

## 「家族治療本土化的研究與展望」再回應文

李岳庭\*

### 摘要

本文針對郭麗安 (Li-An Kuo) 教授、孫頌賢 (Sung-Hsien Sun) 教授、程婉若 (Wan-Juo Cheng) 教授及王明雯 (Ming-Wen Wang) 教授四位專家，針對筆者「家族治療本土化的研究與展望」( *Research and Prospect in the Indigenization of Family Therapy* ) 一文的回應，進行再回應論述。其中包含家族治療本土意涵的定義、研究方法的探討及可執行性、性別平權內涵的考量及文化繼承的本土化 ( *enculturative indigenization* ) 理論建構。

其中回應了孫教授由下而上的研究法及程教授建議民族誌 ( *ethnography* ) 的研究法，並認為這樣的研究法可以建構微理論或模式，是比較可行的理論建構研究法。另外，此種研究法較能探索非主流研究取樣的資料，並深入了解不同文化族群的樣態。另外支持郭教授及程教授在性別平權的觀點，認為在家族治療理論的建構中，性別的成分是不可缺少的。最後回應了王教授在文化繼承的本土化理論建構，認為文化繼承的本土化理論建構除了需要對家族治療的內涵有所了解，並要對本土文化有所熟悉，然而現實的環境中，要兩者都精通的專家是少之又少，感恩的是臺灣已經有先驅者辛苦的先行，後繼者可以依循前者路徑慢行。

因為四篇回應文對家族治療實務的訓練著墨較少，筆者在文中拋出了練習關係問話的諮商方式、熟練觀察及分析案主們的各種模式及後現代思維的體現三個方向，建議訓練可以往這三方面加強，提升本土家族治療訓練的根基。

---

**關鍵詞：**本土家族治療、本土理論、家族治療未來的發展

李岳庭\* 國立臺南大學諮商與輔導學系 ( [ylee@gm2.nutn.edu.tw](mailto:ylee@gm2.nutn.edu.tw) )

## 壹、前言

感謝四位學者由不同的角度深化「家族治療本土化的研究與展望」的回應，筆者於此篇再回應文回應四位學者於回應文中所提之部分觀點。由於筆者自身專業及訓練的限制，只能對四位學者的部分專業觀點進行回應，但仍希望這些回應能進而統整筆者對家族治療本土化的研究與展望之思考，期許透過這來回的對話，為家族治療實務與研究的本土化，更往前開展一哩路。

## 貳、回應郭麗安教授的回應文

感謝郭教授簡短精要地對筆者前文的回應。郭教授在臺灣是長年致力推動性別平權及婚姻家族治療的前輩，她針對西方傳統家族理論發展歷史中，性別所處之重要定位與思量，提出女性長久以來在西方理論與論述中所處的不平權之地位，並提出在思量孝道、分化等觀念於華人關係文化中之內涵的同時，應將性別之交互性列入思量。筆者贊同郭教授所提之觀點與其重要性，認為不管是目前本土的家族治療理論，如王教授在其回應文中所提到的王行（2016）修身與齊家一書以儒家心學為助人知識的家族治療，及吳就君（2017）的「華無式」家族治療，或是 Goldenberg 與 Goldenberg（2012）家族治療一書所提及的西方家族治療的理論，除女性主義的治療法外，少有將性別內涵放入其理論建構中，更不用說用性別角度為主體的理論建構。因此筆者極力贊成應在家族治療的理論中，正視性別因素的考量，並進一步鼓勵以性別為主體的理論建構。

家庭議題與家庭結構中的性別、權力等議題息息相關，但在西方家族治療的歷史發展中，西方的理論建構大多沒有將性別的因素列入理論建構的考量。一方面是理論建構的過程中，是以當時的文化底蘊所發展出來的。若理論發展所處當下的文化中，沒有性別這方面的覺察或反思，就會忽略了性別在其中所遭受不平等論述的狀況，因此就不會納入理論建構的內涵中。

筆者認為，雖然該理論原始的建構，不是以性別為主體所建構的理論，至少應在實務的訓練、督導過程及治療中，加入對性別平權的內涵及提升其敏感度。筆者在臺灣就諮商與家族治療心理師的實務交流經驗中，感受到隨著郭教授及一群有使命感的性別平權人士，多年努力透過倡議、反思、教育及立法等，來提升社會文化對性別平權的思想並改變不合宜的性別議題內涵。臺灣性別平權的教育及概念，持續地在臺灣人民的素養中深化及擴展，已形成良好的文化內涵之一，雖然仍有進步的空間，然而這樣的文化內涵，將反饋於原本沒有建構性別平權內涵的理論，形成理論本身的反思及對話。這樣的反思及對話，造成在實務上，不管是督導或技術的使用，都會產生變化，例如在個案概念化的結果及對家庭的處遇，都會異於原理論沒有反思及對話之前的處遇。筆者在「家

族治療本土化的研究與展望」一文中，以 Bowen 理論及本土的孝道元素來舉例，初衷想提醒讀者，原理論的建構不一定含有性別議題的思維，其理論建構的角度也並不是從性別的角度切入。然而，這種缺乏是嚴重的忽略，因為郭教授指出遠在 1970 年代，西方學者就有不同的聲音提出，認為文化間之差異，最常被討論的是性別的議題。但在原家族治療理論中又缺乏性別的內涵，也就是以這些忽略性別內涵的理論來進行家族治療，對協助的對象將會承受許多的危險。可以想見，缺少性別內涵的原理論，不一定全部的原理論概念都能適切地運用在現今已經成熟發展性別概念的臺灣本土文化，因此需要對原理論有所反思及對話來修正不合宜的地方，特別是以性別的思維來考量。郭教授的回應文中也提及了，其實西方理論早在 Gilligan(1982) 的觀點，就已經挑戰了 Kohlberg(1983) 的道德發展理論及過往心理學中所推崇的「自主」(autonomy) 觀點。郭教授在回應文中也提到，在研究上以後設分析的角度，1940 年思覺失調症病患研究的歸因中，產生對性別刻板化印象下的離譜推論或結論。在現在看來，一些婚姻、家庭、親子教養等研究結果，也經不起目前性別平權內涵的考驗，這些進展都是靠著性別平權文化的成長對西方原理論的反思，並指出原理論在性別內涵的缺乏及不足，提醒人們在使用該理論需有的謹慎態度，或是形成原理論本身的修正或調整。這樣的進展，都是因著對性別議題有敏銳反思的先驅者及對性別平權有使命感的一群人努力的成果。

另一方面，筆者鼓勵家族治療的專業人士，應可嘗試以本土女性的觀點建立以性別為主體成分的本土家族治療理論、模型或是微理論，以期更能貼切地提供本土個案的協助。目前隨著性別意識的普及，多元文化治療觀念的進展，已經建構形成的原家族治療理論也應與時俱進。除以原理論對目前性別的觀點做出反思及回應，或是對理論內容與論述做出修正外，應更進一步以本土性別概念為主題而建構的家族治療理論。若是考量理論建構的工程過大，建立以本土性別為主題的模型或微理論也是一個進展的方向，至於建構的路徑，孫教授在其回應中，提供了一個具體可執行由下而上的方式，這個方式在下面的內文中會討論更多。因為一個理論的呈現，更能以性別為主體的意識來了解家庭、解構家庭、重新建構家庭及對家庭進行的處遇。以性別為主體的理論本身更能顯著的凸顯性別在家庭的重要性，其理念能更清楚地被陳述出來，並較容易被傳遞。當性別平權的理論更廣泛地被人們傳遞後，性別平權的概念將會更多地在社會及人們心中被深化，進而影響當下的主流文化。在家族治療的專業領域中，若有以性別平權為主體的理論，將會方便在培育家族治療師的過程中，能夠有系統的訓練治療師，學習性別平權的核心精神，提升他們對性別平權的敏銳度及以性別平權的內涵進行處遇。

### 參、回應孫頌賢教授的回應文

感謝孫教授提出三個方向，期許成為未來本土家族治療理論建構可行之路徑。這三個方向為實務導向研究的方法來建構本土化家族治療模式、探尋能促成「具系統觀的問題意識」之本土化介入策略及尋找跨文化中的家庭共通本質來建構家族治療理論與模式。筆者非常贊同此三個方向，以下針對這三個方向再做回應。

以實踐實徵研究為方向，研究者進入本土家庭的現象場，由下而上蒐集家庭特色，也就是研究者或實務工作者從實務工作之經驗出發，透過觀察與分析，嘗試對於該現象場所具有之特性建構其家庭論述。筆者相當贊同孫教授所提之方向，也認為這種形式應更多被鼓勵在學術研究與實務工作上。透過大量實務經驗等研究資料的蒐集，雖暫不足以成為一普世性或論述完整之理論，但可嘗試建構出微型化理論，藉微型化理論的堆砌累積，進而建構出具有系統實證邏輯的本土家族治療理論。微型化理論是一個理論建構工程，相對不是那麼巨大且相當務實的做法。其實類似的理論建構歷程，臺灣遊戲治療的前輩，梁培勇（2006）就以自身遊戲治療實務的經驗，發展出其野戰派的微型理論。筆者在幾次碩博士論文的口試中，常常看到研究者對資料分析的結果，已經到了可以對家庭形成微型理論的階段，然而不知是論文的後階段，研究者已經沒有力氣了，或者在研究法上不了解將其研究發現進行邏輯性的推論就可以形成微型理論，又或者研究者對提出理論沒有這樣的自信。不管因素如何，當下著實讓人覺得可惜，差臨門一腳就可以走完最後一哩路，建構由下而上的微型理論或模型。Henrich 等（2010）回顧心理學的研究，其研究資料的取得、理論的建構及心理現象的解釋，大多來自白人、中產階級及大學生等少數族群，難以推論到廣大多元的人類族群。因此，由下而上的小族群現象研究結果，其貢獻可以修正目前研究主流的偏見。當然，這樣的偏見能被修正，還需主流研究態度的改變。

要建立一個穿透性高的本土家族治療理論，所需花費的時間及需要的知識相對廣泛。如王教授在回應文中提到的王行（2016）以儒家心學的角度切入家族治療，這樣的著作成果，除需要對家族治療有深厚的了解外，更需要有儒家學識的涵養，並反思兩方的哲學或論點，重新整合或建構本土角度的家族治療。這樣的建構歷程，是有其一定的難度的！

