

Integrating the Integrators: An Organizing Framework for a Multifaceted Process of Integration

Brian E Eck

Azusa Pacific University

Abstract

Over the last quarter century, several models for the integration of psychology and theology have been proposed. Each of these models holds underlying assumptions about the admissibility of data to the integration process and has identified specific methods by which that data may be integrated across disciplines. The present article reviews and organizes these models according to their underlying assumptions and processes for integration and identifies the three data assumption paradigms, live integration processes and nine meta-models that underlie the field of integration. To advance integrative efforts, the need for agreement on the definition of integration, admissibility of data, and use of integration models is proposed and a multiperspectival application of the meta-models is suggested.

Christians in the field of psychology have spent the last quarter of a century writing about the integration of Christian beliefs with their practice of the discipline. Worthington (1994) summarizes these efforts by describing an unsystematic and rudimentary early period prior to 1975; a vigorous and sophisticated model building middle period from 1975-1982; and a stagnant period from 1982 to the present. He suggests that this dormancy results from a lack of guidelines for how to do integration at a practical level.

Others (Bouma-Prediger, 1990; Clinton, 1990a, 1990b; Foster & Bolsinger, 1990; Foster, Hom & Watson, 1988; Ingram, 1995) have also expressed dissatisfaction with the disjointed direction that integrative efforts have taken. They call for a shift away from theorizing about integration models, and instead, to begin looking for those consistent themes or facts that can serve as the basis for building a truly integrated psychology. If such a psychology could be created there is a need to establish agreement on at least three areas of the integrative process.

Three Areas in Need of Agreement

Definition of Integration

First, there is a need to develop a consistent definition of what integration means. To the present, other than to say that the basis of integration rests on the proposition that all truth is God's truth (Carter & Narramore, 1979; Clinton, 1990b; Collins, 1977, 1981; Crabb, 1977; Evans, 1977, 1982; Farnsworth, 1981, 1985; Foster & Bolsinger, 1990), authors of new books or articles have found it necessary to define in new terminology the type of integration about which they

Correspondence regarding this article should be sent to Brian E. Eck, Ph.D., Department of Professional Psychology, Azusa Pacific University, 901 E. Alost Ave., Azusa, CA 91702-7000 (Fax (818) 815-5015; e-mail: beck@apu.edu).

are writing. Even then, the definition of integration is usually stated in such generalized terms as the "interaction" or "interlace" of psychology and theology, or as the "discovery and articulation of the common underlying principles" of these two fields. The key to creating a uniform definition of integration lies in defining the ultimate goal that the *processes* of integration are attempting to achieve.

I would argue that the goal of integration is to come to a greater, more holistic and unified understanding of human persons and their social/ecosystemic worlds than is possible through any unitary disciplinary window alone. Integration does not detract from the truths of psychology, theology or any other discipline, but rather deepens those truths through a greater cross-disciplinary application and unification of their truths. This more unified perspective enables us not only to celebrate the truths of Scripture, but to marvel at how "fearfully and wonderfully" we are made (Ps. 139:4, NIV). Although this article limits itself to the integration of psychology and theology, the most complete form of integration would go beyond a psychology-theology duality and fully integrate the truths from all disciplines (Carter, 1983; Ingram, 1995).

Admissible Data

The second area requiring agreement is the type of data that is admissible to the integrative process. This involves first defining a response to the different types of truth (the data of psychology and theology), and second to the different means of knowing those truths (the methods of study in each discipline). In spite of the generally accepted belief among Christians that all truth is God's truth,

many Christians make distinctions that attribute different levels of acceptance to the data from general (natural universe based) versus special (biblically based) revelation (Carter & Narramore, 1979; Collins, 1977, 1981; Crabb, 1977; Johnson, 1992). They also differentiate between scientific/academic and personal truths. (For an excellent elaboration on types of truth see Farnsworth, 1981).

No matter the source of the data for the integrative process, scientific/academic truth cannot be divorced from the means by which it is obtained (Evans, 1977, 1982; Farnsworth, 1981, 1985; Johnson, 1992; Van Leeuwen, 1982). Truths come through a particular academic or personal means of knowing. Academically, these means are the accepted methods of study in each discipline. In theology, the data are shaped by the methods used to translate, exegete, and interpret the truths of Scripture (Cranmer & Eck, 1994). In psychology, the data are shaped by the scientific method and although the modernist methods with their positivistic, materialistic, and reductionistic assumptions may be gradually changing in the postmodern world (Ingram, 1995), it still remains the primary means for discovering truth in psychology (Foster & Bolsinger, 1990).

