, 2008, 29: 807–840
- 81 Jost J T. The end of the end of ideology. *Am Psychol*, 2006, 61: 651–670
- 82 Sibley C G, Osborne D, Duckitt J. Personality and political orientation: Meta-analysis and test of a Threat-Constraint Model. *J Res Pers*, 2012, 46: 664–677
- 83 Osborne D, Sibley C G. Does personality matter? Openness correlates with vote choice, but particularly for politically sophisticated voters. *J Res Pers*, 2012, 46: 743–751
- 84 Osborne D, Sibley C G. Within the limits of civic training: Education moderates the relationship between openness and political attitudes. *Polit Psychol*, 2015, 36: 295–313
- 85 DeYoung C G, Peterson J B, Higgins D M. Sources of openness/intellect: Cognitive and neuropsychological correlates of the fifth factor of personality. *J Pers*, 2005, 73: 825–858
- 86 DeYoung C G, Cicchetti D, Rogosch F A, et al. Sources of cognitive exploration: Genetic variation in the prefrontal dopamine system predicts Openness/Intellect. *J Res Pers*, 2011, 45: 364–371
- 87 Kaplan J T, Freedman J, Iacoboni M. Us versus them: Political attitudes and party affiliation influence neural response to faces of presidential candidates. *Neuropsychologia*, 2007, 45: 55–64
- 88 Knutson K M, Wood J N, Spampinato M V, et al. Politics on the brain: An fMRI investigation. *Soc Neurosci*, 2006, 1: 25–40
- 89 Westen D, Blagov P S, Harenski K, et al. Neural bases of motivated reasoning: An fMRI study of emotional constraints on partisan political judgment in the 2004 U.S. presidential election. *J Cogn Neurosci*, 2006, 18: 1947–1958
- 90 Brüne M, Scheele D, Heinisch C, et al. Empathy moderates the effect of repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulation of the right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex on costly punishment. *PLoS One*, 2012, 7: e44747
- 91 Cattaneo Z, Mattavelli G, Platania E, et al. The role of the prefrontal cortex in controlling gender-stereotypical associations: A TMS investigation. *NeuroImage*, 2011, 56: 1839–1846
- 92 Chawke C, Kanai R. Alteration of political belief by non-invasive brain stimulation. *Front Hum Neurosci*, 2016, 9: 621
- 93 Terney D, Chaieb L, Moliadze V, et al. Increasing human brain excitability by transcranial high-frequency random noise stimulation. *J Neurosci*, 2008, 28: 14147–14155
- 94 Nam H H, Jost J T, Meager M R, et al. Toward a neuropsychology of political orientation: Exploring ideology in patients with frontal and midbrain lesions. *Phil Trans R Soc B*, 2021, 376: 20200137
- 95 Van Bavel J J, Packer D J, Cunningham W A. The neural substrates of in-group bias. *Psychol Sci*, 2008, 19: 1131–1139
- 96 Cunningham W A, Van Bavel J J, Johnsen I R. Affective flexibility. *Psychol Sci*, 2008, 19: 152–160
- 97 Nam H H. Neuroscientific approaches to the study of system justification. *Curr Opin Behav Sci*, 2020, 34: 205–210
- 98 Kumaran D, Melo H L, Duzel E. The emergence and representation of knowledge about social and nonsocial hierarchies. *Neuron*, 2012, 76: 653–666
- 99 Kanai R, Feilden T, Firth C, et al. Political orientations are correlated with brain structure in young adults. *Curr Biol*, 2011, 21: 677–680
- 100 Nam H H, Jost J T, Kaggen L, et al. Amygdala structure and the tendency to regard the social system as legitimate and desirable. *Nat Hum Behav*, 2018, 2: 133–138
- 101 Izuma K, Akula S, Murayama K, et al. A causal role for posterior medial frontal cortex in choice-induced preference change. *J Neurosci*, 2015, 35: 3598–3606