然而先以前述微型理論的建構，再整合相關的微型理論，就較容易形成一個更高階的本土化的理論，再用此理論與西方理論進行對話，萃取出跨文化的共通本質，進而有機會形成孫教授所提的第三個方向，並建構跨文化性的家族治療理論與模式。例如梁培勇（2006）的野戰派微理論，若此微理論經由更多的專業人士實務經驗的驗證，即可形成本土性的理論，再跟西方的理論進行對話，以孫教授的看法，透過對話，有可能找到本土理論與西方理論的共通性，進而形成跨文化性的理論或是放諸各文化皆可行的普世性理論。因此，由下而上的理論建構路徑，是一個可以執行的務實方式。

孫教授也提出另一實踐途徑，就是探尋能促成「具系統觀的問題意識」之本土化介入策略，這是非常務實的需要。本途徑可由西方家族治療策略與技術為基礎，在本土實務工作中嘗試、累積經驗，並進而根據本土文化之特性，對西方治療理論進行反思與修正，建構含攝文化的介入技術與研究。也就是在實務工作中，西學為用的家族治療系統概念，運用在本土的治療中，若能廣泛地滲透到家族治療的不同議題上，產生了許多不同的治療經驗，那將是一個好的理論建構的材料。筆者支持孫教授在其文章中，認為系統觀是家族治療實務不可或缺，也不會因文化差異而無法運用的觀點。然而，系統理論是在不同文化下，協助治療師看到家庭內成員互動的模式或是家庭運作的模式，然而模式的解讀及概念化，則會因為不同文化而有不同的理解。就因為如此，在實務工作或研究上，非常需要匯集各種本土以家庭系統治療策略的經驗或研究結果，以交流經驗或研究成果，協助治療師對案家文化的了解，這樣才能使得治療師能以案家的文化來解讀其互動模式，並產生適切的處遇。透過治療師專業經驗的交流，收集並學習不同文化的案家經驗，如：在不同的文化下，家族治療師如何在家庭系統理論下，概念化家庭問題；家族治療師如何協助或導引家庭成員以系統概念來察覺的家庭內負向的互動模式，並以此角度來看待他們的問題；以及如何介入問題的系統運作模式，干預有問題的系統平衡現象並再次平衡到正向的系統平衡模式等。彙整這些策略在不同文化下運作經驗的資料，形成本土系統理論概念下的治療理論，並如上述的理論發展程序，與西方治療理論萃取出共同本質，以建立跨文化的治療理論。

#### 肆、回應程婉若教授的回應文

感謝程教授非常認真及仔細的回應文，文中精要及嚴謹地介紹美國與臺灣在家族治療的發展史，並指出家族治療在臺灣現今的訓練與發展有其獨特性，並於回應文中提出如何界定「本土」之重要反思。在西方多元文化思維下的家族治療，如何修正應用理論與技術於本土家庭特性外，理解家庭在文化中的多元交織性位置，看見家庭所隱喻出背後文化中的特性與意涵，為此世代研究者／工作者所需面對及反思的重點。

從程教授筆下介紹的西方家族治療歷史中，筆者有兩點發現，一是程教授在家族治療的深厚功力，以簡短的篇幅就將西方家族治療的發展史精闢地介紹。另外一點，從其家族治療歷史的描述中，在控制論的描述，看到 *Cybernetics* 一詞及 *Communication Theory* 用訊息交換論來翻譯，這些都是在當下家族治療理論背後的重要根基，若不是對其內容有正確的了解，單單讀其字，是很難理解的，在翻譯上也是特別的困難。這讓筆者想起 2007 年剛回臺灣時，在大學部使用郭麗安教授校閱下的翁樹樹與王大維翻譯的《家族治療：理論與技術》一書中，同學們很多來問何謂第一序人工頭腦 (*first-order cybernetics*) (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1980/1999)，這讓筆者花了很大的工夫由控制論的角度去解

釋，這樣的上課過程，顯示出家族治療的訓練需要提供更多的時數及課程來教導。這個現象，也凸顯了臺灣家族治療在校的訓練，需要有較充裕的師資來開課訓練，然而就筆者的認為，目前家族治療的訓練，在臺灣只有極少數的系所可以擁有這樣的資源，如郭教授及程教授所屬的學系。

程教授所述，臺灣與美國家族治療理論與實務在發展上相同之處，即兩者皆為一多元文化融合的社會，難以一類家庭之特性即形成本土二字的標籤，進而區分家庭是否是本土或非本土，筆者也認為不應該如此粗糙的區隔分類。這樣的論述，也點出了研究的困境就是如何去定義一個研究中所謂的本土。因此，在本土的研究中，筆者建議在研究的內文，應清楚地去定義此研究中的本土定義，以讓讀者能清楚地知道，此研究是從哪個角度來看本土的內涵。一個理論無法解釋全部的家庭現象，因此也難以百分之百地去定義一個本土的內涵是大家所共識的。雖然無法界定出一個大家都能百分之百接受的本土意涵，不代表就不能進行本土理論的建構或是研究，只要將理論的立場陳明清楚即可。不同立場的理論或研究，可以形成對話，進而增加對理論或研究本身背後的本土文化進行反思。這些對話及對話後的反思，能幫助人們以較豐厚的思維來接近本土的真實意涵。

以人的有限性，可能對豐厚又寬廣及進展中的本土文化，只能接近卻無法完全地了解。類似量子力學中 Heisenberg (1958/1992) 提到的不確定性原理 (uncertainty principle) 或是測不準原理，文化隨著時間的推移，是不斷地進展的，在此時此刻的研究或建構的理論合適當下的文化，但研究或理論建構完成後，現在的文化已經不是研究當時的文化了。這個概念大家都理解，所有的家族治療的理論，都是建構在過去的文化及治療經驗上，並用來處理現在的問題，這樣的現象不禁讓人會質疑理論是否偏離此時此刻的家庭問題或文化太遠。

就實務上，專業人士們仍然持續使用過去文化下所建構的理論來協助當下的家庭問題，這樣一來就會產生理論與現在問題的文化差距。這個部分，Anderson (1990) 提出的「不理解」(not knowing) 立場，可以將這個差距補上。原本理論只是幫助專業人士更有效率地接近及了解所協助的家庭，進而提供適切的協助，但理論卻不能幫助專業人士百分之百地了解家庭，只能接近。「不理解」的這個立場，協助了治療師在了解家庭的問題時，保持全面不預設立場及開放的態度來理解家庭所建構的問題，如果案家沒有說，治療師就會不了解，也就是治療師不會根據自己的專業或過去的經驗來對案家以先入為主概念進行推論。其實相似的態度也在 Goldenberg 與 Goldenberg (2012) 介紹敘事治療中提到的，面對個案的問題，治療師要保持對個案所講述的故事抱以高度的興趣。在這裡特別澄清這個概念是對個案已經說的內容有高度的興趣，而不是根據治療師內在的喜好，以好奇的態度形成問題並進行問話。一個是個案自己想說或決定說出的內容，一個是治療師引導個案回答治療師想知道的訊息，這兩者的態度完全不同，但在中文翻譯閱

讀過程中，容易產生誤會。這個「不理解」的立場是治療師面對服務家庭的謙卑，也是尊重。這個謙卑的立場，使得治療師不會以當時原理論建構的文化，刻板化地去理解案家形成問題的當下文化，而是靜靜地由案家帶領治療師，由當下形成問題的文化角度，去理解案家的問題。

程教授所提問之本土家庭之定義，筆者沒有已經定論的定義。筆者分享自身觀點認為，本土家族治療理論，需要的是理論根生於這片土地的文化，用來理解生活在這片土地上的家庭、人民，從家庭的背後根基中去探討文化及社會建構中呈現出的家庭樣貌。因此只要生活在這片土地上，無論以何種或在何時所形成的家庭，都是本土家庭的一種樣貌與代表，如新住民家庭、原住民及各種多元的家庭形式，都值得有志之學者與研究者以好奇及開放的心去發現。筆者非常支持程教授的提醒，除了了解不同文化的家庭外，應該考量所探索家庭的社會位置、政治及經濟等脈絡因素，並與文化概念之間的交互作用來理解家庭的互動模式，這是一個以更大的視角來了解本土家庭，然而這樣的工程是大的，需要有更多的專業人士一起投入，希望未來會有更多的學者專家能在此方向有所著力，並進行更多的交流，以期待這樣的交流能對本土家庭有更多的了解，並進而提供更適切的協助。

另外，在研究法方面，程教授所分享之民族誌（ethnography）研究法為例，深入了解一群體中的特性，是可鼓勵之研究方向，而只要在臺灣本土所進行的研究，皆可視為本土化之研究，其也記錄下此世代文化融合的臺灣當下建構的本土家庭在地化知識，透過各種研究的累積，建構多元文化下家庭的多元在地化論述，是學術研究及家庭工作實務中相當重要的，記錄、詮釋、理解這些所蒐集來的資料，進而將資料與其他國家、文化、族群之家庭作比較，都是未來研究更進一步相當珍貴的資料，透過這些資料、理論的積累，萃取出共同的現象，並嘗試建構一個具有普世性因素的理論，這也是跨文化研究中重要的一環。

在這裡特別回應一下程教授提及控制論、系統和訊息交換理論，使得早期進行家庭研究和其後之家庭治療師能從心理分析視框走出的這個描述，當然也包含了理論的建構。從心理分析的範疇離開，在西方的家族治療理論的發展過程，也是不容易的。如程教授所提及，很早期就引入臺灣的 Satir 學派，在當時的美國家族治療領域中，也受到非常大的排擠。在 Boyd 整理 Murray Bowen 於 1989 年的信件中，收錄了當時 Bowen 以信件的回應當時其他專家的問題內容中，不難發現，Bowen 理論在發展的過程中受到不同學派的質疑（Bowen, 1989/2016）。當時的心理工作者要離開原本的心理分析的信念，也是困難的。不管 Satir 的理論，是因性別因素或是理論內容不被當時主流學術文化所接納，或是 Bowen 理論，不被當時主流的心理分析學派所認可，這都是一個新理論會發生的過程。