The goal of a fully integrated understanding of human persons and their social/ecosystemic worlds is constrained by the limitations inherent in the methods of study in both psychology and theology. Multidisciplinary integration may thus require different models using different processes to overcome the existing limitations of method and data in growing areas of knowledge.

Personal truth reflects the need for integrated truth to be personally relevant and practically applicable (Farnsworth, 1981). For integration to be complete, the truths of the integration process must move beyond the theoretical (Worthington, 1994) and become "embodied" (Farnsworth, 1981) in the individual's own unique existential experience.

Rejects Integration Process

The issue of admissibility of a discipline's data reflects one's belief in the accuracy, appropriateness, usefulness and reliability of that data. There seems to be extensive agreement among Evangelicals on the supremacy of the truth of Scripture (Carter & Narramore, 1979; Clinton 1990b; Collins, 1977, 1981; Crabb, 1977; Evans, 1977, 1982; Farnsworth, 1981, 1985; Foster & Bolsinger, 1990; Johnson, 1992), but very little agreement on how to use that truth in the integrative process.

What Processes for Integration

A final area for agreement would be on the *process* or *processes* by which truth is integrated. A number of authors (e.g., Carter & Narramore, 1979; Collins, 1977, 1981; Crabb, 1977; Evans, 1977, 1982; Farnsworth, 1981, 1985) have between them provided 27 separate models for the Integrative process.

Integrating the Integrators

The 27 models mentioned above can be organized into three integrative paradigms that define the admissibility of the data from each discipline, five basic integration processes that define a method for relating the data of each discipline, and nine specific meta-models of Integration (see Figures 1 and 2). The processes and models identified here could be used in the integration of any group of disciplines.

The integrators can be organized into three broad paradigms that are defined by the assumptions they make regarding the data from the disciplines of psychology and theology. The *Non-Integrative Paradigm* does not seek integration of the data but rather builds its understanding of God's truth on one discipline alone. The *Manipulative Paradigm* seeks to integrate the data of both disciplines, but the data of one discipline must be altered before becoming acceptable to the other discipline. The final paradigm, the *Non-Manipulative Paradigm*, accepts the data from both disciplines directly into the integrative process.

Each paradigm contains certain processes that define the method for how the data of each discipline will be integrated. The Non-Integrative Paradigm contains only the *Rejects Process*; the *Manipulative Paradigm* contains both the *Reconstructs Process* and the *Transforms Process*; and the Non-Manipulative Paradigm utilizes the *Correlates Process* and the *Unifies Process*.

As each discipline utilizes a particular integrative process, it produces a unique meta-model for the integration of psychology and theology. Except for the Unifies and Correlates processes in which there is a mutual coming together, the discipline listed first controls the integrative process.

Non-Integrative Paradigm

The Non-Integrative Paradigm does not seek to integrate multiple sources of truth, but rather attempts to keep the pure truth of one discipline unsoiled by the fallen (unacceptable) untruth of the other. Because acceptable data are believed to come from only one discipline, each discipline must reject the other as a source for truth. The *REJECTS* process is the only process within this category and it contains two meta-models.

Psychology Rejects Theology Model

In the first Rejects model, PSYCHOLOGY REJECTS THEOLOGY, scientific knowledge is the only recognized source for truth while theology is generally reduced to the status of superstition and myth. The data from theology are thus perceived as inadmissible for integration. This position is perhaps best represented by Freud's (1961) conception of religion as an "illusion" that needs to be replaced by reason, or by Skinner's (1971) conception of religion as "prescientific thinking" that needs to be replaced by scientific explanation. Another representative of this model would be secular psychologist Albert Ellis (1980). Among the integrators, this view is only represented by Carter and Narramore's (1979) SECULAR AGAINST model in which the only reliable means of finding truth is through the scientific method and its use of rationalism and empiricism.

Theology Rejects Psychology Model -

In the second Rejects model, THEOLOGY REJECTS PSYCHOLOGY, biblical revelation becomes the only admissible data because it is perceived as the one pure source for truth and the knowledge of how to live in God's created world. Weaver (1986) points out that Christian counselors from this perspective view psychology with "outright suspicion and rejection" (p. 205). An excellent proclamation of this model is Richard Ganz's (1976) statement that, "It takes an unpolluted spring to form an unpolluted pond. Likewise, the only way to have a non polluted system of counseling is to fill it from an unpolluted source. That source is the Scriptures" (p. 196).

Other representatives of this model would include Adams (1970), Martin and Diedre Bobgan (1978,1985,1987), and Kilpatrick (1983).

