

Critical Psychology is not psychology: an essay from the perspective of an ancient Chinese philosopher *Gongsun Longzi* written by a so-called Hong Kong psychologist¹².

Fu Wai

Hong Kong Shue Yan University

Abstract

Slow-living is not regarded as a virtue, but a sin, in a bustling metropolis like Hong Kong. Procrastination is even worse, as it reveals the anxiety towards seeing a caveat underlying a possible nadir. In order to make one feel that the nadir does not exist, one will develop a delusion that “everything already exists, and there is no room for dispute”. This projects every social phenomenon in Hong Kong: from the attitude towards disputed archipelago in Eastern Sea, to the identity of “Hong Kong” as “the city is dying”. This even extends to the topic in question: psychology in Hong Kong. On one hand it “exists” as a group of people labeled as psychologists, on the other hand does not constitute an independent entity of “Hong Kong Psychology”. Only “Psychology in Hong Kong” could be found.

This article does not serve as a manifesto “And God creates critical psychology... since Fu (2012) the Hong Kong critical psychology scene was gradually developed...”. This article signifies the moment that a naughty child opens the lid upon the Schrodinger’s Cat: represented by a proposition from *Gongsunlongzi* - “White horse” is not “horse”; “a white horse” is not “a horse”; “a white horse” is not “horse”; “White horse” is not “a horse”.

Keyword: Gongsun Longzi, Critical Psychology as “Non-Psychology”, Simulacra

Author’s note

Since Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s *Anti-Oedipus* (schizoanalysis) and *A thousand Plateau* (rhizome), we have witnessed personalized anti-knowledge lost the war against formalized knowledge-like-writing. The state of *avidyā* (無明) is taking over.

This means that format is the *sine qua non* of “knowledge”. Knowledge always brings power. Following this logic, adopting the APA style in critical psychology is no different from announcing that the APA is subduing critical psychology.

Sadly speaking, APA formatting is not only an editorial style. It’s a limit, it’s a curse, it’s a way of thinking, and it’s a worldview. The linear flow of introduction → literature review → methodology → major arguments → evidence → discussions → conclusions allure critical psychologists to fall into the trap of hypothetical-deductive positivistic hegemonic psychology. The situation becomes even worse when most critical psychologists are working in “psychological” settings (no matter how deviant they

¹ Special acknowledgment is given to Athanasios Marvakis for his support (and tolerance), Dr. S. K. Cheung from Hong Kong Shue Yan University and an anonymous reviewer for their very insightful (and constructive) comments. Last but not the least, this paper is dedicated to Dai-Lo.

² This article was originally titled *Critical Psychology is not psychology: an essay from the perspective of an ancient Chinese philosopher Gongsun Longzi written by a so-called Hong Kong psychologist in the time of “Hong Kong doesn’t exist”*. The phrase “in the time of Hong Kong doesn’t exist” is deliberately deleted by the author to reflect the self-censorship state of mind of a Hong Kong “psychologist”.

are). This makes it very difficult for the general public to realize what is going on inside the ivory tower.

Critical psychology has always been diversified with a loose hard-core of an anti-positivist stand and anti-hegemonic attitude. It is not an essentialized outfit. If we regard critical psychology as a movement instead of an establishment, then public involvement is *surely* sine qua non. The success of such a movement should be indicated by public emancipation from various “psychological discourses” (discourse from popular psychology and professional psychologists). Interestingly, popular psychology and professional psychologists are symbiotic. While the *imago* of popular psychology still survives without the existence of “professional psychologists”, and “professional psychologists” always want to get rid of any reference to “popular psychology”, the public perception of such imago always provides the necessary impetus for the general public to consult a “professional psychologist”. If the general public cannot distinguish “critical psychology” from “psychology”, it will be simply a castle built on sand. An antipsychology stance, or at least a “non-psychology” stance, will be a better alternative than its reformist counterpart. Therefore, this paper argues that “critical psychology is not psychology” – and the proposition is not proposed negatively.

The relationship between “Critical Psychology” and “Psychology” is a miniature of the relationship between “Hong Kong” and “China”. Therefore, a case study of the psychology scene in Hong Kong should be interesting for those who are interested in critical psychology. The establishment of “Hong Kong” is mostly an artificial artifact emerging after the colonization of Hong Kong. The dream of an “East-meet-West harmonic colony” existed for a long time but had never been realized (it’s always quoted as *Lion Rock Spirit* 獅子山下精神 in Hong Kong). The modernization process took off in the first half of the 20th century and was accompanied with the recreation of “Chinese-ness” in the KMT way and in the Communist way. This placed Hong Kong in the eye of the cyclone. Hong Kong was not a place where “East-meet-West”, but where “East-fights-with-East under the surveillance of the West”. This was possible only when Hong Kong became a British Colony. Sadly, the handover of Hong Kong to Communist China did not really bring about a bona fide self-governing status. Hong Kong is somewhat an “outsider” from mainland China, yet Hong Kong citizens feel worried about the degree to which Hong Kong could be different from inland cities like Shenzhen, and fear that Hong Kong will follow the Shanghai model (a capitalist city managed in a Communist way) is prevailing.³ The image of “Hong Kong” therefore leads to a paradox: the nostalgia for a “British Colony” serves as “evidence” to “prove” that “Hong Kong” is not a “Chinese Colony” and not even “equal to other parts of China”.⁴ Nonetheless, this only works in the imaginary order: the Independency of Hong Kong is never a taboo, as it has never even been thought of.⁵

Back to the history of psychology in Hong Kong: it is found that the history of psy-hyperreality was much longer than the history of the profession itself. The psy-hyperreality was imported to the colony in early 1930s, yet due to the reluctance of the Hong Kong colonial government to provide statutory registration for psychologists (a similar system was imposed on psychiatrists, nurses, and social workers) the Hong Kong Psychological Association could never be transformed into something like the British Psychological Society or the American Psychological Association. In doing so, as the profession needed to fight for its statutory status, it was necessary to maintain its apolitical appeal and now it serves a priestly function, spreading “positive values of harmony”. This often means that the profession is pro-establishment in times of social upheaval.⁶ Yet the “anarchic” status of “professional psychology” doesn’t imply that psychology is free from any hegemony. On the contrary, the general

³ The context of marginalization of “Hong Kong” as a research object is described in detail in Siu-Keung Cheung (2012), Hong Kong: Geopolitics and intellectual practice, *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, DOI:10.1080/14649373.2012.689687.