## 伍、回應王明雯教授文

感謝王教授於回應文中，詳細介紹臺灣發展家族治療的狀況，特別是深度地介紹本土家族治療的先驅者，在發展本土家族治療的歷程。特別感動的是他在其回應文的副標題及文末所提出的邀請「一起重返心靈的原鄉」，讓筆者有所共鳴。王教授回應文中根據原靶子論文中之論點，詳細論述出未來可行之研究方向，並實際舉例說明質性研究與量化研究能在未來本土化之路徑上，可以進行的方向。並列舉在家族治療實務上的先驅，以及這些前輩在實務推行上，各自面臨不同的挑戰與困難，並呼籲眾家庭工作者與專家，嘗試循著這些前人曾走過的途徑，思考自身之方向，鼓勵合作之社群，共同為了家族治療的研究與實務本土化貢獻心力，一同前行。

王教授根據王智弘（2017）對本土諮商心理研究的三個方向中，對外學引入的在地化及文化融合的本土化兩方向做了非常細緻的回應。並補足了筆者在原文中文化繼承的論述不足。王教授透過吳就君（2017）的「華無式」及王行（2016）以儒家與易經元素運用在家族治療中，介紹了兩位前輩的心路歷程。其中筆者有兩點是共鳴的，一是以文化繼承所建構的本土理論是艱辛的，其二是這樣的建構里程是孤單的。以本土文化為素材所建構的理論，本身要對本土文化有深刻的了解。

筆者對王教授所指出的一個現象很有共鳴，那就是家族治療的專家們，很少在本土文化中同時也是專家，因此以文化繼承的角度來建構本土家族治療的理論有其難度。對此，筆者有深刻的體驗，因著對本土文化的涵養不足，至今無法提出一個本土化的家族治療理論。這個結果，有可能筆者深陷西方理論框架太深而無創建本土家族治療理論，也有可能對本土文化，如儒家、釋家或道家的了解不夠深入，而產生的結果。臺灣在早期，黃光國（2014）及楊國樞（1993）兩位大老就熱切地鼓勵學者們用本土文化去建立本土的理論，並以本土理論去了解本土人群的行為及解釋心理現象。黃光國（2014）的內文中記錄到臺灣臨床心理的先驅者柯永河教授於臺灣心理學會第48屆年會上的發言，反思當時臨床心理學界全盤採用西方的理論與技術的狀況，並鼓勵產生一個或數個本土理論，這些理論是臺灣特有且可以與其他理論平等對話，並自信地相信或許有些本土理論會優於且可包容其他的理論。就本土理論而言，目前有 Hwang（2011）以釋家的角度建立普世性的自我曼陀羅模型為先驅，儒家有夏允中與張峻嘉（2018）論述自性與修養曼陀羅的自我模型、Hwang（2009）論述儒家的修養；以釋家建立的研究有李秀如等（2021）修正以釋家中的接受與承諾治療的步驟、簡瑩儀等（2022）以釋家中的不執著運用在悲傷的心理治療歷程中，以及鍾文佳等（2019）以儒釋道儀式的角度切入哀傷議題；彭心怡等（2015）就易經的角度研究生涯的轉化經驗、林俊德（2018）以易經的角度切入反思諮商專業。雖說，文化繼承的研究，在前人努力及鼓吹中，已經有了起步，然而目前在家族治療的領域中，除了吳就君及王行老師外，尚未有更進一步的進展。而王教授指

出吳老師的「華無式」在傳承東方思想上有其困境，王行老師提供運用儒家與易經在家族治療上的一個視角，但仍沒有建構出一個心理治療模式。因此，外學引入的在地化及文化融合的本土化，這兩個部分雖已在家族治療領域展開，並持續地前進，而在文化繼承的理論建構仍大有可為。

## 陸、家族治療的實務訓練

要培育一位擁有成熟家族治療理論與技術內涵的家族治療師，需要長期的訓練才能養成，這個觀點筆者與程教授的看法一致。在目前現實的考量下，為配合心理師考試科目之要求，研究生在滿足考試科目要求後，能接受家族治療的訓練科目有限。另一方面，系所的師資除了少數系所能提供完整的訓練外，其他系所會受限於家族治療專業師資的不足，而無法提供完整的訓練。在這兩個條件下，建議有興趣於家族治療的心理師，可多參加一些幾天的家族治療工作坊，並在其中找到自己喜歡的理論學派，然後參加長期的培訓並同時有資深的督導協助，以熟練此學派的家族治療。以下有幾點提升家族治療能力的心得跟讀者分享。

### 一、練習關係問話的諮商方式

不管哪一個家族治療學派，在學校的訓練中，包含實習的過程中，除了團體及個別諮商的訓練外，若在條件允許下，可以開始練習一對二以上的問話方式。關係問話的方式就是，問一個問題，治療室中的案主們都要回答。比如對一對情侶問說：這個問題對你們的關係有什麼影響？或是對一個家庭問說：這個困難，對你們家庭彼此的關係有什麼影響？這個以關係為主軸的問話方式，第一是讓學生開始學習用一個問題，使治療室內的案主們同時都有責任去思考這個問題。這樣可以避免治療師在問某一位案主時，一位案主覺得沒有自己的事，就分心。第二是，關係問話的訓練，可以讓學生注意到以系統的概念去了解案主們。第三則是可以讓治療師去觀察家庭的互動模式或是權力結構，如誰先回答問題、誰都不回答、誰一直搶著回答、誰幫誰回答等。這個關係問話的方式，其實也是以系統概念進入家族治療的開端。

### 二、熟練觀察及分析案主們各種模式

在與案主們互動的過程中，治療師是否能夠很快地注意到案主們溝通模式、情緒傳遞模式、肢體語言的互動模式、解決問題的模式或是價值模式等。這些觀察都有助於以系統理論形成個案概念化，並從中找到治療介入的路徑。熟練觀察案主們的模式，將有

助於治療師問話及處遇的效能，也不會讓治療師陷入不知該問什麼的窘境，如同有地圖卻不知方向。一般熟練的家族治療師，在晤談的 10-20 分鐘內就應該可以注意到案家們的一些模式，不管這些模式是正向或負向的，可否用於介入上或是與家庭問題有關。一個家族治療的初學者，在面對案家們，雖然學了很多的家族治療學派，每個學派都如同一種地圖，但在實務現場，卻不知道要往哪裡走。這就是為什麼筆者建議初學者，能找一位與自己合適的督導，讓他帶著走一段路，好讓自己越來越精熟於家族治療。

### 三、後現代思維的體現

後現代思維的養成，對於部分學習家族治療的專業人士，有一定的難度。就如同筆者剛剛接觸後現代學派的概念時，仍以現代學派的思維來學習，真是苦不堪言，也鬧了不少笑話。在實務上雖然可以用後現代技術的問話，但骨子裡卻不是後現代的精神。其實，後現代學派的創始技術並不多，問話技術也不難學習，但其背後的精神與概念，卻難以內化在個人心中。一位精熟後現代學派的家族治療師，一般在與案家晤談 20 分鐘左右，應該都找得到可以賦能案家的材料，至於何時要使用這個材料賦能或者不選用這個材料賦能，都是治療師在治療過程的編織，並形成獨一無二的治療風格，這樣的精熟，也是需要有合適的督導來協助，陪伴在這專業成長之路。不精熟的狀況會反映在實務運作中，常常案主已經出現了焦點解決中的例外、敘事治療中的閃亮經驗或是可以用來賦能（empower）的材料，因為治療師尚未成熟地內化後現代的精神，因此就無法立即覺察和及時運用這些材料。當然這多少跟自我成長的背景有關，筆者在學習心理的路途中，經由訓練學會了找原因、找問題的來源並處理問題，治療就結束。這樣的養成背景，要進入後現代的治療理念，是要經過很多的自我反思、督導的檢視及老師們的身教，一點一滴地培育。正如王教授與筆者都有共識，學習家族治療，需要有資深的督導來協助。

由於四篇回應文對實務的部分回應較少，筆者在此特別簡短拋出三個訓練方向，希望有更多家族治療的專業人士，能夠交流、分享與建議，使得臺灣家族治療的訓練可以更成熟。

### 柒、結語

衷心地感謝郭教授、孫教授、程教授及王教授四位專家的回應，讓筆者學習良多。在此，筆者再次說明，由於專業能力的限制，只能對筆者可以回應的部分回應，至於不能回應的部分，期盼其他的專業人士能接棒分享與回應。而家族治療訓練的部分，在本文只是拋磚引玉，希望其他的家族治療大師及前輩們可以多多的分享，好讓家族治療的訓練能更完善。

總之，本土家族治療理論建構需要被鼓勵和接納。Bowen 理論及程教授指出 Satir 學派在初始階段，受到當時主流學術所質疑；其實在非文字記載中，焦點解決取向在初期也受過系統概念中某一位理論創始大老的直接質疑。筆者認為，這個為了維護主流理論的主體性而產生的排他現象 (Kuhn, 1996)，無論在家族治療領域或其他科學領域都有發生過，並不是什麼新鮮事。檢視過去西方理論創建的过程，本土理論的建構應該減少這方面的干擾，使得不同的理論或概念可以被論述及討論。就如同程教授在回應文中的期待，希望本土研究可以有更多精彩的對話，因此筆者也呼籲在學術的對話平台中，有更多的期刊可以開放並接納以本土文化為根基的新理論。建議無論是新的家族治療理論、模式、微理論或是觀點被提出時，能有較多交流的管道及發表的平台，就如同有較多像《本土諮商心理學學刊》的學術交流期刊，或是在目前既有的學術期刊中，有更多的期刊，像《中華輔導與諮商學報》可以接受家族治療理論建構的發表。

筆者相信不可能用單一理論了解本土的多元家庭，也不會有單一技術處理各種家庭議題，因此確實是需要更多有志於此領域之工作者、研究者的共同投入，才能有更多的本土理論及技術可以使用。而臺灣的本土化家族治療已有吳就君 (2017)「華無式」及王行 (2016) 以儒家心學為助人知識的家族治療為先驅，鼓舞著家族治療的專業人士，能夠接棒向前行。本土家族治療理論不管是採用程教授所提及 Tubbs 與 Burton (2005) 主張的民族誌 (ethnography) 的研究法，或是孫教授所提由治療師實務工作經驗中由下而上的理論建構，也不管是普世性的理論、微理論或模型都非常需要。本土多元理論的產出，將有助於專業人士，以更多不同的視角去了解家庭並進而解決家庭議題。奠基於先驅們的努力，家族治療已經進入到這個亟欲建構理論的階段，期待不久的幾年內有更多不同的本土家族治療理論能誕生。