Among the integrators, this position is found in Carter and Narramore's (1979) SACRED AGAINST model in which biblical revelation is the only reliable means of finding the truth; Crabb's (1977) NOTHING-BUTTERY model in which psychology is altogether disregarded; and Evans' (1977) the LIMITER OF SCIENCE, TERRITORIALIST model, which accepts physiology as a science of the human body, but rejects the notion of a science that ignores the soul.

Manipulative Integration Paradigm

The second paradigm, the Manipulative Integration Paradigm, accepts that some truth exists in each discipline but does not believe that the truth from the other discipline is directly admissible into the integration process. In this paradigm, data from the other discipline must be altered to become acceptable as data for the process of integration. This paradigm contains two integrative processes, each of which contains two meta-models.

Reconstructs Integration Process

The RECONSTRUCTS Integration Process is characterized by taking the truth from one discipline and subsuming it within the truth of the other. Although there is a beginning acceptance that some admissible truth resides in both disciplines, the data of one discipline are reconstructed in such a way that the outcome is similar to the rejects models in that it yields only one acceptable body of knowledge.

Psychology Reconstructs Theology Model

In the first Reconstructs model, PSYCHOLOGY RECONSTRUCTS THEOLOGY, the truths of theology must be brought into their proper psychological context. The most frequent reconstruction is the elimination of the supernatural. This model reconstructs theological truth into a theologically informed system of psychology.

Examples of this model include Jung's (1961) statement that among his patients in the second half of their lives, there was not one whose problem did not require "finding a religious outlook on life" (p. 69). He does not here mean a supernatural, theologically religious outlook on life. This becomes clear, when in another work he states,

It would be a regrettable mistake if anybody should understand my observations to be some kind of proof of the existence of God. They prove only the existence of an archetypal image of the Deity, which to my mind is the most we can assert psychologically about God (Jung, 1938, p. 73).

Other representatives of this model include Fromm (1950), May (1969), and most recently, Sperry (1988) who, writing in the *American Psychologist*, called for a rapprochement between psychology and religion, but without religion's supernaturalism.

Among the integrationists, this approach is first found in Carter and Narramore's (1979) SECULAR OF and SACRED OF models which minimize the purely religious nature or content of religious concepts, reject supernaturalism, place science above the authority of Scripture, and interpret Scripture as an expression of psychological truth. Collins (1981) also identifies a reconstructive approach that he

calls NOTHING BUTTERY in his review of Crabb's models. Here the psychologist, according to Collins, "redefines all theology in psychological terms" (p. 31). This is not, however, Crabb's NOTHING BUTTERY. Crabb (1977) defines his NOTHING BUTTERY as a Rejects process in which psychology is "altogether disregarded" (p. 40). What

Collins is describing is instead closer to Jeeves' (1976) NOTHING-8UTTERY concept, in which all aspects of the human person are reduced to being "nothing but a complex animal, a complex machine, or the result of environmental forces. (p. 83).

A third integrator, Evans (1977), describes this reconstructive model as the REIN-TERPRETER, CAPITULATOR who assents to the truth of the scientific and reinterprets theological data to make it consistent with a scientific view. Farnsworth (1985) is a final integrator who identifies a reconstructive process that he calls the "CC»IVERTIBIUTv" model. This model of integration, which I have identified as CONVERTIBILITY B, involves either "demythologizing" or "psychologizing" the theological findings (p. 100). Revelation is rearranged so that interpretations of data leave no room for the spiritual side of human nature.

In all of these models theological truth is acknowledged but is not independently accepted. Integration becomes possible only if theological truth can be manipulated into a scientific framework by losing its supernatural context. Because only the scientific remains, this model produces a theologically informed, psychological system.

Theology Reconstructs Psychology Model

In the second Reconstructs model, THEOLOGY RECONSTRUCTS PSYCHOLOGY, the truths of psychology must be brought into their proper theological context. The most frequent reconstruction is to eliminate the natural scientific basis of psycho-

logical truth. This model reconstructs psychology into a psychologically informed, theological system.

Examples of this model would include Shostrom and Montgomery's (1978) description of healthy psychological and spiritual growth in the core, or innermost being of the person. They state that the core is not the raw, chaotic power of Freud's unconscious, but rather it is "an innate guidance system energized by the power of God's love" (p. 128). Another example is Payne (1981), who counsels her clients that dreams are an intuitive way of knowing and serve as important vehicles for the revelation of the heart of God to our hearts and heads. Her process of dream interpretation removes the scientific while highlighting the spiritual. She states that in the company of others that are Spirit led, "The most important factor in dream interpretation of the unconscious, is a complete dependence upon the Holy Spirit and the Word of God" (p. 178).