⁴ This can be summarized with a *Gongsunlongzisque* proposition: “Hong Kong” is not Hong Kong, but if “Hong Kong” = Hong Kong, then Hong Kong does not exist.

⁵ Yet Hong Kong people often wanted to make comparisons to Singapore, a state-country which shares a similar background but took a different way at the crossroad. In psychoanalytic terms, it’s an act of projection.

⁶ See Appendix I.

public is still affected by various discourses about “psychologists” and “psychology”.⁷ Psychologists are often “sexualized” despite the profession’s avoidance of this issue (please see Appendix II for evidence). Psychologists’ public profile is somewhat a hybrid of a “sexologist” and a “psychodocor” (“psychodocor” 心理醫生 is a generic term in Hong Kong culture used to describe someone who offers counseling and psychotherapy). This makes “psychologists” somewhat distinctive from other professions like social workers and psychiatrists, despite the overlaps in their roles in Hong Kong mental health settings.⁸

On the other hand, psychologists in academia were aware of the hegemony of American Psychology and started the indigenous psychology movement in 1970s. This Nationalism-fueled movement was critical at first, yet it was later found that the simulacrum of “Chinese-ness” (signified by the Confucianism-Taoism-Buddhism triad) led “indigenous psychology” to fall into the trap of positivism and essentialism. “Indigenous Psychology” became everything that involved non-“Western” participants, any research topics that involved “non-Western” themes, and at times referred to any research articles that included vast citations of ancient texts (e.g. *Confucian Dialect*).⁹ This illustrates the worst possibility of what “critical psychology” could be, confining itself to the reformist “neo-psychology” dogma. Here the author calls for an anti-psychology underground. With a slightly disturbing anti-APA formatting writing style, the author refuses any essentializing attempt. The deliberate choice of a forgotten “Chinese” philosophical root (*Gongsun Longzi*) represent a humble salute to Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s *schizoanalysis*.¹⁰

Readers are encouraged to juxtapose this article to the articles contributed by our mainland Chinese counterparts. The term “appendix” epitomizes the rhetoric adopted in this article.

The Main Body

The main body is written by a so-called “psychologist”; one who is defined by his educational background, and who is teaching in the Department of Counseling and Psychology of a local university. However, his interest is reading texts (ancient Chinese philosophy, Chinese history, psychoanalysis, Sigmund Freud, Jacques Marie Lacan), and is not a “practicing psychologist” in the professional sense.

The main body begins with the following proposition inspired by *Gongsun Longzi*: “Critical Psychology” is not “psychology”.

Premises

The theme of the 2006 Issue of *Annual Review of Critical Psychology* was “Critical Psychology in a changing world”. Based on articles in that issue, particularly the work of Babak Fozooni (*Towards a critique of the Iranian psy-complex*)¹¹, the following impressions (not “descriptions”, not to mention “definitions”) pop up:

- 1) Critical psychologists work in academia, mostly graduates from “psychology” programs (with a few contributors from other disciplines like philosophy and sociology).
- 2) Critical psychologists regard their work as a serious research output.
- 3) Major themes include:

⁷ See Appendix II.

⁸ See the survey results reported in Yu, K.C.C., Fu, W., Zhao, X., and Davey, G. (2010). Public understanding of counsellors and counselling in Hong Kong. *Asia Pacific Journal of Counselling & Psychotherapy*, 1(1), 47-54.

⁹ See Appendix III.

¹⁰ See Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. (1972). *Anti-Oedipus*. Trans. Robert Hurley, Mark Seem and Helen R. Lane. London and New York: Continuum, 2004. Trans. of *L'Anti-Oedipe*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit, and Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari, (1980). *A Thousand Plateaus*. Trans. Brian Massumi. London and New York: Continuum. Trans. of *Mille Plateaux*. Paris: Les Editions de Minuit.

¹¹ Fozooni, B. (2006). Towards a critique of the Iranian psy-complex, *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 5, pp. 69-88.

- i. how to establish anti-establishment psychologies;
 - ii. how to fight against the hegemony of positivistic psy-complex, which is often epitomized by American Psychological Association;
 - iii. calls for more attention to culture, history, philosophy, and methodological eclecticism.
- 4) Articles contributed by various critical psychologists are still written in APA format.
- 5) The purpose of citation is to establish credibility. In doing so a net of “knowledge discourse” is weaved.

These features confine “critical psychology” as an academic act. By sharing similar infrastructures to mainstream psychology (circulation of papers, funded by mainstream institutes, adopting APA style, citations as evidences of anchorage in thinking, etc.), critical psychology is becoming a pale counterpart of mainstream psychology. While the critical psychology scene is investigating various topics, including anti-capitalism, anti-colonialism, feminism, homosexual rights, minority rights, etc., it often fails to inspire faith in a post-methodology spirit. At best it adopts history, discourse analysis, and various forms of qualitative research methods as “neo-methodologies”. Ultimately, “critical psychology” is a call for “heterogeneous psychologies”, the antithesis of “a hegemonic psychology” (i.e. many vs. one). The difficulty lies with the following question: to what extent should we tolerate “the one” in the “many”. If critical psychologies have to tolerate “positivistic hegemonic psychology” as one of the “many”, soon will we find that critical psychology will sink into a state of implosion described by Jean Baudrillard.¹² If critical psychology can’t dissolve the Priest-like status of a sexologist / psychodocotr hybrid (“and psychologists create woman...”) with God substituted by science,¹³ it simply fails to make a difference.

Therefore “critical psychologists” can’t be “psychologists”, by definition or by general practices.

Plagiarism as anti-Methodology: eulogy to *Gongsun Longzi*¹⁴

Chinese philosophy is often perceived to be non-methodological. This impression is probably due to the situation in Confucianism and Taoism.¹⁵ It was not the case in Late Zhou Dynasty (War-Kingdoms) (476BC-221BC). Chinese philosophy was often categorized according to one’s subject and expertise. For example, Confucius was an expert in history, ancient rites, and ethics. Taoism was concerned with co-existence with nature. Fa-jia 法家 (literally: school of law and management) comprised of a group of politicians, generals and diplomatist. A

¹² The situation is just like the Hong Kong political scene. The so-called “pro-democratic league” could never become the majority in Hong Kong Legislative Council even they obtained majority of votes in district elections, due to the fact that half of the seats were allocated to elections within “profession groups”. (Please note that while medical practitioners, social workers, and nurses have their own “professional representatives” in Legislative Council, “psychologist” is not regarded as a “professional group” in Hong Kong political system). Majority of such legislators (“professional representatives”) always pass Government proposals and veto pro-democratic leagues’ proposals. Nonetheless, under the current situation, such a election system provides a hyper-reality that “we still have choices”.