另外，筆者想在這裡想再次提醒，以謙卑的態度看待理論。單一的理論不可能完全詮釋或解釋全部的家庭現象，因此我們需要多種不同的理論來協助理療師，以不同的角度來了解家庭。不論建構出來之理論是否能夠適合各種家庭，但至少提供了治療師對一個家庭珍貴的思考模式。我們難去對家庭之特性有完全百分之百的理解，但我們能多元地去了解。在多元理論的協助下，我們能採取越多的角度及眼界去看家庭，越能夠協助理療師更接近案家的真實。筆者所謂的謙卑，就是提醒治療師們，當你選擇一個理論去運用時，要去相信並知道這個理論可以做的事，但更要去了解哪些是這個理論做不到的事。筆者的一位授業恩師曾說過，要相信理論，但不要嫁給它，這應該值得大家思考一下。筆者用謙卑的態度看待理論的另一層涵義，是指以謙卑的心去聽家庭的心聲，不以理論過早地對案家做推論，這樣的作法，其實也是在傳遞治療師對案家的尊重。美國一位以系統概念建立某一理論的大老，在最後一場公開的研討會上，每十年挑出一卷經典的治療影片與大家分享，會中有人問這位大老，他最初的治療與最近的治療有什麼最大

的不同？大老回答說，他現在花很多的時間去聽家庭要告訴他什麼。這個回應，值得大家想想。

再次重申，筆者認為，黃光國教授的自我曼陀羅之普世性模型所需時間較久，且研究者更須累積豐厚的學識涵養、文化素養，一般學者要達到其成就是有所門檻，由此途徑建構一普世性理論所耗費時間也較長，待理論建構出一雛型、到有一完整論述建構之理論，文化變遷的巨輪早已不等待我們追上，持續滾動往前，讓所建構而出的理論適用性，可能會與時下文化有較長的距離。但這並不代表這樣的理論論述是不需要的。由此建構而出的理論論述，能夠提供一個理論角度、眼界來思考家庭的互動與問題。

筆者傾向鼓勵學者與目前於學習階段之學生，可循孫頌賢教授所提實踐實徵研究、王明雯教授所提質性研究、程婉若教授所提民族誌(ethnography)研究等方向作為參考，由實務經驗出發，對一現象場所建構的論述及微型理論。這種從微觀現象建立微型理論的優勢在於，較能夠立即性反應目前本土化家庭所具有之的現象，能有效率應用在實務工作者進行家庭議題的工作上。另一方面，從質性研究及微型理論的建構，能探索本土文化的特性並擺脫西方理論所未能涵蓋的文化特殊性，如王教授所點出的人贅現象或是童養媳的現象，這些都是西方文化中所沒有的。

雖然在回應文中，較少提到量性研究，不代表家族治療本土化的量性研究不需要。只是在現實中，少數族群的研究，會因著樣本數的不夠，而無法提出說服人的統計研究結果，因此質性研究在這方面較能使得上力。在前述的本土化研究的文章中，有一些都有自編量表，但是筆者建議可以進一步地建立本土化的常模，雖然常模的建立工程比較浩大，鼓勵學者們可以嘗試看看，本土化的常模在實務上是有很大的貢獻意義，這一點是值得支持的。

筆者也推崇郭麗安教授、程婉若教授，從性別平權角度、文化交織的多元性角度，來對建構中之本土家族治療理論進行反思。因此筆者也想鼓勵在學習階段的學習者，對於性別、權力議題的訓練上得持續精進，修習相關的課程與知識，並付諸實踐行動，累積經驗並持續接受督導，對自身經驗進行反思。這些經驗也可透過研究，轉化為研究成果累積下來。而系所方與訓練方在課程上，也期待能引入更多相關的師資並開設課程，提供學生修習，培養多元文化知能與能力。在呈現本土化家庭之現象的同時，從多元觀點進行省思，是未來不論是工作者或研究者都必須謹記在心的。以國外的發展史為鑑，如同 Goldenberg 家族治療教科書中所記錄下家族治療女性主義治療法發展的歷程，工作者與研究者應拓展其對於性別之敏感度，未來邁向家族治療本土化的同時，也應效法這些女性主義家族治療先進，從女性平權之角度出發，走入華人文化之汪洋大海，對其文化中論述進行反思，更進一步而能建構出本土化女性主義家族治療理論。

回歸當初被邀請撰寫此靶子論文與回應文之初衷，期待能以筆者自身在臺灣大學教育所觀察、覺知的一現象，匯聚成一篇引論，拋磚引玉邀請更多不同學者的意見與分享。

建構本土化家庭理論並非是去建立另一種文化霸權，而是嘗試建構多元對話的角度，並促進不同理論間的對話，豐厚對家庭了解的工具或視角。也希望能鼓勵更多的培育訓練體制，如學校端、機構端等，能反思目前國內家族治療訓練之現況，並持續精進訓練方式及內容，以期培育更多成熟的家族治療專業人士，進而幫助臺灣這塊土地上的家庭。

### 參考文獻

- 王行 (2016)。修身齊家：以儒家心學為助人知識的家族治療。心理。
- 王智弘 (2017)。探索本土諮商心理學的發展理路。本土諮商心理學學刊，9 (1)，vii-x。
- 吳就君 (2017)。華無式家族治療：吳就君的治療新法和助人美學。心理。
- 李秀如、許玫茵、夏允中 (2021)。接受與承諾療法中心理接受與心理治療步驟再修正：回到原來的面目。本土諮商心理學學刊，12 (4)，28-53。
- 林之丞、夏允中 (2019)。從儒釋道到靜覺得自我修養模式：正念的重新思考。本土心理學研究，52，69-114。
- 林俊德 (2018)。易經之問題解決思維對諮商專業的啟發。輔導季刊，54 (1)，28-39。
- 夏允中 (2020)。自性覺醒心理治療理論與心理治療歷程：自我到無我體驗的心理修養療癒取向。本土諮商心理學學刊，11 (1)，33-77。
- 梁培勇 (2006)。從做中學：一個遊戲治療者之個案治療模式建構的省思。國立臺北教育大學學報，19 (1)，119-138。
- 彭心怡、劉淑慧、洪瑞斌、盧怡任、張嘉惠 (2015)。從易經內涵探討生涯發展中轉化之經驗結構。臺灣心理諮商季刊，7 (2)，20-48。
- 黃光國 (2014)。論「含攝文化的積極心理學」。臺灣心理諮商季刊，6 (2)，36-47。
- 楊國樞 (1993)。我們為什麼要建立中國人的本土心理學？本土心理學研究，1，6-88。
- 鍾文佳、郭怡芬、夏允中 (2019)。建構儒釋道喪禮儀式的悲傷療癒歷程模式。中華輔導與諮商學報，54，59-89。
- 簡瑩儀、蔡俞鈞、夏允中 (2022) 佛法智慧中的不執著在悲傷心理治療歷程的應用。本土諮商心理學學刊，13 (4)，81-105。
- Anderson, H. (1990). Then and now: A journey from “knowing” to “not knowing”. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 12(3), 193-197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00891246>
- Bowen, M. (2016). History and process. In C. Boyd (Ed.), *Commitment to principles: The letters of Murray Bowen, M.D.* Murray Bowen Archives. <http://murraybowenarchives.org/boyd-book/> (Original letter written 1989)
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Harvard University Press.
- Goldenberg, H., & Goldenberg, I. (2012). *Family therapy: An overview* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Brooks/Cole.

- Goldenberg, I., & Goldenberg, H. (1999)。家族治療：理論與技術（翁樹澍、王大維譯）。揚智。（原著出版年：1980）
- Heisenberg, W. (1992)。物理與哲學（周東川、石育民、黃銘欽譯）。協志工業叢書。（原著出版年：1958）
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, 466(7302), 29-29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>
- Hwang, K. K. (2009). The development of indigenous counseling in contemporary Confucian communities. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(7), 930-943. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009336241>
- Hwang, K. K. (2011). The Mandala Model of Self. *Psychological Studies*, 56(4), 329-334.
- Hwang, K. K. (2017). Confucian ethical healing and psychology of self-cultivation. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 60-87. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004348936\\_005](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004348936_005)
- Hwang, K. K. (2019). A psychodynamic model of self-nature. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 32(3-4), 285-306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2018.1553147>
- Hwang, K. K., & Chang, J. (2009). Self-cultivation: Culturally sensitive psychotherapies in Confucian societies. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(7), 1010-1032. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009339976>
- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hewer, A. (1983). Moral Stages: A current formulation and response to critics. *Contributions to Human Development*, 10, 174.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Tubbs, C., & Burton, L. (2005). Bridge research: Using ethnography to inform clinical practice. In D. H. Sprinkle & F. P. Piercy (Eds.), *Research methods in family therapy* (2nd ed., pp. 136-154). Guildford.
- Verschuuren, G. M. (2014). *It's all in the genes!?: Really?* CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Xu, J., Chang, N. S., Hsu, Y. F., & Shiah, Y. J. (2022). Comments on previous psychological Tai-Chi models: Jun-zi self-cultivation model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.871274>

## **A Response to Four Comments on “Research and prospect in the Indigenization of Family Therapy”**

Yueh-Ting Lee\*

### **Abstract**

This article is in response to the discussion made by four scholars, Professor Li-An Kuo, Professor Sung-Hsien Sun, Professor Wan-Juo Cheng and Professor Ming-Wen Wang, to the author’s “Research and Prospect in the Indigenization of Family Therapy”. The dialogue included a discussion about the definition of the indigenous meaning of family therapy, the discussion and implementation of research methods, the incorporation of the connotation of gender equality, and the theoretical construction of enculturative indigenization.