When representatives of this model have finished their integrative process, one is struck by the lack of the scientific and the strong presence of a theological system at the core of their approach. Other representatives of this model would include Kelsey (1986), Sanford and Sanford (1982), and the approach of Alcoholics Anonymous. Among the integrationists, this model is only found in Collins' (1981) NOTHING BUT-ERY, where the theologian reduces all psychology to theology.

Transforms Integration Process

The second process within the manipulative integration paradigm is the TRANS-FORMS integration process. This is the first approach that truly accepts the legitimacy of the data from both disciplines. It remains a manipulative approach, however, because the data from one discipline must be altered before becoming admissible to the integrative process. In general, the data from the other discipline must either pass through a set of control beliefs or be reworked into a more acceptable worldview framework.

Psychology Transforms Theology Model

In the first Transforms model, PSYCHOLOGY TRANSFORMS THEOLOGY, theological truths must either pass through a particular psychological filter, usually empirical methodology, or be altered to fit into a particular psychological worldview. Examples of this approach would include psychologists who empirically study religion, such as Spilka, Hood, and Gorsuch (1985). For them the use of "empirical" frameworks and the utilization of the scientific method are crucial for understanding religious phenomena and for conveying the excitement and fascination of the nature and place of religion in people's lives. After passing through this empirical filter, something of the other discipline is screened out and, in this case, it is the supernatural that is removed. This model is illustrated by Spilka et al.'s (1985) statement that, "it is not the place of psychologists to challenge religious institutions and their theologies. God is not our domain; neither is the world vision of churches" (p. 3). In other words, admissible data for the study of religion or religious experience must first pass through an empirical filter. Other representatives of this model include Allport (1950) and Sargent (1957).

Among the integrationists, this perspective is represented by Farnsworth's (1985) CONVERTIBILITY model, which I have identified as CONVERTIBILITY A. This model revises theological findings by filtering them through the psychological.

Non-Manipulative Integration Paradigm

Theology Transforms Psychology Model

In the second Transforms model, THEOLOGY TRANSFORMS PSYCHOLOGY, psychological truth must either pass through a particular theological filter (which is usually Scripture), the FILTER TRANSFORMER SUBTYPE, or is altered to stay in keeping with a particular theological worldview, the

WORLDVIEW TRANSFORMER subtype.

Filter transformer subtype. An example of a filtering transformer subtype is Crabb (1977), who states that the most important job of the integrationist is to "screen secular concepts through the filter of Scripture." The integrationist should then align those concepts which pass through with appropriate theological matter and attempt to assimilate them into a comprehensive whole. Crabb goes on to state that anyone who wants to work toward a truly evangelical integration of Christianity and psychology should "agree that psychology must come under the authority of Scripture" and that "regardless of its support from empirical research, any idea that conflicts with Scripture will not be accepted as truth" (p. 49). Other representatives of this model would include Minirth and Meier (1982).

Among the integrators, the filter transformer model is represented by Crabb's SPOUNING THE EGYPTIANS model and Collins' (1981) restatement of Crabb's SPOUNING THE EGYPTIANS model. The filter transformer is also found in Evans' (1982) TRANSMUTATION model. Jones (1986) redefines this model of Evans as the Humanizers or Christianizers of Science. For them, the Christian psychologist who is committed to integration uses "Christian control-beliefs to radically depart from the methods and conclusions of their nonbelieving colleagues" (p. 23). A final representative is Farnsworth's (1985) CREDIBILITY model, in which psychological concepts are seen as secular concepts, and therefore must be "screened through the filter of scripture to give them credibility" (p. 97).

Worldview transformer subtype. The goal of the worldview transformer is to produce a Christianized science of psychology. Examples of the worldview transformer subtype include Cosgrove (1979), who feels that psychology had gone awry because of errors in its underlying belief systems. He seeks to replace the current psychological worldview with Christian theism because it "offers the most defensible world view available to psychology" (p. 149). He believes that such a transformed worldview best fits our data and experience, is broad enough to explain all the data on humanity, and is detailed enough to be tested.

Collins (1981) is another representative of this model. He seeks to rebuild psychology from the ground up by changing its foundational presuppositions to be more consistent with a Christian worldview. "I believe that the whole science of individual human behavior could be changed if it were to be built on such a biblically oriented base. This is integration at the foundational presuppositional level" (p. 36). A final representative of this model is Koteskey (1980).

Among the integrators, the worldview transformer subtype is found in Gary Collins' (1981) REBUILDING APPROACH. It is also found in Evans' (1977) HUMANIZER OF SCIENCE, GENERALIST model, which opposes the positivist view of science as a whole and attempts to build psychological science on explicitly Christian presuppositions (Jones, 1986). A final worldview transformer is found in Farnsworth's (1985)

CONFORMABILITY model, labeled CONFORMABILITY A by Foster et al. (1988), where psychological findings must conform to a Christian worldview before being admitted into the integration process.