¹³This provides an answer to my question to Mr. Huang Sheng Ji 王醒之 from Fu Jen Catholic University 輔仁大學; who advocated psychologists’ involvement in politics in Taiwan. The question is, “What is the symbolic meaning underlying such acts, given that psychologists are simply ordinary citizens?” If people vote for such a candidate because he/she is “psychologists” that “know”, then “psychology” here is just like a secular religion. If they don’t consider this factor at all, then no matter the candidate is psychologist or not makes no difference.

¹⁴ *Gongsun Longzi* is the name of the philosopher as well as the title of the book of collected works.

¹⁵ Taoism has two faces: one is philosophical Taoism, the other is its deviant religious Taoism, which is fond of martial arts, fortune telling, qi-gong and alchemy.

deviant of Fa-jia is Zhong-Huang Jia (縱橫家), which was a school for training spies. The syllabus of the teaching material (titled *Guiguzi* 鬼谷子, named after its founder) comprised methods in logical inference, interview skills, strategies for interrogatives, mnemonics, power struggles, the art of bribery, voice training, guided imagery, drama training, how to tell jokes, personality assessment, and survey methodology. Those schools of thoughts presented a very different picture on “Chinese-ness”. Sadly speaking, the majority of non-Confucian / Taoist schools of thought could not survive the Qin Dynasty (221BC-207BC).

A significant debate in the Late Zhou Dynasty was the war between realism (represented by Mo-Jia 墨家, the school led by Mo Tzu 墨翟, one of the most famous defense weapon designer, scientist, and peace activist in Chinese history, and the first in Chinese history to delineate a scheme of scientific method and a logic system called Mu 侔) and idealism (represented by Ming Jia 名家). Ming Jia literally means school of symbols, and comprised a group of mathematicians, psycho-linguistics, and debaters. The most famous among them were Chuang-tzu’s 莊周 (one of the most famous philosopher in Taoism) friend Wei-Tsu 惠施; another was the psycho-linguist *Gongsun Long* 公孫龍 who talked about concept formation, signifier / signified (指 / 非指), and proposed a state of unconscious inference (*Tien Xia*) with evidences from reflex actions.¹⁶ Their way of thinking could also be regarded as a crude form of phenomenology:

- (1) They presented an anti-common-sense proposition.¹⁷
- (2) They wrote a script from the standpoints of Mo Jia (realist standpoints).
- (3) They wrote rebuttals with skills including twists in language, naturalistic observations, and theoretical constructions.
- (4) They described in what sense the anti-commonsense proposition could lead to reconstruction of perceived knowledge.

These steps were not strictly a “methodology”, but in a contrary, an “anti-methodology”. They challenged the act of citation and they were dubious about the knowledge system provided by Mo Jia scholars. *White Horse* (《白馬》) was indeed a thought experiment to lead us to thinking about the impossibility rooted in language. This was a debate with Mo Jia who adopted set theory to justify white horses are members of category “horses”.

The adaptation of *Gongsun Longzi* in this text does not add any “credibility” to our arguments. This simply provides a starting point for the destruction of “common grounds”. Yes, it’s plagiarism *de facto*.

¹⁶ In *Solidity and Whiteness* (《堅白》), written circa 4th century B.C., Gongsun Longzi argued against the Mo-Jia viewpoint that “a stone is a stone because it’s white and it’s solid”. Gongsun Longzi commented that “stone”, “white” and “solid” were not natural entities, but results from activities in three different levels: 1) tactile sensation; which could be found in reflex action; 2) perception of whiteness was a judgment on a relative spectrum, and could be created in afterimage, that meant “whiteness” was not an natural entity, and 3) summative conclusion of “stone” in semantic network based on sensations and perceptions (力與知果). When all sensation and perception fades, they were kept in a storage called “Tien Xia” (天下, meaning “subconscious”), which was a state that was out of one’s knowledge system and could not be proved with logical propositions (故獨而正).

¹⁷ Wei-Tsu’s 惠施 was said to raise ten propositions 歷物十事 for a public competition, and “White horse is not horse” was one of such propositions.

White horse is a devilish twist-and-turn. There is no “articles” in the Chinese language, and there was no punctuation in ancient Chinese. The same character could denote its verb form, adjective form, and adverb form; could at the same time mean “the concept”, “the essence”, and “the member”. For example, “ma” 馬 (horse) can represent “horse” (the category), “a horse” (the member), “horse-ness”, “to ride a horse”, and “to regarded something as belonging to the category of horse”.

Last but not the least, white horses were very rare in ancient China, majority of Chinese breeds were brown (in the text it’s called “yellow”) or black. Many people could not imagine the existence of “white horse” at the time, just like many psychologists can’t imagine the possibility of “critical psychology”.

White Horse

Note: the articles (a, the) are deliberately dropped in to assist one’s reading. “A white horse” (the member) is not “white horse” (the concept); and “a horse” (the member) is not “horse” (the concept).

“White horse” is not “horse”, is it ok?

Yes.

Why?

“Horse” is referring the shape of the animal, “white” is the name for a color. Color is independent from the shape. Therefore, “white horse” is not “horse”.

Hey, “white horse” really exists, and we can’t say “there is no horse”. If “white horse” really exists, how come “a white horse is not a horse”?

If I ask for “a horse”, either a yellow horse or a white horse suffices. If I ask for a white horse, a yellow horse or a black horse is not acceptable. If “white horse is horse”, then they should be in the same semantic level. This means “a white horse” can denote “yellow horse / black horse”. What makes a difference between “horse” and “white horse”? It is because “horse” can include the possibility of “a yellow horse” and “a black horse” as it is not necessary to delimit the concept of “the horse” with colors. No exclusion criteria on color are attached to the concept “horse”. Therefore “white horse” is not “horse” is very clear.

Yet, there is no horse without color, thus you cannot regard “a white horse” is not “a horse”.

I know there is no colorless “horse”. If all horses are colorless, then “horse” alone is adequate, and there would be no room for the concept of “white horse”. Yet, once the concept of “white” is connected with “horse”, it’s never the same, therefore “white horse” is not “horse”.