The present article responds to Professor Sun’s bottom-up research method and Professor Cheng’s suggested ethnography research method. The author believes that such a research method can construct a micro theory or model, which is a relatively feasible research method for theory construction. In addition, this kind of research method can better explore the sampling data of non-mainstream research and gain an in-depth understanding of the patterns of different cultural groups. Furthermore, the author supports Professor Guo and Professor Cheng’s views on gender equality, and believe that the topic of gender is indispensable and need to be integrated in the construction of family therapy theory. Finally, the author responded to Professor Wang’s construction of enculturative indigenization theory, and believed that the formation of such a theory requires not only an understanding of the connotation of family therapy but also the familiarity with local culture. In actuality however, experts who are proficient in both fields are extremely limited. Luckily, pioneers in the indigenous research have paved the path, providing a guide for successors to follow.

The four scholarly discussions focused less on the training aspects of family therapy practice, thus, the author provided a more elaboration on how to practice interpersonal relationship counseling. These skills include how to observe and analyze the various modes of

the clients and the three embodiment of postmodern thinking. The author suggests that future training can focus on strengthening these three aspects to enhance the foundation of indigenous family therapeutic training.

*Keywords: Indigenization of Family Therapy, Indigenous Theory, Prospects in the Indigenization of Family Therapy*

---

Yueh-Ting Lee\*

Department of Counseling and Guidance, National University of  
Tainan (ylee@gm2.nutn.edu.tw)

## **I. Foreword**

Thanks to the responses of the four scholars who deepened the “Research and Prospect in the Indigenization of Family Therapy“ from different angles, the author responds to some of the views raised by the four scholars in this response. Due to the limitations of the author’s own profession and training, I can only respond to some of the professional views of the four scholars. However, I hope these responses can further unify the author’s thinking on the research and prospect of family therapy indigenization. I hope this back-and-forth dialogue takes the indigenization of family therapy practice and research a mile further.

## **II. In response to Professor Li-An Guo’s response article**

Thanks to Professor Guo for his brief and concise response to the author’s previous article. Professor Guo is a senior who has been dedicated to promoting gender equality and marriage and family therapy in Taiwan for many years. Based on the critical positioning and thinking of gender in the history of the development of traditional Western family theory, she proposed the long-standing position of women in Western theories and discussions. The status of unequal rights suggests that when considering the connotations of concepts such as filial piety and differentiation in Chinese relationship culture, the interactivity of gender should be taken into consideration. The author agrees with Professor Guo’s point of view and its importance and believes that whether it is the current indigenous family therapy theory, such as Wang’s (2016) book *Self-cultivation and family harmony* mentioned by Professor Wang in his response, Confucian psychology is used to help others. Intellectual family therapy and Wu’s (2017) “Hua Wu Style” family therapy, or the Western family therapy theories mentioned in the book *Family Therapy* by Goldenberg & Goldenberg (2012), except for feminist therapy, there are few gender connotations into its theoretical construction, let alone use gender perspective as the main theoretical construction. Therefore, the author strongly agrees that the consideration of gender factors should be taken seriously in the family therapy theory and further encourages the construction of theories with gender as the main body.

Family issues are closely related to issues such as gender and power in the family structure. However, in the historical development of Western family therapy, most Western theoretical constructions did not include gender factors in theoretical construction. On the one hand, in the process of theoretical construction, it was developed based on the cultural heritage at that time. If the theory was developed in that time culture and there was no awareness or reflection on

gender, the unequal discussion of gender in it would be ignored. Therefore, it will not be included in the connotation of theoretical construction.

The author believes that although the original construction of this theory is not constructed with gender as the main body, at least the connotation of gender equality should be added, and the sensitivity should be improved in practical training, supervision process, and treatment. In the practical exchange experience of counseling and family therapy psychologists in Taiwan, the author felt that Professor Guo and a group of gender equality people with a sense of mission have worked hard for many years to improve social culture through advocacy, reflection, education, and legislation—thoughts on gender equality and changing inappropriate connotations of gender issues. The education and concept of gender equality in Taiwan has continued to deepen and expand the literacy of Taiwanese people and has formed an excellent cultural connotation. Although there is room for improvement, such cultural connotations will provide feedback on the original lack of gender equality. The connotative theory forms reflection and dialogue on the theory itself. Such reflection and dialogue will lead to changes in practice, whether it is supervision or the use of technology. For example, the conceptualization results of cases and the treatment of families will differ from the treatment before reflection and dialogue in the original theory.

In the article “Research and Prospect in Indigenization of Family Therapy,” the author uses Bowen’s theory and indigenous filial piety elements as examples. The original intention is to remind readers that the construction of the original theory does not necessarily include thinking on gender issues, and the perspective of its theoretical construction does not necessarily include gender issues. Not from a gender perspective. However, this lack is a severe neglect because Professor Guo pointed out that Western scholars had different voices as early as the 1970s, suggesting that the differences between cultures were most often discussed around gender issues. However, the original family therapy theory lacks the connotation of gender; that is, using these theories that ignore the connotation of gender to conduct family therapy will expose the recipients to many dangers. It is conceivable that not all theoretical concepts in the original theory that lack gender connotation can be appropriately applied in Taiwan’s local culture, which has matured and developed gender concepts. Therefore, reflection and dialogue on the original theory are needed to correct inappropriate places, especially when considering gender. Professor Guo’s response article also mentioned that Western theories have already challenged Kohlberg’s (1983) theory of moral development and the “autonomy” perspective promoted in psychology as early as Gilligan’s (1982) point of view. Professor Guo also mentioned in his response that from the standpoint of postulate analysis in research, the attribution of the study

of schizophrenia patients in 1940 led to outrageous inferences or conclusions based on gender stereotypes. It seems now that some research results on marriage, family, parent-child education, etc., cannot withstand the test of the current connotation of gender equality. These developments are based on the growth of gender equality culture and reflection on the original Western theory, and point out that the original theory lacks and shortcomings of gender connotation, reminding people to be cautious when using this theory, or it may lead to the revision or adjustment of the original theory itself. Such progress results from the efforts of pioneers who keenly reflect on gender issues and a group of people who have a sense of mission for gender equality.

On the other hand, the author encourages family therapy professionals to try to establish indigenous family therapy theories, models, or micro-theories with gender as the main component from the perspective of local women to provide more appropriate assistance to local cases. With the popularization of gender awareness and the development of multicultural treatment concepts, the original family therapy theory that has been constructed should also keep pace with the times. In addition to using the original theory to reflect on and respond to current gender perspectives or to revise the theoretical content and discussion, a family therapy theory based on the local gender concept should be further developed. If the project of theory construction is considered too large, establishing models or micro-theories with local gender as the theme is also a direction of progress. As for the construction path, Professor Sun provided a specific and executable bottom-up approach in his response. This method will be discussed in more detail in the following text. Because of the theory presentation, it is easier to understand the family, deconstruct it, reconstruct it, and deal with the family with gender as the central consciousness. The theory itself that takes gender as the main body can more significantly highlight the importance of gender in the family, and its ideas can be stated more clearly and be passed on more quickly. When the theory of gender equality is more widely disseminated, the concept of gender equality will be more deeply rooted in society and people's minds, affecting the current mainstream culture. In the professional field of family therapy, if there is a theory with gender equality as the main body, it will be convenient in cultivating family therapists. Therapists can be systematically trained to learn the core spirit of gender equality and enhance their understanding of it—sensitivity and treatment with the connotation of gender equality.

### **III. Response to Professor Sung-Hsien Sun's response**

Thanks to Professor Sun for proposing three directions, which we hope will become feasible for constructing indigenous family therapy theory in the future. These three directions

are practice-oriented research methods to construct an indigenous family therapy model, exploring indigenous intervention strategies that can promote “systematic problem awareness,” and looking for the common essence of families across cultures to construct family therapy theories and models. The author strongly agrees with these three directions and will respond to them below.

Taking practical research as the direction, researchers enter the phenomenon field of local families and collect family characteristics from bottom to top. Researchers or practitioners start from practical work experience and try to understand the situation through observation and analysis—the characteristics of the phenomenal place structure and its family discourse. The author entirely agrees with the direction proposed by Professor Sun and believes that this form should be encouraged more in academic research and practical work. By collecting a large amount of practical experience and other research data, although it is not yet enough to become a universal or complete theory, we can try to construct a miniaturized theory. By accumulating miniaturized theories, we can construct a systematic empirical logic—the theory of indigenous family therapy. Miniaturization theory is a relatively small and pragmatic approach to theoretical construction projects. In fact, in a similar process of theory construction, Liang (2006), the predecessor of Taiwanese play therapy, developed his field style micro-theory based on his practical experience in play therapy. In several oral examinations for master’s and doctoral thesis, the author often saw that the understanding of the family from the data has reached the stage where a micro-theory can be formed. However, I don’t know why it is the final stage of the thesis and if the researcher has no energy or is not good at research methods. Understand that micro-theories can be formed by logically inferring their research findings, or the researchers may not be confident in proposing a theory. Regardless of the factors, it is a pity that we are just on the verge of completing the last mile and constructing a bottom-up micro theory or model. Henrich et al. (2010) reviewed the research in psychology. They found that most of the data obtained, theoretical construction, and psychological phenomenon explanations came from minority groups such as whites, middle class, and college students. Making inferences from the vast and diverse human groups was difficult. Therefore, the contribution of bottom-up research results on the phenomenon of small ethnic groups can correct the bias of the current mainstream research. Of course, mainstream research attitudes must change before such bias can be fixed.

Establishing a highly penetrating indigenous family therapy theory requires extensive time and knowledge. For example, Professor Wang mentioned in his response that Wang (2016) approaches family therapy from the perspective of Confucian psychology. Such work requires

a deep understanding of family therapy and the cultivation of Confucian knowledge and reflection. The philosophies or arguments of the two parties reintegrate or construct family therapy from a local perspective. Such a construction process has its difficulties!

However, it is easier to form a higher-order indigenous theory by first constructing the aforementioned mini-theories and then integrating related mini-theories. This theory can then be used to dialogue with Western theories to extract the common essence across cultures, and then have the opportunity to form the third direction proposed by Professor Sun and construct a cross-textual family therapy theory and model—for example, Liang (2006)'s field micro-theory. If more professionals' practical experience verifies this micro-theory, it can form an indigenous theory and then dialogue with Western theories. According to Professor Sun's view, through dialogue, it is possible to find the commonalities between indigenous and Western theories and then form a cross-cultural or universal theory that is feasible for all cultures. Therefore, the bottom-up theory construction path is a pragmatic way that can be implemented.