The final paradigm is the Non-Manipulative Integration Paradigm. This paradigm accepts the legitimacy of the truth from both disciplines, but unlike the Manipulative Paradigm, this perspective admits the data from each discipline directly into the integrative process. This paradigm contains two integration processes and three meta-models.

Correlates Integration Process

In the first process within the non-manipulative paradigm, the CORRELATES process, the truth to be integrated from each discipline is left within the discipline from which it was derived. This approach maintains that because each discipline has its own worldviews, methods, and focus, the integrity of the data requires that it be kept in its original context. The integrative process involves forming relationships between the separated truths that are contained in each discipline.

Psychology Correlates With Theology Model

In the first model, PSYCHOLOGY CORRELATES WITH THEOLOGY, there are two subtypes. The first subtype, CORRELATES-LEVELS, involves assigning psychological and theological truth to different but often related levels of explanation.

Correlates-levels subtype, This model is perhaps the most popular among those working as natural scientists. Bube's (1971) second thesis for relating science and religion illustrates the separation of the data from each discipline when he states that "there are many levels at which a given situation can be described. An exhaustive description on one level does not preclude meaningful descriptions on other levels." (p. 28).

Within psychology an example of correlating levels would be David Myers (1986), who believes that God has written two books, nature and the Bible. For him, professional scientists and biblical scholars are needed to help us discern these two revelations and, while remaining open to the insights from either nature or Scripture (remembering that no single interpretation of nature or Scripture is final truth), one should be skeptical of any attempts to "subject theology to science or science to theology" (p. 218). Myers fears that confusion results when anyone of these disciplinary levels is asserted to be primary. This is because "a given event can very often be described by simultaneous, correlated explanations at various levels. It makes no sense to say that one level is causing the other" (p.

13). Other representatives of this model would include MacKay (1974), Jeeves (1976), Larzalere (1981) and Ingram (1995).

Among the integrators this position is first represented in Carter and Narramore's (1979) PARALLELS (ISOLATION) model, where each discipline is carefully relegated to the confines of its own methodology, language, and perspective. The CORREL.A.TES-LEVELS model is also found in Collins' (1981) LEVELS OF ANALYSIS APPROACH, in which the universe can be viewed from a variety of equally valid levels. Larry Crabb (1977) describes a CORREL.A.TES-LEVELS model called SEPARATE BUT EQUAL, in which the two disciplines deal with different problem areas.

Evans (1982), using Jeeves (1976) and MacKay (1974) as examples, lists a LIMITERS OF SCIENCE, PERSPECTIVALISTS model that emphasizes the observation of unitary reality from different viewpoints so that multiple aspects will appear. A final CORREL.A.TES-LEVELS model is found in Farnsworth's (1985) COMPLEMENTARITY LEVELS

model in which the findings from two equally valid but different views of the same phenomenon are correlated.

Correlates-linkages subtype. In the second correlates model, PSYCHOLOGY CORRELATES WITH THEOLOGY-LINKAGES, the truth of each discipline is to remain separate and contextualized within the discipline from which it came. Rather than assigning the data from each discipline to different levels, this approach gives more equivalent acceptability to the data from each discipline and integration involves establishing linkages between each discipline's truths. This model takes a middle position between the CORRELATES-LEVELS model, and the Non-manipulative paradigm's UNIFIES model. An example of this approach would be Pecheur (1978) who, in relating cognitive therapy and sanctification, writes "the processes in these two spheres are seen as the same, but the contents are seen as different. Cognitive therapy appears to make explicit the process of growth indicated in Scripture" (p. 239). Other representatives of this perspective are Oden (1966) and some of Carter and Mohline (1981).

Among the integrators, this model is first found in Carter and Narramore's (1979) PARALLELS, CORRELATION VERSION, which attempts to correlate or align certain psychological and scriptural concepts. Collins (1981) calls this approach the RAILROAD TRACK APPROACH, in which psychology and theology are "like two railroad tracks-going in the same direction, linked together with common ties, but meeting each other only on the distant horizon, and then, only in the mind of the beholder" (p. 22).

Evans (1977) calls this approach the REINTERPRETER, COMPATIBILIST who tries to "have it both ways." They would, for example, accept the traditional view of the person as free and responsible, while also accepting that one's behavior is driven by deterministic mechanisms and Divine sovereignty. Finally, Farnsworth's (1985) COMPATIBILITY model relates psychological and theological findings by correlating the data from each discipline that clearly seem to be saying the same thing.