You cannot say so. The quality of “whiteness” is not necessarily dependent on the quality of “horse-ness” and the coexistence of two qualities does not affect the existence of each other. Therefore one cannot say “a white horse” is not “a horse”.

If your argument is correct, why “a white horse” is not equal to “a yellow horse”? In your opinion “white horse” is equal to “yellow horse”? This is the most ridiculous argument I’ve heard.

No, I said “a white horse is a horse”, simply because it shares “horse-ness”. If a white horse is sharing “horse-ness”, we can say “white horse is horse”. We call a white horse “a horse” simply because it shares the “horse-ness”.

No, they are not the same. Talk about “white-ness”, the perception is always relative and there is no absolute “whiteness”. “White horse” is a concept that contains delimiter and exclusion criteria based on colour. On the other hand, “horse” does not exclude any “colour”. Therefore, “white horse” is a concept with boundary, and “horse” is a concept without boundary (of colour). Therefore, “the essence of white horse” is not the same as “the essence of horse” (as the act of exclusion *per se* is the “essence” of the concept).

Appendix I: Psychology¹⁸

Hong Kong became a British Colony after the 1841 Opium War and the Colonial Government functioned until the handover of Hong Kong as a special administrative region of mainland China (People’s Republic of China) in 1997. The Colonial Government was not particularly interested in establishing Hong Kong’s general education system until the opening of the University of Hong Kong in 1911.

While most local psychologists assume “there was no psychology before 1968”, there are inklings of psychological activities long before that. The name of “the first psychologist” should be given to Dr. Irene Cheng-Ho Tung (鄭何艾齡), the daughter of the first local millionaire Sir Ho-Tung, who obtained the Doctor of Philosophy in Education in the University College of London (1936). As the first female PhD holder in Hong Kong, and the Senior Inspector of Schools by the Department of Education of the Hong Kong Government, she was elected to the executive board of the WFMH between 1954 and 1959, and established a Child Guidance Clinic in 1957. Her vision was to follow the model of Tavistock Clinic.¹⁹ Yet after negotiations the clinic was streamlined to become a self-funded clinic and was officially under the management of the University of Hong Kong (a government-funded university). This reflected the tongue-in-cheek attitude of the Colonial Hong Kong Government to establish any formality in “psychological service” in Hong Kong in 1950s. Fulfilling this policy the Government gave two scholarships to train “experts in psychology”, and the choice was to fund studies in master of clinical social work in UK (Ms. Anita Chen, Ms. Gennie Lee). Officially the post was also called “expert in psychology”. Seen from this perspective, in the 1950s, there was no formal demarcation of professions. As the service was expensive, and public reception towards “psychological service” was lukewarm due to its perceived association with lunacy, the Child Guidance Clinic ceased to function as a clinic after 1960, sank into oblivion after its transformation into a “research centre” and officially dissolved in 1968 after the establishment of the Department of Psychology.²⁰ Part of the reason why the Child Guidance Clinic was short-lived was that the

¹⁸ The choice of historical bits and bites always involves subjectivity and randomness, or it’s based on underlying ideologies in the discourse weaves. The debate between E.H. Carr and R.G. Collingwood over the function of “facts” and “imagination” in history is never-ending. Accessibility to inaccessible data places historians in an advantageous position to claim legitimacy over “discovery” of “historical facts” (just like a recollection of the bygone colonial days: “the first can claim”). Yet, who can claim to be the first?

¹⁹ See the proposal for the Child Guidance Clinic by Cheng Ho-Tung, I. (1954). Some Comments on Mental Health and Child Guidance. *Journal of Education*, 12(1): 42-43. Dr. Irene Cheng Ho-Tung invited Dr. J. Stirrat from World Health Organization to visited Hong Kong in November 1955. The Child Guidance Clinic was the Hong Kong Colonial Government’s response towards Dr. J. Stirrat’s suggestions. Dr. Tam Wai Hon, Ms. Beryl Wright and Ms. Anita Chen were appointed as experts in psychologist (which official title suggested by Dr. Irene Cheng Ho-Tung) of the Child Guidance Clinic. All of them were educated in England.

²⁰ From the *Vice Chancellors’ Report of the University of Hong Kong*, the number of client dropped from 584 in fiscal year 1957-1958; to 158 in fiscal year 1958-1959, and finally 87 in fiscal year 1959-1960. The revenue dropped from \$29200 to \$7900 and finally \$4350. Each client was charged with \$50 HKD for treatment, which was too expensive for general publics. According to Wong (1997), the rent of a typical Hong Kong grassroot family in 1950s was \$14 HKD per month. Most of them lived in a squatter with average size 120 square feet

expectation towards “psychological service” at time was a mean to test and select students.²¹ The story of the Child Guidance Clinic revealed that the Colonial government was not interested in establishing “psychological services.” What they were interested in was “Guidance” as what the title stands itself. Overall, they perceived no difference among “psychologists”, “education experts”, and “social workers,” but rather grossed them under the same category of “experts in psychology”.

In 1967 the “Anti-British and Anti-Violence Campaign” mobilized by home-grown leftist camp forced the Colonial Government to change its social policy by increasing public investment into public housing, transportation system, medical system, hygiene system. A less-known aftermath was the establishment of Faculty of Social Science in 1967 in the University of Hong Kong, including the Department of Psychology²² on 1 July 1968. The first head of the Department, John L.M. Dawson, regarded Hong Kong as “a natural laboratory of cross-cultural psychology”.²³ His overall vision was to establish the Department of Psychology as a stronghold in social psychology / cross-cultural psychology. He even insisted in establishing the Hong Kong Psychological Society (HKPS) according to the model of the British Psychological Society on 2 February 1968. Under his headship, a postgraduate program entitled the Master of Clinical Psychology Program was launched in 1971, the year that the first cohort of undergraduate obtained their Undergraduate degree in psychology. Dawson did contact Mr. C.S. Rowlands, an official of the Social Work Department (SWD) of the Hong Kong Government, in July 1969 to ensure the career prospects of the Master graduates, including the coordination of psychological activities, definition of “psychologists” and their role, which resulted in the opening of the post “clinical psychologist” in the SWD in 1970.²⁴

This led to a strange situation: while the majority of the academics were interested in social psychology / cultural psychology (particularly topics concerning Chinese culture), the existence of the “profession” was in line with the development of clinical psychology. Among other things the field was very small at that time. There was only 5 full-time teaching staff in the Department of Psychology of the University of Hong Kong in 1971. Even when the Chinese University began to offer psychology courses and established their Department of Psychology in 1982, the academic circle remained small. Only 14 “psychologists” worked in academia; the rest worked in either Governmental settings or private sectors. The earliest collaboration of the HKPS, in which the practitioners outnumber academic psychologists, was not surprisingly the standardization of the WISC (1977-1979) in Hong Kong.²⁵ The

without any kitchen or private washrooms. See Wong, M.K.T. (1997). *Remaining in memories: Hong Kong and its society: 1950s to 1970s – selected photos from Mr. Chung Man Luck* [戰後香港軌跡: 社會掠影]. Hong Kong: Commercial Press.