Professor Sun also proposed another practical approach: exploring indigenous intervention strategies that can promote “systematic problem awareness.” This is a very pragmatic need. This approach can be based on Western family therapy strategies and techniques, trying to accumulate experience in local practical work, and then reflecting and revising Western therapy theories based on the characteristics of local culture to construct culturally inclusive intervention techniques and research. That is to say, in practical work, if the concept of the family therapy system used in Western learning is applied in local therapy, it will be a good idea if it can widely penetrate different issues of family therapy and produce many different therapeutic experiences—materials for theoretical construction. The author supports Professor Sun's article that the systems view is indispensable in family therapy practice and will not be inapplicable due to cultural differences. However, systems theory can help therapists see the interaction patterns of family members or the family functioning patterns in different cultures. However, the interpretation and conceptualization of the patterns will be understood differently by other cultures.

For this reason, in practical work or research, it is necessary to bring together various local experiences or research results of family systems treatment strategies to exchange experiences or research results and assist therapists in understanding the client's culture. Only in this way can therapists have the ability to interpret the client's interaction patterns based on the client's culture and provide appropriate treatment. Through the exchange of professional experiences of therapists, we collect and learn the experiences of clients from different cultures, such as: in other cultures, how do family therapists conceptualize family problems based on family systems

theory; how do family therapists assist or guide families? Members use the system concept to detect the negative interaction patterns within the family and view their problems from this perspective and how to intervene in the system operation mode of the problem, intervene in the problematic system balance phenomenon, and rebalance to a positive system balance mode, etc. The data on the operation experience of these strategies in different cultures are compiled to form a treatment theory under local systems theory. Following the above-mentioned theory development process, the common essence with Western treatment theories is extracted to establish a cross-cultural treatment theory.

#### **IV. Response to Professor Wan-Juo Cheng's response**

Thanks to Professor Cheng for his very serious and careful response. The article briefly and rigorously introduced the development history of family therapy in the United States and Taiwan. He also pointed out that the current training and development of family therapy in Taiwan is unique. He also proposed responding to the critical reflections on defining "indigenous." In family therapy under Western multicultural thinking, how to modify the application theory and technology in addition to the characteristics of the local family, understand the diverse and intertwined position of the family in culture, and see the characteristics and meanings of the culture behind which the family metaphors, for this generation key points that researchers/workers need to face and reflect on.

The author made two discoveries from the history of Western family therapy introduced by Professor Cheng. First, Professor Cheng has profound skills in family therapy and has described the development history of Western family therapy in a short space. Another point is that from the description of family therapy history, we can see that the words Cybernetics and Communication Theory are translated as information exchange theory. These are essential foundations behind the current family therapy theory. If it were not for Without a correct understanding of the content, it isn't easy to understand just by reading the words. Translation is also tricky. This reminds me of when I first returned to Taiwan in 2007 when I was using the book *Family Therapy: Theory and Techniques* translated by Shu-Shu Wang and Da-Wei Wang and edited by Professor Li-An Guo; many students asked me what is the first-order cybernetics (Goldenberg & Goldenberg, 1980/1999), which made the author spend a lot of effort to explain it from the perspective of cybernetics. This class process shows that family therapy training needs to provide more hours and courses to teach. This phenomenon also highlights the need for more sufficient teachers to conduct family therapy training in schools in Taiwan. However,

in the author's opinion, only a few departments in Taiwan have such resources for current family therapy training, such as the departments to which Professor Guo and Professor Cheng belong (Department of Guidance and Counseling, National Changhua University of Education).

Professor Cheng said family therapy's theoretical and practical development in Taiwan and the United States are similar. Both are societies with multicultural integration. It is difficult to label the characteristics of one type of family as indigenous and then distinguish whether the family is native or non-native; the author also believes that there should not be such a rough classification. Such a discussion also points out the dilemma of research, which is how to define the so-called indigenous in research. Therefore, in the study of indigenous people, the author recommends that the definition of indigenous in this study should be clearly defined in the text of the study so that readers can know from what angle this study looks at the connotation of indigenous people. One theory cannot explain all family phenomena, so it isn't easy to define an indigenous connotation that is 100% universally agreed upon. Although it is impossible to define an indigenous meaning that everyone can 100% accept, it does not mean that we cannot construct or research indigenous theories as long as the theoretical position is clearly stated. Theories or research from different positions can form a dialogue, thereby increasing reflection on the indigenous culture behind the theory or research. These dialogues and post-dialogue reflections can help people approach the true meaning of locality with richer thinking.

Due to human limitations, we may only be able to come close to but not fully understand the rich, broad, and evolving indigenous culture. Like the uncertainty principle mentioned by Heisenberg (1958/1992) in quantum mechanics, culture continues to progress over time and is researched or constructed now. The theory is suitable for the current culture. Still, after the research or theoretical construction is completed, the current culture is no longer the culture at the time of the study. Everyone understands this concept. All family therapy theories are built on past culture and therapeutic experiences and are used to deal with current problems. This phenomenon makes people question whether the theory deviates from the family problems and the culture at this moment or not and is too far away.

In practice, professionals continue to use theories constructed in past cultures to assist current family problems, which creates a cultural gap between theory and current problems. In this part, the "not knowing" position proposed by Anderson (1990) can fill this gap. Initially, the theory was only to help professionals get closer to and understand the families they were assisting more efficiently to provide appropriate assistance. However, the theory could not help professionals understand the families 100%; they could only get closer. The position of "not understanding" helps the therapist maintain a comprehensive and non-preconceived role and an

open attitude to understand the problems constructed by the family when understanding family problems. If the client does not say anything, the therapist will not understand, which means that the therapist will not draw inferences about the client based on their expertise or past experiences. A similar attitude was also mentioned in the introduction of narrative therapy by Goldenberg and Goldenberg (2012). When facing the problems of the case, the therapist should maintain a high degree of interest in the story told by the case. The concept is specifically clarified here as having a high degree of interest in what the patient has said rather than forming questions and asking questions with a curious attitude based on the therapist's inner preferences. One is what the patient wants to say or decides to tell, and the other is the therapist guiding the patient to answer the information the therapist wants. The attitudes of the two are entirely different, but misunderstandings can quickly occur during the Chinese translation and reading process. This stance of "not understanding" is the therapist's humility and respect for the families he serves. This humble stance prevents therapists from rigidly understanding the current culture in which clients create problems based on the culture constructed by original theories at the time. Instead, therapists quietly allow clients to lead therapists to formulate the current cultural perspective of problems and to understand the client's problem.

The author has no finalized definition of the indigenous family that Professor Cheng asked for. The author shares his opinion that indigenous family therapy theory needs a theory rooted in the culture of this land, used to understand the families and people living on this land and to explore the culture and social construction from the foundation behind the family. The family appearance is shown in. Therefore, as long as you live on this land, no matter what kind of family is formed or when, it is a form and representative of the indigenous family, such as the families of new residents, aborigines, and various diverse family forms. It is worth discovering by aspiring scholars and researchers with curiosity and an open mind. The author strongly supports Professor Cheng's reminder that in addition to understanding families from different cultures, the families being explored should consider their social location, politics, economics, and other contextual factors, as well as the interaction with cultural concepts to understand family interaction patterns, this is a larger perspective to understand indigenous families. However, such a large project requires more professionals to invest together. I hope that more scholars and experts will work in this direction. Conduct more exchanges in the hope that such exchanges will lead to a better understanding of indigenous families and thus provide more appropriate assistance.

In addition, in terms of research methods, Professor Cheng shared the ethnographic research method as an example. An in-depth understanding of the characteristics of a group is

an encouraged research direction, and any research conducted in Taiwan can be considered. The study of indigenization also records the indigenous knowledge of indigenous families constructed in Taiwan, a culturally integrated country of this generation. By accumulating various studies, it constructs a pluralistic indigenous discussion of families under multiculturalism. In academic research and family work practice, it is crucial to record, interpret, and understand the collected data and compare it with families in other countries, cultures, and ethnic groups. These are valuable data for further research in the future. By accumulating these materials and theories, we can extract common phenomena and try to construct a theory with universal factors. This is also an essential part of cross-cultural research.

Here, I would like to specifically respond to Professor Cheng's mention of cybernetics, systems, and information exchange theory, which enabled early family research and later family therapists to step out of the psychoanalytic perspective. This description, of course, also includes theoretical construction. Leaving the scope of psychoanalysis, the development process of family therapy theory in the West is not easy. As Professor Cheng mentioned, the Satir school, which was introduced to Taiwan very early, was also very excluded in family therapy in the United States. In Boyd's collection of Murray Bowen's letters in 1989, which included Bowen's letters responding to questions from other experts, it is not difficult to find that different schools of thought questioned Bowen's theory during its development (Bowen, 1989/2016). It was also tricky for psychologists at that time to leave their original beliefs in psychoanalysis. Whether the mainstream academic culture did not accept Satir's theory at the time due to gender factors or theoretical content, or Bowen's theory was not recognized by the mainstream psychoanalytic school at the time, this is a process that will occur with a new theory.

Here, I would like to specifically respond to Professor Cheng's mention of cybernetics, systems, and information exchange theory, which enabled early family research and later family therapists to step out of the psychoanalytic perspective. This description, of course, also includes theoretical construction. Leaving the scope of psychoanalysis, the development process of family therapy theory in the West is not easy. As Professor Cheng mentioned, the Satir school, which was introduced to Taiwan very early, was also very excluded in family therapy in the United States. In Boyd's collection of Murray Bowen's letters in 1989, which included Bowen's letters responding to questions from other experts, it is not difficult to find that different schools of thought questioned Bowen's theory during its development (Bowen, 1989/2016). It was also tricky for psychologists at that time to leave their original beliefs in psychoanalysis. Whether the mainstream academic culture did not accept Satir's theory at the

time due to gender factors or theoretical content, or Bowen's theory was not recognized by the mainstream psychoanalytic school at the time, this is a process that will occur with a new theory.

## **V. Response to Professor Ming-Wen Wang's article**

Thanks to Professor Wang for his detailed introduction to the development of family therapy in Taiwan, especially the in-depth introduction to the pioneers of indigenous family therapy and the process of developing indigenous family therapy. What particularly moved me was the invitation she put in the subtitle of his response article and at the end of the article to "return to the homeland of the soul together," which resonated with the author. Professor Wang responded that based on the arguments in the original target paper, she elaborated on possible future research directions and gave practical examples of the directions in which qualitative research and quantitative research can be carried out on the path of future indigenization. He also lists the pioneers in family therapy practice and the challenges and difficulties these predecessors faced in implementing the practice. He also calls on family workers and experts to try to follow their predecessors' paths and think about their own direction, encourage a cooperative community to jointly contribute to the indigenization of family therapy research and practice and move forward together.