Unifies Integration Process

In the final process of the non-manipulative paradigm, the UNIFIES process, the truth to be integrated from each discipline is brought together to create a unified set of truths that mirror the wholeness and unity of God's created and revealed truths. This process seeks to use the data gathered through the best methods each discipline has to offer while recognizing that we are "looking through a glass darkly" (I Cor. 13: 12, NIV). This approach recognizes the limitations of human understanding that impact our ability to know and understand the truth from both disciplines, yet seeks to live out a unified set of truths in one's life and practice of psychology.

Psychology Unifies With Theology Model

The only model in this process is PSYCHOLOGY UNIFIES WITH THEOLOGY. The basis for this approach is usually found in the incarnation of Christ. As Christ was both fully human and fully Divine, so too our approach as Christian psychologists should represent a unity of God's world and God's word. The goal of this approach and its one model is to seek the underlying truths of God's world in psychology and God's word in theology, and unite them by incarnationally living them out in one's life.

An example of the first half of this model would be found in Ellens' (1980) affirmation that wherever truth is disclosed it is always God's truth. "Whether it is found in General Revelation or Special Revelation, it is truth which has equal warrant

with all other truth. Some truth may have a greater weight than other truth in a specific situation, but there is no difference in its warrant as truth" (p. 3). The second half of this model would be found in Farnsworth's concept of EMBODIED INTEGRATION. For Farnsworth (1985), wholehearted integration is incarnational, that is "God's truth lives through us as we live as Jesus lived" (p. 108). This unifying process of integration occurs in a lifelong, never ending process of living out integrated truths in our lives. This, for Farnsworth, is the practical application of integration that others have called for (Bouma, Prediger, 1990; Clinton, 1990a, 1990b; Foster & Bolsinger, 1990; Foster, Hom & Watson, 1988; Ingram, 1995). It involves taking what we intellectually understand to be God's truth and using it as the framework for interpreting our experience and as guidelines for making responsible choices

Among the integrators, this model is first found in Carter and Narramore's (1979) INTEGRATES model, where psychological and theological understandings are not seen as distinct and unrelatable fields of study, but rather assume that there is ultimately only one set of explanatory hypotheses. This model looks for "unifying concepts" that broaden the understanding that comes from either psychology

or theology in isolation (p. 104).

Collins (1981) relabels the INTEGRATES model of Carter and Narramore as the ZIP-PER APPROACH. He feels that Carter and Narramore's model forces psychology "into a procrustean bed of theological doctrines, and that the two disciplines have been lined up and zippered together" (p. 30). Farnsworth (1981) echoes this sentiment in what I have termed the COMPATIBILITY B model. Here one lines up the psychological findings on one side and theological findings on the other and "Where they seem on the surface to be saying the same thing, point for point, (you) zip 'em up" (p. 6). Finally, Crabb (1977) refers to this model as the TOSSED SALAD APPROACH. In comparing this form of integration to a cooking technique, Crabb feels that this model "mixes several ingredients together into a single bowl to create a tasty blend" (p. 36). He feels this approach aligns the two disciplines by finding where the subject matter overlaps and then blending the insights of both disciplines together.

Conclusion and Application

The nine models presented here identify and integrate the underlying data assumptions and five basic processes for relating the data from psychology and theology that have been described in the integration literature. A truly integrated psychology requires agreement on the definition of integration, what data are admissible to the integration process, and which processes can be used to produce integrated truth. When seen from God's perspective, the truths of God's revealed Word and created world are a unified whole regardless of their data source. The vastness of God's unified truth goes far beyond the scope of anyone human discipline and the use of only one integration model is unlikely to achieve the full incarnation of God's truth. This use of different models, depending on the nature of the data or context, is consistent with the growing trend toward a post-modern research paradigm and its acceptance of multiperspectival analysis and procedures, the use of smaller scale rather than universal models, and a more holistic orientation (Ingram, 1995).

One application of this multiperspectival approach to integration would be to implement a particular process, depending upon the nature of the data provided by each discipline. Given the unity of God's truth, the UNIFIES model would be pre-

ferred in areas of knowledge where the data from each discipline have substantial corroboration and acceptance, can be conceptually related, and can be incarnationally lived out. In areas of knowledge where the data from each discipline have substantial corroboration, can be conceptually related, but cannot at the present time be unified, the COARELATES models may be most appropriate. The TRANSFORMS or RECONSTRUCTS models may be the most helpful where the data from one discipline have only minimal corroboration, can be only superficially related, and cannot be incarnationally lived out. Finally, in areas where the data from one discipline are not corroborated, it may be inappropriate to conceptually relate those data to the corroborated truth in the other discipline until further study. In this case the REJECTS model might actually be helpful in keeping the unwarranted, unsupported data from one discipline from being integrated with the corroborated data of the other discipline. Future research should seek to identify which model, and its assumptions about data, is going to be most helpful for integration in specific areas of study in each discipline.