²¹ *Vice-Chancellor's report: Department of Education, 1959-1960* revealed that an anonymous school had asked the Child Guidance Clinic to “test” 1409 children (aged 12-15) and selected 100 of them for the offer of Secondary Grade 1 places. No details were given about the charge of this deal and the method of the “assessment”, and why the school insisted keeping this deal anonymous is still a mystery. One of the possibilities is that consulting a “psychological service” was still a taboo in Hong Kong in 1950s.

²² As the only existing British colony in the Far East after WWII, Hong Kong was a good place for academics. At 1960s there were no University in Macau, in mainland China the psychological scene was dissolved and psychologists were persecuted in the Cultural Revolution, and Hong Kong was preferred to Taiwan for security considerations. Hong Kong was relatively safe and attractive for Western academics in the Colonial days. On the contrary, immigrant scholars often couldn't share such opportunities. An example was Zing Yang Kuo (郭任遠), the most famous Chinese psychologist in the US and in mainland China, who failed to find a place in academia after his migration to Hong Kong in 1949, and was rejected for the position as a child psychologist in the Department of Education in the University of Hong Kong. See Blowers, G.H. (2001). To be a Big Shot or to be shot: Zing Yang Kuo's other career. *History of Psychology*, 4, 367-387.

²³ Dawson, J.L.M., (1970). Psychological research in Hong Kong. *International Journal of Psychology*, 5(1): 63-70.

²⁴ The first person who took the position was Mr. K.H.Kwong (鄺基雄). See Fu, W. (2003). *Public Image of Psychologists in Hong Kong: An Historical and Cultural Perspective*. M.Phil Dissertation, The University of Hong Kong.

²⁵ To cut a long story short, the chronological Whig History can be found in the following list of “landmarks”: establishment of the Department of Psychology, the University of Hong Kong (1968); establishment of the Hong Kong Psychological Society (HKPS) (1968); creation of the first post of clinical psychology in Social Welfare

public profile of the HKPS was still low in the 1980s and the urge for statutory status in professional legislation (since 1991) has not been successful so-far. Psychologists' requests were being rejected by the Hong Kong Government on the grounds of inadequate number of professional members and self-regulation among HKPS. The Government and the NGO was regarded as enough, an excuse which the field disagreed.²⁶ This is different from the statutory monitoring over the title of psychiatrists²⁷, psychiatric nurses, and particularly, social workers. In case of social work, Government had established a set of stringent regulations over the NGOs intrigued by a network of complicated funding policies.²⁸

One possible context for the case was that the majority of Hong Kong psychologists worked in Governmental Social Welfare, Educational, or Medical settings, and not surprisingly the only occasion that the HKPS became involved in a political event was the Hotline for emotionally disturbed people after the June-Fourth Incident in mainland China (1989).²⁹ Since 1993 the HKPS has organized the Critical Incident Team to provide support to general public and the victims of trauma.³⁰ Yet, "professional psychologists" are often regarded as the advocator for "positive psychology", as well as a "professional sources" for parenting information.³¹

Nonetheless, "psychologists" fail to enjoy monopoly in the public common sense of "expert in psychology". In 1968, the same year the Department of Psychology was established, the Department of Social Work and Social Administration of the University of Hong Kong was established as well. The Department of Social Work and Social Administration organized an M.Soc.Sc program in Social Deviance in 1971. The program was comprised of four papers and a 600-hour practicum, and covered various aspects of psychotherapy, statistics, clinical neurology and psychiatry. The four compulsory courses included 1) social work and social administration; 2) social policy and social pathology; 3) clinical psychology, including principles of psychological testing, design of experiments and statistical

Department of Hong Kong Government (1970), establishment of the Master of Clinical Psychology program in the University of Hong Kong (1971); establishment of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP) (1972), opening of the Mental Testing Workshop in HKPS (1974); the WISC Hong Kong standardization led by HKPS (1977-1979); establishment of the Department of Psychology in Chinese University of Hong Kong (1982), establishment of the Master Program of Educational Psychology in the University of Hong Kong (1981), establishment of the Master of Clinical Psychology at Chinese University of Hong Kong (1988), establishment of the Division of Educational Psychology (1989) in the HKPS; establishment of the Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology in the HKPS (2000), and establishment of the Division of Counseling Psychology in the HKPS (2006).

²⁶ The issue was still being discussed in the open forum session at the Annual Conference of Hong Kong Psychological Society, 16 June 2012, held in the City University of Hong Kong.

²⁷ Even psychiatrists showed more political enthusiasm than psychologists do. In 7 September 2012 a majority of psychiatrists working in public hospitals signed the advocacy letter calling on the withdrawal of the proposal for national education on the ground that "it's a form of brainwash that is harmful to children's mental development". See "Psychiatrists send a public letter to Chief Executive advocating withdrawal of the proposal for national education". 醫生聯署促撤科 *Appledaily*, 9-Sep-2012, A2.

²⁸ See Chang Siu Wah (2002). Managerialism and small NGOs in Hong Kong, *Hong Kong Journal of Social Work*, 36 (1/2): 83-94.

²⁹ The June-Fourth Incident resulted in doubts and negative sentiment towards the Communist Party among Hong Kong people, which led to the wave of Brain Drain between 1989 and 1997.

³⁰ The HKPS' first involvement of trauma intervention for the public, aside from the June Fourth Incident, was the Lan Kwai Fong Incident, when people stepped over each other during the New Years' celebration in the bar district Lan Kwai Fong in 1993. See Leung, E.Y., Wong, C.W., Wu, K.K., and Li, E.K.W. (1996). Disaster Management: A report on psychological interventions after two disastrous fires in 1996. *Bulletin of the Hong Kong Psychological Society*, 36/37: 85-97.