According to Wang (2017), among the three directions of indigenous counseling psychology research, Professor Wang wanted to give a very detailed response to the two aspects of localization introduced by foreign studies and the indigenization of cultural integration. It also makes up for the author's shortcomings in discussing cultural inheritance in the original article. Professor Wang introduced the mental journey of the two predecessors through Wu (2017)'s "Hua Wu style" and Wang (2016)'s application of Confucian and I Ching elements in family therapy. Two points resonate with the author. One is that constructing indigenous theory based on cultural inheritance is difficult, and the other is that such a construction journey is lonely. The theory constructed with indigenous culture as material requires a deep understanding of indigenous culture.

The author resonates with a phenomenon pointed out by Professor Wang, that is, family therapy experts are rarely experts in the indigenous culture. Therefore, it is challenging to construct a theory of indigenous family therapy from the perspective of cultural inheritance. In this regard, the author has a profound experience. Due to the insufficient cultivation of indigenous culture, it is still impossible to propose an indigenous family therapy theory. This result may be due to the author being too deeply immersed in the Western theoretical framework

and not creating an indigenous family therapy theory, or the author may not have a deep enough understanding of indigenous cultures, such as Confucianism, Buddhism, or Taoism. In the early days of Taiwan, Hwang (2014) and Yang (1993) eagerly encouraged scholars to use indigenous culture to establish indigenous theories to understand local people's behavior and explain psychological phenomena. Hwang (2014) records the speech given by Professor Yung-Ho Ko, a pioneer in clinical psychology in Taiwan, at the 48th Annual Conference of the Taiwan Psychological Association. He reflected on the situation in which the clinical psychology community at that time fully adopted Western theories and techniques and encouraged the creation of new or several indigenous theories unique to Taiwan and dialogue with other theories on an equal footing. I confidently believe that perhaps some indigenous theories are superior to and inclusive of other theories.

Hwang (2011) established a universal self-mandala model from a Buddhist perspective. Many scholars have used the cultural connotations of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism to construct theories. For example, in Confucianism, Shiah and Chang (2018) discussed the self-model of self-nature and self-cultivation mandala; Hwang (2009) discussed Confucian self-cultivation; Studies conducted by Buddhism, including Li et al. (2021) who revised the steps of acceptance and commitment therapy at home, Jian et al. (2022) who explained the application of non-attachment at Buddhism in the process of grief psychotherapy, and Chung et al. (2019) approached the issue of grief from the perspective of Confucianism, Buddhism and Taoism rituals; Peng et al. (2015) have studied the experience of career transformation from the perspective of the I Ching, and Lin (2018) used the perspective of the I Ching to reflect on the counseling profession. Although the study of cultural inheritance has already started due to the efforts and encouragement of predecessors, in the field of family therapy, except for teachers Chiu-Chun Wu and Shane Wang, there has not yet been any further progress. Professor Wang pointed out that Teacher Wu's "Hua Wu Style" had its difficulties in inheriting Eastern thought. Teacher Xing Wang provided a perspective on using Confucianism and the I Ching in family therapy but still did not construct a psychotherapy model. Therefore, although the localization introduced by foreign studies and the indigenization of cultural integration has been launched in family therapy and continues to advance, there is still much room for improvement in the theoretical construction of cultural inheritance.

## **VI. practical training in family therapy**

Long-term training in mature family therapy theories and techniques. Consistent with Professor Cheng's view, to meet the requirements for psychologist examination subjects, postgraduate students are limited in the training subjects they can receive in family therapy after meeting the examination subject requirements. On the other hand, except for a few departments that can provide complete training, other departments are limited by the lack of teachers specializing in family therapy and cannot provide full training. Under these two conditions, it is recommended that psychologists who are interested in family therapy attend a few more family therapy workshops, find their favorite theoretical school, and then participate in long-term training with senior supervision. Assist in becoming proficient in this school of family healing. Here are some tips to share with readers on improving family healing capabilities.

### **1. Practice counseling methods of relational questioning**

No matter which school of family therapy you choose, in the college training, including the internship process, in addition to group and individual counseling training, if conditions permit, you can start to practice one-on-two or more questioning methods. The method of relationship questioning is to ask a question, and the clients in the therapy room have to answer it. For example, ask a couple: What impact does this problem have on your relationship? Or ask a family: How does this difficulty affect your family's relationship with each other? This questioning method with a relationship as the central axis first allows students to start learning to use a question, and the clients in the treatment room are also responsible for thinking about this question. This can prevent the therapist from being distracted when a client feels they have nothing to do when questioning a client. The second is that the training in relational questioning can make students pay attention to using systematic concepts to understand the clients. The third is to allow the therapist to observe the family's interaction pattern or power structure, such as who answers the question first, who does not answer, who keeps rushing to answer, who answers for whom, etc. This relationship-questioning method is the beginning of family therapy based on the concept of systems.

### **2. Skillfully observe and analyze various patterns of clients**

When interacting with clients, the therapist can quickly notice the clients' communication patterns, emotional transmission patterns, body language interaction patterns, problem-solving patterns, value patterns, etc. These observations help to formulate case conceptualization based

on systems theory and find paths for therapeutic intervention. Proficient observation of client patterns will help the therapist's questioning and the effectiveness of treatment. It will not put the therapist into a dilemma of not knowing what to ask, like having a map but not knowing the directions. Generally, skilled family therapists should be able to notice some patterns among the clients within 10-20 minutes of the interview, whether these patterns are positive or negative, or whether they can be used for intervention or related to family problems. When facing clients, a beginner in family therapy has learned many schools of family therapy, and each school is like a map, but at the practice site, he does not know where to go. This is why the author recommends that beginners find a suitable supervisor and let him guide them for a while to become more and more proficient in family therapy.

### **3. The embodiment of postmodern thinking**

The development of postmodern thinking is difficult for some professionals studying family therapy. Like the author, when I first came into contact with the concept of the postmodern school, I still looked at it with the thinking of the modern school. It was miserable, and I made a lot of jokes. Although it is possible to use postmodern technology questions in practice, it is not in the spirit of postmodernism. There are not many founding techniques of the postmodern school, and questioning techniques are not difficult to learn. Still, the nature and concepts behind them are challenging to internalize in individuals. A family therapist who is proficient in the postmodern school of thought should usually be able to find materials that can empower the client after meeting with the client for about 20 minutes. As for when to use this material for empowerment or not, it is woven by the therapist during the treatment process and forms a unique treatment style. Such proficiency also requires the assistance of appropriate supervision to accompany this professional growth path. Lack of proficiency will be reflected in practice. Often the client has already experienced exceptions in the focus of solution, shining experiences in narrative therapy, or materials that can be used to empower (empower), because the therapist has not matured internally. The postmodern spirit makes detecting and using these materials promptly and immediately impossible. Of course, this is somewhat related to the background of self-growth. In learning psychology, the author learned to find the cause and source of the problem and deal with the problem through training, and the treatment was over. With such a training background, entering the postmodern treatment concept requires a lot of self-reflection, supervisory inspections, and teachers' teachings, bit by bit, to cultivate. As

Professor Wang and the author both agree, learning family therapy requires the assistance of experienced supervisors.

Since the four response articles have few responses to the practical part, the author briefly outlines three training directions here. I hope that more family therapy professionals can communicate, share, and make suggestions to make the training in family therapy in Taiwan more comprehensive and mature.

## **VII. Conclusion**

My heartfelt thanks to the four experts, Professor Guo, Professor Sun, Professor Cheng and Professor Wang, for their responses, which helped the author learn a lot. Here, the author once again explains that due to the limitation of professional ability, I can only respond to the parts I can respond to. As for the parts I cannot respond to, I hope other professionals can take over and share and respond. As for the family therapy training part, this article is just an introduction. I hope other family therapy masters and seniors can share more so the family therapy training can be perfect

In short, the theoretical construction of indigenous family therapy needs to be encouraged and accepted. Bowen's theory and Professor Cheng pointed out that the mainstream academic circles would question the Satir school in its initial stage at that time. In fact, in non-written records, the solution-focused approach was directly questioned by a particular theoretical founder of the system concept in its early stages. The author believes that this exclusionary phenomenon (Kuhn, 1996), which occurs to maintain the subjectivity of mainstream theories, has happened in family therapy or other scientific fields and is nothing new. Examining the process of Western theory creation in the past, the construction of local theories should reduce interference in this area so that different theories or concepts can be discussed and discussed. Just like Professor Cheng responded to the article's expectations, he hopes local studies can have more exciting dialogues. Therefore, the author also calls for more journals in the academic dialogue platform to be open to and accept new theories based on local culture. It is recommended that when new family therapy theories, models, micro-theories, or opinions are proposed, there should be more communication channels and publishing platforms, just like there are more academic communication journals such as local counseling psychology journals. Among the existing academic journals, more journals, such as the Chinese Journal of Guidance and Counseling, can accept the publication of family therapy theoretical constructs.

The author believes that using a single theory to understand local plural families is impossible, and there is no single technology to deal with various family issues. Therefore, it does require the joint investment of more workers and researchers interested in this field to have more Indigenous theories and techniques can be used. Indigenous family therapy in Taiwan has been pioneered by Wu (2017), “Hua Wu Style,” and Wang (2016), who use Confucian psychology as helpful knowledge, inspiring family therapy professionals to take up the baton and move forward. Whether the indigenous family therapy theory adopts the ethnographic research method advocated by Tubbs and Burton (2005) mentioned by Professor Cheng or the bottom-up theoretical construction based on the practical work experience of therapists mentioned by Professor Sun, it can also Whether it is universal theory, micro-theory or formal model, it is very much needed. The output of indigenous pluralistic theories will help professionals understand families from different perspectives and thus solve family issues. Based on the efforts of pioneers, family therapy has entered this stage where it is urgent to construct a theory. More and different indigenous family therapy theories are expected to be born in the next few years.