- 102 Johansson P, Hall L, Sikström S. From change blindness to choice blindness. *Int J Psychol Sci*, 2008, 51: 142–155
- 103 Hall L, Johansson P, Strandberg T. Lifting the veil of morality: Choice blindness and attitude reversals on a self-transforming survey. *PLoS One*, 2012, 7: e45457
- 104 Proulx T, Inzlicht M, Harmon-Jones E. Understanding all inconsistency compensation as a palliative response to violated expectations. *Trends Cogn Sci*, 2012, 16: 285–291
- 105 Henry P J, Saul A. The development of system justification in the developing world. *Soc Just Res*, 2006, 19: 365–378
- 106 Adolphs R, Tranel D, Damasio A R. The human amygdala in social judgment. *Nature*, 1988, 393: 470–474
- 107 Méndez-Bértolo C, Moratti S, Toledano R, et al. A fast pathway for fear in human amygdala. *Nat Neurosci*, 2016, 19: 1041–1049
- 108 Tritt S M, Page-Gould E, Peterson J B, et al. System justification and electrophysiological responses to feedback: Support for a positivity bias. *J Exp Psychol-Gen*, 2014, 143: 1004–1010
- 109 Foti D, Weinberg A, Dien J, et al. Event-related potential activity in the basal ganglia differentiates rewards from nonrewards: Response to commentary. *Hum Brain Mapp*, 2011, 32: 2267–2269
- 110 Ochsner K N, Bunge S A, Gross J J, et al. Rethinking feelings: An fMRI study of the cognitive regulation of emotion. *J Cogn Neurosci*, 2002, 14: 1215–1229
- 111 Dixon M L, Thiruchselvam R, Todd R, et al. Emotion and the prefrontal cortex: An integrative review. *Psychol Bull*, 2017, 143: 1033–1081
- 112 Wakslak C J, Jost J T, Tyler T R, et al. Moral outrage mediates the dampening effect of system justification on support for redistributive social policies. *Psychol Sci*, 2007, 18: 267–274
- 113 Dunbar R I M, Shultz S. Evolution in the social brain. *Science*, 2007, 317: 1344–1347
- 114 Fuster J M. The prefrontal cortex—An update. *Neuron*, 2001, 30: 319–333
- 115 Gogtay N, Giedd J N, Lusk L, et al. Dynamic mapping of human cortical development during childhood through early adulthood. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 2004, 101: 8174–8179
- 116 Han S H, Zhang Y F. Social cognition, culture and brain—Cultural neuroscience approach (in Chinese). *Bull Chin Acad Sci*, 2012, 27: 66–77 [韩世辉, 张逸凡. 社会认知、文化与大脑——文化神经科学研究. 中国科学院院刊, 2012, 27: 66–77]
- 117 Powell J L, Lewis P A, Dunbar R I M, et al. Orbital prefrontal cortex volume correlates with social cognitive competence. *Neuropsychologia*, 2010, 48: 3554–3562
- 118 van der Toorn J, Berkics M, Jost J T. System justification, satisfaction, and perceptions of fairness and typicality at work: A cross-system comparison involving the U.S. and Hungary. *Soc Just Res*, 2010, 23: 189–210

Summary for “系统合理化的动机属性: 困境与突破”

The motivational nature of system justification: Dilemma and coping

Zhaoxie Zeng¹, Yue Zhang¹, Shenlong Yang² & Yongyu Guo^{1*}

¹ School of Psychology, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210097, China;

² Institute of Social Psychology, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an 710049, China

* Corresponding author, E-mail: yyguo@njnu.edu.cn

Why do some women feel that they should pay less than men do? Why do people who are treated unjustly blame themselves? Why do the poor also oppose redistribution? Such questions embody a common motivational process called system justification. The fundamental concept of a system pertains to the operational forces in society, both institutionalized and non-institutionalized, that exert control over the existence of individuals, regulate their behavior, and function as a source of authority. Systems can take various forms, ranging from extensive structures such as the state, government, or culture, to more compact ones such as the families or workplaces. Typically, individuals exist in multiple systems that often overlap. System justification refers to the psychological tendency to bolster, defend, and justify the status quo. Individuals use system justification to satisfy their epistemic, existential, and relational needs.

However, the development of this research area has encountered harsh criticism and research dilemmas. First, these criticisms can be classified into the following four categories: Outgroup favoritism which symbolizes that system justification is not implicit; system justification is not motivational; the conditions under which system justification functions are not explained; there is no autonomous and independent motivation for system justification. This study attempts to respond to this challenge by sorting out evidence from questionnaires and behavioral experiments to defend the unique status of system-justifying motives. Second, as system justification is a way of judging and evaluating the system in which an individual lives, the effects of social desirability and self-presentation bias cannot be avoided by adopting a self-reporting research approach. This may lead to difficulties in detecting the true relationships between variables. At the same time, according to system justification theory, system justification is implicit and prone to the problem of experiencing difficulty in the separation of process and outcome in research. A solution can be provided to overcome this research dilemma through neuroscientific methods. It also responds to the criticism of other researchers. Current neuroscience-based evidence suggests that the dorsolateral prefrontal cortex and the amygdala are associated with epistemic and relational needs. These structures are involved in activating system justification. This implies that people's tendency to maintain (or resist) the social status quo is likely to have a neurobiological basis.

Compared to the well-known social identity theory, the system justification theory is still in its early phase. It is normal to come across opposing empirical evidence, and queries made by other researchers are useful in determining research directions and questions that should be pursued in the future. In addition, investigations of the neural basis of system justification using neuroscientific methods are still in the nascent stage. Therefore, the correlational results reported across studies should not be interpreted reductively. First, system justification is a complex mental activity. It should not be assumed to be identical to the neural activity of specific brain structures and cortexes. A one-to-one relationship may not exist between the brain and a particular behavior. Second, in conjunction with the perspective and the evidence of reward and threat processes in the brain, future work should expand the scope of research on the neural basis of system justification by studying neural structures and system justification to investigate the relationship between neural function and system justification. Finally, the basic mental process of system justification itself, and when viewed from an evolutionary perspective, determines that the functional evolution of the brain is influenced by the social environment in which an individual lives. Thus, future research should examine whether the process of activating system justification has cross-cultural coherence.

system justification, motivational drive, psychological needs, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, amygdala

doi: [10.1360/TB-2022-1306](https://doi.org/10.1360/TB-2022-1306)