³¹ For example, a Clinical Psychologist Daisy Chow 鄒凱詩 advised parents of students who joined the University early admission scheme (usually granted to "gifted children") in 27 Jul 2012 to allow their sons and daughters to participate in extracurricular activities and to live in school dormitories, so that they would be socially active and feel less anxious about university life. Several Gifted Children who were admitted to the University of Hong Kong refused orientation camps and residential halls [港大神童不玩O Camp 不住宿舍], *Apple Daily*, 27 Jul 2012, A4.

methods, therapeutic methods and rehabilitation, professional aspects; and 4) clinical neurology and psychiatry, including clinical neurology, general psychiatry, child psychiatry, mental subnormality. The large overlap can be seen between this program and Masters of Clinical Psychology, and that the graduates of the social deviance program were called “social workers”; while those from clinical psychology program were called “psychologists”. This foresaw the future that the concept of “experts in psychology” would continue to be shared among various “disciplines” including psychiatrists, social work, and psychologists for a long time.

Appendix II: “Psychologists”

For years, “psychologists” in the Chinese language was a synonym for “experts in psychology”, while “psychologists” (particularly clinical psychologists) is still called (unofficially) “psycho-doctors” (in Chinese *Xinli Yisheng*, 心理醫生) in Hong Kong. Dr. Irene Cheng Ho-Tung was the only “local expert in psychology” (in official sense) for a very long time. Interestingly, the public image of a “psychologist” existed long before than the introduction of a “real” psychologist in Hong Kong. Since the establishment of the Chinese Psychic Research Institute (中華精神研究會) by Bao Fengzhou (鮑芳洲) in 1911, there was a huge market for hypnotism in Shanghai, and the Institute established a branch in Hong Kong (Hong Kong institute of Hypnotism 香港中華精神醫學總院) in 1934.³² The Institute provided a variety of teaching modes: extramural training (general member); certificate hypnotist; and full time hypnotist. They published their own teaching materials on clairvoyance and “psychic power” and called themselves “experts in psychology”. Although its popularity in Hong Kong could not be compared with the phenomenon in Shanghai (which was estimated to have over 100,000 members during its heyday), it did survive for a long time as an expensive “clinic” during the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945),³³ and only sank into oblivion after its major figure, Bao Fengzhou’s death, in 1967. Therefore, public conceptualization of “expert in psychology” at the time was probably a hypnotist; or anyone who provided somewhat less threatening procedures, which was different the procedures adopted by a “doctor” who was responsible for the “lunatics” in the asylum. Another common (mis)perception of “psychologists” was that “psychologists” were credible sources in relation to sexology and intimate relationship. The trend had been prevailing since Zhang Jingsheng 張競生 published his notorious book *The History of Sexuality* 性史, in 1917. The book was available in Hong Kong and a hit the time. Since then Hong Kong newspapers often cited psychologists for sex-related information.³⁴

The confusion about “psycho-doctor” and “sexologist” could be found in a newspaper report in 1950 about Ms. Helen Lee’s visit to Hong Kong. She was regarded as a “psychologist”:

Female psychologist Helen Lee, the daughter of millionaire Lee Kuo Tim, has arrived Hong Kong. She was studying in the US, and she often made analysis on the philosophy of life. Several years has passed she came to know the secret of psychology and gained special knowledge of the philosophy of life. She is also an expert in swimming and equestrianism, and is praised as the Chinese Siren.³⁵

In this article the “psychologists” was not only an “expert in psychology”, but a “sexy figure” herself. In summary, since 1968 three types of “psychologists” have been projected in public discourse about psychologists:

³² It was located in 46 Caine Road, an expensive residential area for Westerners in Hong Kong in 1930s. See the news announcement in *Kung Sheung Daily News*, 16 Oct 1934, p. (4)2.

³³ The price per session of “psychotherapy” was ten Hong Kong Dollars, and the monthly salary of a teacher at that time was merely 30 to 40 Hong Kong dollars. See Tsai Jung-Fung 蔡榮芳 *The Hong Kong People’s History 1841-1945*. (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 2001, p.231)

³⁴ More references could be found in Ye LingFeng 葉靈鳳, *Shijie Xingsu Congtan* 世界性俗叢談 *Miscellany on Sex Customs Around the World), Hong Kong: Nanyue, 1989, p. 147.

³⁵ “Nu Xinlinxuejia Helen Lee Dida Xianggong” 女心理學家李海倫抵達香港 [Female Psychologist Helen Lee arrives Hong Kong] *Kung Sheung Daily News* 1 May 1950, p.6.

1. Academic Psychologists – mostly active in the Governmental funding research regime (through the semi-governmental body, the Research Grant Council); mostly fall into oblivion in the public eye unless they “evolve” as a “psycho-doctor” or “expert in human intimacy”.
2. Psychologists as “experts in psychology” – an entity shared by other professions (social worker, psychiatrists, education professionals) and co-existing with the name “psycho-doctors”, which is inherited from the magician’s image of the hypnotists.
3. Psychologists as “experts in human intimacy” – most psychologists (members of HKPS) do not actively create this image (on the contrary the HKPS wanted to stay away from this stereotype)³⁶ but the image survive despite their intentions.

A keyword-search in *Appledaily* 蘋果日報, the most popular newspaper in Hong Kong, provides evidences for the above claims. Entering the keyword “psychologists” into the magazine’s search engine, with the timeframe extending from 1 January 2009 to 15 October 2012 yielded 534 entries. 140 of these were translations of foreign reports on psychologists’ finding in sex or human intimacy.³⁷ The rest were description of psychologists’ role, psychologists’ positive messages for traumas³⁸, psychologists’ views on parenting, and psychologists’ views on mental health. With rare exceptions, local psychologists do not appear in any sex/intimacy reports. The search for the keyword “expert in psychology” 心理專家 found 190 entries, and all of which were related to mental health and parenting. The search for “counselor” yielded 180 entries, all of which referred to volunteers and peer counselors. The search for “social workers” yielded 2249 entries, which were related to all kinds of aspects of society, including mental health, social policy, democracy, etc., yet none of these referred to sex and human intimacy. Similarly, the search for the keyword “psychiatrists” confirmed that none of the 181 results were related to sex and human intimacy. Also, it is interesting to find that despite the long time effort of the HKPS to establish its own identity by despising the label “psycho-doctors”, the term psycho-doctors 心理醫生 still appeared in 202 reports, including formal court case reports.³⁹ Again none of the reports with keyword “psycho-doctors” were associated with sex and human intimacy.