In addition, the author would like to remind you to view theory humbly. A single theory cannot fully interpret or explain all family phenomena, so we need various theories to assist therapists in understanding families from different perspectives. Regardless of whether the constructed theory can be suitable for various families, it at least provides therapists with a valuable thinking model for a family. It is difficult for us to have a complete and 100% understanding of the characteristics of a family, but we can understand it in multiple ways. With the help of pluralistic theory, the more angles and perspectives we can take to view the family, the more it can help the therapist get closer to the client’s reality. What I call humility is to remind therapists that when you choose a theory to apply, you must believe and know what the theory can do, but you must also understand what the theory cannot do. One of my mentors once said you must believe in theory, but don’t marry it. This should be worth thinking about. Another meaning of the author’s humble attitude towards theory is to listen to the voice of the family with a humble heart and not to make premature inferences about the client based on the theory. This approach conveys the therapist’s respect for the family. A senior expert in the United States established a particular theory based on the concept of system. At the last public seminar, this senior expert selected a classic therapy video to share with everyone every ten years. During the meeting, someone asked this senior expert about the most significant difference between his initial and recent treatments. The senior expert replied that he now

spends much time listening to what his family has to tell him. This response is worth thinking about.

Once again, the author believes that Professor Kwang-Kuo Hwang's universal model of the self-mandala takes a long time, and researchers must accumulate rich academic accomplishments and cultural qualities. There are certain thresholds for ordinary scholars to achieve their achievements. This approach also takes a long time to construct a universal theory. Once the theory has been constructed into a prototype and has a complete construction theory, the great wheel of cultural change is no longer waiting for us to catch up. It will continue to roll forward, allowing us to construct a theory. The applicability of the proposed theory may be far removed from current culture. However, this does not mean that such theoretical discussion is unnecessary. The theoretical discussion from this can provide a theoretical perspective and perspective to think about family interactions and problems.

The author tends to encourage scholars and students currently in the learning stage to follow the practical research proposed by Professor Sung-Hsien Sun, the qualitative research proposed by Professor Ming-Wen Wang, and the ethnographic research proposed by Professor Wan-Juo Cheng as a reference, and start from practical experience, a discussion, and micro-theory of the construction of a phenomenal place. The advantage of establishing a micro-theory from microscopic phenomena is that it can more immediately reflect the current phenomena of indigenous families and can be effectively applied to practical workers' work on family issues. On the other hand, through qualitative research and the construction of micro-theories, we can explore the characteristics of indigenous culture and get rid of cultural particularities that cannot be covered by Western theories, such as the phenomenon of bride-in-law or child brides pointed out by Professor Wang. These are all things that are not found in Western culture. However, this does not mean that such theoretical discussion is unnecessary. The academic discussion from this can provide a theoretical perspective and perspective to think about family interactions and problems.

Although quantitative research is rarely mentioned in the response articles, it does not mean that quantitative research on the indigenization of family therapy is unnecessary. However, studies on minority groups cannot produce convincing statistical results due to insufficient sample sizes. Therefore, qualitative research is more effective in this regard. Some of the aforementioned indigenous research articles have self-compiled scales, but the author suggests that indigenous norms can be further established. Although the norm establishment project is relatively large, scholars are encouraged to try and see how indigenization can work. The standardized norm significantly contributes to practice, which is worthy of support.

The author also recommends Professor Li-An Guo and Professor Wan-Juo Cheng reflect on the ongoing construction of indigenous family therapy theory from the perspective of gender equality and the diversity of cultural intersections. Therefore, the author also wants to encourage learners in the learning stage to continue to improve their training on gender and power issues, learn relevant courses and knowledge, put them into practice, accumulate experience, continue to receive supervision, and reflect on their own experiences. These experiences can also be converted into research results and collected through research. Regarding courses, departments, and training providers also hope to introduce more relevant teachers and open courses to provide students with training and cultivate multicultural knowledge and abilities. While presenting localized families, future workers and researchers must remember that they should reflect from multiple perspectives. Taking the development history of foreign countries as a guide, as the Goldenberg family therapy textbook records the development process of feminist therapy in family therapy, workers and researchers should expand their sensitivity to gender and move toward indigenization, we should also follow these advances in feminist family therapy, start from the perspective of women's equality, enter the vast ocean of Chinese culture, reflect on the discussions in its culture, and further construct an indigenous feminist family therapy theory.

Returning to the original intention of being invited to write this target paper and response paper, I hope to compile an introduction based on the phenomenon that the author has observed and perceived at the Taiwan university campus and to invite more scholars to express their opinions and share. Constructing an indigenous family theory is not to establish another cultural hegemony but to construct a pluralistic dialogue perspective and promote dialogue between different theories to enrich the tools or perspectives for understanding the family. We also hope to encourage more cultivation and training systems, such as schools, institutions, etc., to reflect on the current situation of family therapy training in Taiwan and continue to improve training methods and content to cultivate more mature family therapy professionals and help families in Taiwan.

### Reference

- Anderson, H. (1990). Then and now: A journey from “knowing” to “not knowing”. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 12(3), 193-197. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00891246>
- Bowen, M. (2016). History and process. In C. Boyd (Ed.), *Commitment to principles: The letters of Murray Bowen, M. D.* Murray Bowen Archives.

- <http://murraybowenarchives.org/boyd-book/> (Original letter written 1989).
- Chung, W. C., Kuo, Y. F., & Shiah, Y. J. (2019). The grief healing model of the funeral rituals based on Confucianism, Taoism and Buddhism. *Chinese Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 54, 59-89. <https://doi.org/10.3966/172851862019010054003> (in Chinese)
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Harvard University Press.
- Goldenberg, H., & Goldenberg, I. (2012). *Family therapy: An overview* (8<sup>th</sup> ed.). Brooks/Cole.
- Goldenberg, I., & Goldenberg, H. (1999). *Family therapy: An overview*. (Weng, S. S., & Wang, D. W. Trans.). Yang-Chih Book Co., Ltd. (Original work published 1980)
- Heisenberg, W. (1992). *Physics and philosophy*. (Zhou, D. C., Shi, Y. M., & Huang, M. Q. Trans.) Hsieh-chih Industrial Library. (Original work published 1958)
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, 466(7302), 29. <https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a>
- Hwang, K. K. (2009). The development of indigenous counseling in contemporary Confucian communities. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(7), 930-943. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009336241>
- Hwang, K. K. (2011). The Mandala Model of Self. *Psychological Studies*, 56(4), 329-334.
- Hwang, K. K. (2014). On culture-inclusive theories of positive psychology. *Taiwan Counseling Quarterly*, 6(2), 36-47. <http://jicp.heart.net.tw/article/TCQ6-2-3.pdf> (in Chinese)
- Hwang, K. K. (2017). Confucian ethical healing and psychology of self-cultivation. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 28, 60-87. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004348936\\_005](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004348936_005)
- Hwang, K. K. (2019). A psychodynamic model of self-nature. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 32(3-4), 285-306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2018.1553147> (in Chinese)
- Hwang, K. K., & Chang, J. (2009). Self-cultivation: Culturally sensitive psychotherapies in Confucian societies. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 37(7), 1010-1032. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000009339976>
- Jian, Y. Y., Tsai, Y. C., & Shiah, Y. J. (2022). Buddhist wisdom of non-attachment in the psychotherapeutic grief process. *Journal of Indigenous Counseling Psychology*, 13(4), 81-105. (in Chinese)
- Kohlberg, L., Levine, C., & Hwer, A. (1983). Moral stages: A current formulation and response to critics. *Contributions to Human Development*, 10, 174.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Li, H. J., Hsu, M. I., & Shiah, Y. J. (2021). Revised acceptance and commitment therapy: Towards the original self. *Journal of Indigenous Counseling Psychology*, 12(4), 28-53.

- <http://jicp.heart.net.tw/article/JICP12-4-03.pdf> (in Chinese)
- Liang, P. Y. (2006). Learning by doing: A play therapist's case conceptualization model. *Journal of National Taipei University of Education*, 19(1), 119-138. (in Chinese)
- Lin, J. D. (2018). Using the thought of I-Ching as the change medium. *Guidance Quarterly*, 54(1), 28-39. (in Chinese)
- Peng, H. I., Liu, S. H., Hung, J. P., Lu, Y. J., & Chan, H. C. (2015). Using philosophy of Yi to explore the resilience experience structure of career development. *Taiwan Counseling Quarterly*, 7(2), 20-48. <http://jicp.heart.net.tw/article/TCQ7-2-2.pdf> (in Chinese)
- Shiah, Y. J., & Chang, C. C. (2018). Using Lianxi theory to talk about the theory of cultivation psychology towards constructing Chinese autonomy: Confucian autonomy and cultivation mandala self-model. In J. H. Zhang (Ed.), *Studies on Zhou Dunyi: Proceedings of the International Academic Symposium on the 1000th Anniversary Celebration of Zhou Dunyi's Birth* (pp. 262-280). China Social Sciences Press. (in Chinese)
- Tubbs, C., & Burton, L. (2005). Bridge research: Using ethnography to inform clinical practice. In D. H. Sprinkle & F. P. Piercy (Eds.), *Research methods in family therapy* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), pp. 136-154. Guildford.
- Verschuuren, G. M. (2014). *It's all in the genes!: Really?* CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Wang, C. H. (2017). Exploring the development of indigenous counseling psychology. *Journal of Indigenous Counseling Psychology*, 9(1), vii-x. <http://jicp.heart.net.tw/article/JICP9-1-1.pdf> (in Chinese)
- Wang, X. (2016). *Cultivating oneself and harmonizing the family: Family therapy using Confucian psychology as knowledge to help others*. Psychological Publishing Co., Ltd. (in Chinese)
- Wu, C. C. (2017). *Hua Wu Style family therapy: Chiu-Chun Wu's new treatment method and the aesthetics of helping others*. Psychological Publishing Co., Ltd. (in Chinese)
- Xu, J., Chang, N. S., Hsu, Y. F., & Shiah, Y. J. (2022). Comments on previous psychological Tai-Chi models: Jun-zi self-cultivation model. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.871274> (in Chinese)
- Yang, K. S. (1993). Why do we need to establish Chinese indigenous psychology? *Indigenous Psychological Research in Chinese Societies*, 1, 6-88. (in Chinese)