Another application of a multiperspectival approach is to see the varied usefulness, depending on the work setting of the integrator, of the different integration processes. For those with training in both disciplines, but whose work occurs primarily within the rigid methodological framework of only one discipline, the COARELATES MODELS are an easier starting place. For those whose training, work, and professional identity are primarily in only one discipline, the TRANSFORMS or RECONSTRUCTS models are perhaps the best beginning places for understanding and communicating in an integrated way. In fact, the lack of representation of the THEOLOGY RECONSTRUCTS PSYCHOLOGY model among the integrators suggests that they have ignored the contributions of the more charismatically oriented integrative efforts. For those Christian psychologists working in secular settings and in dialogue with their secular colleagues, the PSYCHOLOGY TRANSFORMS or PSYCHOLOGY RECONSTRUCTS models may provide the most appropriate starting points to bridge the gap between science and religion.

The stagnation in the field of integration described by Worthington (1994) may be due to an inappropriately narrow understanding of integration. Foster et al. (1988) found that over a five-year period 80% of the articles published on integration used only one model (See Figure 2). Contemporary efforts at integration would be broadened by reassessing the five processes and adopting a more multiperspectival approach. That is not to say that all models are equally helpful to the ultimate goal of understanding the unity of God's truth. Each model has its own limits and disadvantages. But, by having an awareness of those limits and the potential problems contained in each model, we can come to appreciate the particular window which that model uniquely provides into a corner of God's truth.

References

- Adams, J. (1970). *Competent to COCHtseI*. Gram RapidS, MI: Baker.
- Allport, G. W. (1950). *The individual and his reliQion*. New York: Macmillan.
- Bobgan, M., & Bobgan, D. (1978). *The~ JoIogical/ way / The spiritual way*. MimeepoIis: Bethany.
- Bobgan, M., & Bobgan, D. (1985). *How to counsel from scripture*. Chicago: Moody.
- BobgIn, M., & Bobgan, D. (1987). *PsyJd18l8By: The p\$~ seQ.cbI of CIwjslian;. ty* Santa Barbara, CA: Eas1gafe.
- Bouma.Prediger. S. (1990). The lask ollntegrallon A modest proposal *Journal 01 Psychology and Theology*. 18. 21.31
- Bube. R. H. (1971). *The human quest A new took at sc..nce and Chns"an lalth* Waco. TX Word
- Caner. J. D. (1983) *To integration and back again* Paper presented at the annual meeting ollhe Christian Association lor Psyd1oIogical Studies. Chicago.
- Caner. J. D.. & ~ine. R. J. (1981). The nature and scope 01 integration: A proposal. In J. R. Fleck. & J. D. Caner (Eds.). *Psychology and Christianity: Inegrative readings*. (pp. 97.111). Nashville, TN: Abingdon.
- Caner. J. D.. & Nanamorl. B. (1979). *The Integration 01 psychOlogy and theology* Grand Rapids. MI: Zondervan.
- C~on, S. M. (19908). A crit~e 01 integration models *Journal 01 PsychOlogy and Theol.* ogy. 18.13-20.
- Clinton. S. M. (1990b). The loundationalIntegration model. *Journal of Psychology and Theok)gy*, 18, 115-122.
- Collins, G. R. (1977). *The rebuilding 01 PSyChOlogy: An integration of psychOlogy and Christianity*: Wheaton. IL: Tyndall.
- Collins. G. R. (1981). *P\$ydJoIogy and theology: Prospects lor integration*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon,
- Cosgrove, M. (1979). *P'yc/Iology gone awry*. Grand Rapids. MI: Zondervan.
- Crabb. L. J. (1977). *E".cr;w biblical counseling: A modet for helping caring Christians become CBP8ble counselors*. Grand Rapids. MI: Zondervan.
- Cram-.r, D., & Edt. B. E. (1994). God said it: Psychology and biblical interpr8lation. how leX! and r..-lterad ~.. ~ darkly. *JoumaJ of Psychology 8Ix1 ~*, 22, 207.214.
- Enens. J. H. (1980). Biblical themes in psychological theory and practice. *The Bulletin: Publication of the Christian Association lor Psychological Studies*, 6 (2), 2-6.
- Ellis. A. (1980). Psychotherapy and atheistic values: A response to A. E. Bergin's "psychotherapy and religious values." *Journal of Consulting and Clinat Psychology*, 48, 635-639.
- Evans. C. S. (1977). *PresetWlg the person: A look at the human \$cieras*. Downers Grove. IL: InterVarsity.
- Evans. C. S. (1982). *Preserving the person*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Farnsworth, K. E. (1981). *Integrating psychology and theology: ElbOws together but hearts apart*. Washington. DC: Univefsily Press.
- Farnsworth. K. E. (1985). *Whole-hearted integration: Hannonizlng psychology and Chris. tianity thIOUgtI word and deed*. Grand Rapids. MI: Baker.
- Foster. J. D., & Bolsinger. S. A. (1990). PromWlent themes in 8YangelicalIntegration litera. ture. *Journal of P'YChofogy and Theology*. 18.3-12.
- Fostlr, J. D.. Hom. D. A., & Watson. S. (1988). The popularity 01 integration models, 1980- 1985. *Journal of PsycIIoIovt and Trleology*. 16.3-14.
- Freud. S. (1961). *The future of an illusion*. New Vorl<: W W. Nonon.
- Fromm, E. (1950). *PsydJoanalysis and religion*. New Vorl<: Bantam.
- Ganz, R. (1976). Nouthetic counseling defended. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. 4, 193-205.
- The Holy Bible: New tnternalion8l Version*. (1984). Grand Rapids. MI: Zondervan.
- Ingram, J. A. (1995). Contemporary iSSues and Christian models of integration: Into the modemlpostmodem age. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 23. 3-14.
- Jeeves, M. (1976). *PsychokJgy and Christianity: The view both ways*. Downers Grove. IL: InterVarsily.
- Johnson. E. L. (1992). A place lor the Bible within psychological science. *Journal 01 PsycIIoIovt and TheoiOQy*, 20. 346-355.
- J~. S. L. (1986). Relating the Christian faith to psychology. In S. L. Jones (Ed.). *Psy- chology and the Christian faith: An introductory reader* (pp. 15-33). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker
- Jung, C. G. (1938). *Psychology and religion*. New Haven: Vale.
- Jung, C. G. (1961). *Memories. dreams. refteclions*. New York: Random House.