This indicates that “psychologist” is a sexualized concept and a clinicalized concept, and the two connotations are mutually exclusive.

Appendix III: “Critical Psychology”: (Anti) Psychology Underground

Psychologists in Hong Kong (both academic and practicing psychologists) show great enthusiasm for what is called “indigenous psychology”. Hong Kong has a long history of joining force with Taiwan and later mainland Chinese academia in advocating “indigenous psychology”, or more boldly, “Chinese psychology”.

Since the establishment of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology (IACCP) in March 1972 (its convener, again, was John Dawson) and the Inaugural IACCP conference from 22 to 25 August 1972, the call for establishing indigenous psychologies that would be “independent from

³⁶ For example, psychiatrists and psychologists (which are collectively regarded as “experts” and “doctors”) criticized a “expert in psychology of love” called Santino (郭政彤), who appeared in a TV reality Show *Bride Wannabe* 盛女愛作戰, as unprofessional. They commented that “love should be based on genuine communication but not tactics and strategies”. Nonetheless, this revealed the truth that the myth that psychologists are sex and intimacy experts is still prevalent among general public. See “Doctors criticized TV reality Show *Bride Wannabes* as misleading.” 醫生轟盛女「專家」教壞人, *Mingpao*, 17 Apr 2012, p. A1.

³⁷ For example, an article in *Appledaily*, 21 July 2012, p. B1, “Indulged in online game and porn site led to the extinction of male, psychologists said” (沉迷打機上網, 男人遲早絕種) cited Philip Zimbardo’s work *Demise of Guys*. The report was actually adopted from *Daily Mail* in the United Kingdom.

³⁸ For example, the term “psychologist” has appeared in *Appledaily* much more frequently since the Lamma Island Boat Sinking Incident on 1 October 2012.

³⁹ For example, in a court case on sexual harassment, the Judge used the term “psycho-doctors’ report 心理醫生報告” in his verdict. See Court Case number KTCC5180/12, reported in “School Headmaster charged for sexual harassment” 色狼校長25年前非禮昨受審, 28 September 2012, *Appledaily*, p. A3.

American Positivist Psychology” has become part of the *zeitgeist*.⁴⁰ Soon anything that cited Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, used Chinese as subject; or any investigation with the keywords “China” or “Chinese”, would be welcomed as an “indigenous research output”. Yet the lack of methodology in Confucian Philosophy, and Taoist Philosophy (and the ignorance of Buddhist methodology)⁴¹ put “Chinese Psychology” in a state that still left it relying on positivistic, “scientific” methodology. In this sense the majority of studies are not different from their “enemy”, and the majority of psychologists involved are still interested in doing surveys, operationalized experiments, assessments, CBT, and “evidence based research”.

Only a few exceptions, including Erik Kvan, who often questioned the positivistic assumption of psychology (including criticisms of indigenous psychology); Geoffery H. Blowers, who focused on the history of psychology in Hong Kong and mainland China and was concerned with the over-emphasis on statistical methodologies; the work from Sik-Ying Ho from the Department of Social Work (HKU) and Adolf Tsang Ka Tat on the construction of sexuality, could be regarded as *bona fide* critical research in psychology. Nonetheless, none of these referred to political ideology (particularly Marxism).

There are signs of changes, and a “(anti)psychology underground” has been building up. For example, the author’s attempt to establish the Signifier (指非指) in the Jockey Club Creative Arts Centre for weekly seminars on psychoanalysis (Freudian, Lacanian) for the general public (for free since 2010)⁴², joins forces with the Chinese University Weekly Reading Group and the Hong Kong Žižek Society, which was founded by social worker Nelson Cheung Ka Wing 張嘉榮 and his collaborator Tong Kin 唐健. They are not academic in the strict sense, but their philosophy web channel OurTVHK 哲人道 is highly influential. Book stores like Hong Kong Reader (序言書室), Kubrick, and The Coming Society (實現會社), become the hubs for anti-establishment discussions, and SocRec (a social activist group for making documentary and independent news report) as well as Immediatelink (香港獨立媒體) evolved as sponsors of such events. Most of them comprise youngsters who are not studying psychology but other disciplines like journalism, politics, philosophy, sociology, and some are high school students. Those groups often mobilize members to support social activities (like the recent “anti-national education movement” in Hong Kong since mid August 2012). The recent trend in Hong Kong psychology underground is to spot Lacan and Žižek (and Badiou at times) and organize workshops and reading groups on such topics. For members of those groups, the APA format is a totally alien concept, and Cantonese dialogue (even foul language)⁴³ is welcome in articles and discussion on serious (sometimes not so serious) topics in philosophy.

⁴⁰ Spinks, J.A., and H.S.R. Kao. “Hong Kong: A Review of Psychological Research, Education, and Professional Issues.” *World Psychology*, 1(1995): 71-75. And Spinks, J.A. and D.Y.F.Ho, *People Culture and Society: A researcher’s guide to psychological studies in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Social Sciences Research Centre, the University of Hong Kong.

⁴¹ Confucianism and Taoism are regarded as an indigenous religion in secularized form in embedded in philosophical discourses. Buddhism, on the other hand, originated in India and struggled with Taoism and Confucianism for popularity until the three joined force to become “indigenous roots” against “Western Christianity” after the Opium War in 1840.

⁴² The Signifier has evolved from a psychoanalysis reading group in Hong Kong Shue Yan University. The reading group was formed after a small local conference, Hong Kong Conference in Psychoanalysis in July 2007. Dr. Sean Homer and Dr. Eugene Georgaca were invited as keynote speakers.

⁴³ For example, the 20th episode of OurTVHK is titled *Žižek ChuanBao On Justice*. Literally the title could be deciphered as Žižek challenge On Justice in a cocky mood, yet the term ChuanBao is highly informal, on the brink of foul language in Cantonese dialect.

The Main Body (reprise) - “Critical psychology” is not “psychology”

“Critical Psychology” is not “psychology”?

Yes.

Why?

“Psychology” refers to the scope of an academic discipline, and “critical” is an attitude. Attitude does not denote an academic discipline. Therefore, “Critical Psychology” is not “Psychology”.

Hey, “critical psychology” really exists, and one can’t say that there is no psychology. If “critical psychology” really exists, in what sense “critical psychology is not psychology”?