Kelsey, M. (1986). *Christianity as psychology: The healing power of the Christian message*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.

Koteskey, R. L. (1980). *Psychology from a Christian perspective*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Kilpatrick, W. K. (1983). *Psychological seduction: The failure of modern psychology*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.

Larzalere, R. (1981). The task ahead: Six levels of integration of psychology and Christianity. In J. R. Fleck & J. D. Carler, (Eds.), *Psychology and Christianity: Integrative readings*. (pp. 54-65). Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

May, R. (1969). *Love and will*. New York: W. W. Norton.

MacKay, D. M. (1974). *The dockwork image*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Minirth, F. B., & Meier, P. D. (1982). *Counseling and the nature of man*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Myers, D. G. (1978). *The human puzzle: Psychological research and Christian belief*. New York: Harper & Row.

Myers, D. G. (1986). Social psychology. In S. L. Jones (Ed.), *Psychology and the Christian faith: An introductory reader*. (pp. 217-239). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Oden, T. (1966). *Kerygma and counseling*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Payne, L. (1981). *The broken image: Restoring personal wholeness through healing prayer*. Westchester, IL: Crossway.

Pecheur, D. (1978). Cognitive theory/therapy and sanctification: A study in integration. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 6, 239-253.

Sandford, J., & Sandford, P. (1982). *The transformation of the Inner man*. South Plainfield, NJ: Bridge.

Sargent, W. (1957). *Battle for the mind*. London: Pan.

Shostrom, E. L., & Montgomery, D. (1978). *Healing love: How God ~ within the personality*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. New York: Knopf.

Sperry, R. W. (1988). Psychology's mentalistic paradigm and the religion/science tension. *American Psychologist*, 43,607-613.

Spillka, B., Hood, Jr., R. W., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1985). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Van Leeuwen, M. S. (1982). *The sorcerer's apprentice: A Christian looks at the changing face of psychology*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.

Weaver, G. (1986). Psychology of religion. In S. L. Jones (Ed.), *Psychology and the Christian faith: An Introductory reader*. (pp. 196-216). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Worthington, E. L. (1994), A blueprint for intradisciplinary integration. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*; 22, 79-86.

Author

Dr. E. Erik completed the PhD in clinical psychology from Anderson School of Forestry, Rich University. He is the Chair and Director of Clinical Programs of the Professional Psychology Department at Azusa Pacific University (CA). Dr. Erik's research interests include the integration of psychology and Christianity, the psychology of religious experience, and training and supervision of clinical practice.

Figure 1

I
 '-leant"' Concept.a'
 Ick (19M) Models I, Rllatlonshlp I RepresIntatly" I