If I ask for “a psychologist”, either a “psycho-doctor”, a “priest”, or a “sexologist”, suffices. If I ask for “a critical psychologist”, then “a psycho-doctor” or “a priest” is not acceptable. If “critical psychology” is “psychology”, then they should be compared in the same semantic level. What does it mean? This means that “a critical psychologist” must not include the quality of “psycho-doctor”, “sexologist” or “priest”. What makes “critical psychology” different from “psychology”? “Psychologist” denotes “psycho-doctor”, “sexologist” and “priest”, and “psychologists” need not to define itself with the delimiter “critical attitude”. Therefore, that “critical psychology” is not “psychology” is clear.

Yet, by definition a “psychologist” is the one who receive relevant education and training, those who haven’t are not psychologists. Hence you cannot say a “critical psychologist” is not a “psychologist”.

I know “psychologist” is defined by one’s educational background. If it is not necessary to make such a distinction, then there will be no rooms for “critical psychology”.⁴⁴ However, once the critical attitude is embedded in the term “psychology”, it will never be the same. Therefore “critical psychology is not psychology”.

Yet you cannot say so. The quality of “critical” is not associated with the essential quality of a “psychologist”. The co-existence of two qualities does not affect each other. Therefore you cannot say “a critical psychologist” is not “a psychologist”.

If you are correct, why “a critical psychologist” cannot be at the same time “a psycho-doctor”? In your opinion, “critical psychology” is equal to “clinical psychology”? This is the most ridiculous argument I’ve ever heard.

No, I regard “a critical psychologist” as “a psychologist” on the ground that both share the essential quality of “a psychologist”. If a critical psychologist is sharing the same essential quality, then we can argue that “critical psychology is psychology”. We can call a critical psychologist as a psychologist simply because they share the “essential quality” of psychologists.

⁴⁴ This is exactly what happened in Hong Kong before the establishment of the first Department of Psychology in 1968.

No, they are not the same. There is no absolute “critical-ness”, as it is always floating: it’s an attitude towards “establishment”. “Critical psychology” is a concept that contains delimiters and exclusion criteria based on its anti-establishment attitude. On the other hand, “psychology” does not exclude any “establishment”. Therefore, “critical psychology” is a concept with boundary, and “psychology” is a concept without boundary. Therefore, “critical psychology” is not “psychology” as the act of excluding the “essence” of “psychology” *per se* is the essence of the concept of “critical psychology”.

Epilogue: Procrastination

The Hong Kong Psychological Society’s *Position Paper for Psychologists Working with Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexual (LGB) Individuals* was finalized and uploaded on the HKPS website on 1 August 2012. Some statements in the *Position Paper* appear to be liberal:

1. Psychologists understand that homosexuality and bisexuality are not mental illnesses.
5. Psychologists understand the societal stigma imposed on LGB individuals and the effects on their lives.
11. Psychologists advocate for an inclusive society and the promotion of equal opportunity. This includes advocating for the elimination of homophobia, biphobia, discrimination, bullying, harassment, or any form of stigmatization towards LGB individuals.

The *Position Paper* is indeed an attempt to fill the vacuum of existing ethical guideline. Most of the statements were modified from corresponding APA guidelines. Yet it is clearly stated that “...the position paper has been written based on the principle of upholding professionalism in the provision of ethical and evidence-based practice to our service users and society-at-large.” The *Position Paper* does not assume the HKPS to be promoting liberalism towards LBG, but is a manifesto stating that “psychologists know”. Psychologists are priests of “the scientific understanding of human being”. See the following statements:

4. When using and disseminating information on sexual orientation, psychologists fully and accurately represent research findings that are based on rigorous scientific research design and are careful to avoid any possible misuse or misrepresentation of these findings.
6. Psychologists always act to ensure the public is accurately informed about sexual orientation and LGB-related issues.
7. Psychologists are aware of their own attitudes, beliefs and knowledge about sexual orientation and LGB individuals’ lives and experiences. They do not impose personal beliefs or standards about sexual orientation when they are offering professional services.

HKPS does not pretend to be “indigenized” at this time and uses only APA and other “Western” sources for reference. “...Upon careful discussion and reference to the existing practice guidelines and position statement from major psychological and medical associations in the Western countries.”⁴⁵ Nonetheless, the drafting of the *Position Paper* by the Workgroup of 10 psychologists from the Division of Clinical Psychology (DCP) attracted lukewarm perception from the HKPS. Only six members from DCP submitted suggestions and

⁴⁵ See appendix to the Position Paper, *Background to the Development of the Position Paper for Psychologists Working with Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexual Individuals*, 1 August 2012.

comments to the Workgroup, and no responses were generated from the Division of Counseling Psychology (DCoP), the Division of Educational Psychology (DEP), and the Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (DIOP).⁴⁶

After the uploading of the *Position Paper* on the HKPS website, no psychologists and Division under HKPS openly gave any opinions towards LGB, and the profession kept silent towards Legislator Cyd Ho's motion *Equal rights for people of different sexual orientation*, which was discussed and negated in Hong Kong Legislative Council on 7 November 2012. By no means the profession "keeps the public informed" about anything.

Once again psychologists acted politically by staying political neutral. Just like the standstill in progress regarding the statutory registration of psychologists, the profession in Hong Kong is signified by the term *procrastination*.

⁴⁶ Original quote from *Background to the Development of the Position Paper for Psychologists Working with Lesbians, Gays, and Bisexual Individuals*, "...Upon careful discussion and reference to the existing practice guidelines and position statement from major psychological and medical associations in the Western countries, the Work Group has drafted the guidelines and this background supplement and submitted to DCP, DCoP, DEP, and DIOP Committees for endorsement on January 4, 2012. Since then, the DCoP and DEP Chairpersons have circulated the guidelines and this background supplement through email to Committee members with no comments received on January 2012, the DCP Committee has discussed it at its meeting on January 11, 2012, and the DIOP Committee has discussed and supported the guidelines and this background supplement at their Committee meeting on February 8, 2012. The guidelines and this background supplement have also been emailed to DCP members for feedback from 19-30 March 2012. Comments from six DCP members have returned and the Work Group has prepared a detailed response to the comments and has submitted the revised guidelines and the background supplement to the DCP Committee for its endorsement....".

Contact details:

Fu Wai

Department of Counselling Psychology,
Hong Kong Shue Yan University

The Founder of *The Signifier*, Hong Kong

Contact: Department of Counselling and Psychology, Hong Kong Shue Yan University, North Point,
Hong Kong.

E-mail: wfu@hksyu.edu