Psychology   College of Arts & Sciences

Winter 2006

Invitation to the Table Conversation: A Few Diverse Perspectives on Integration

Natalia Yangarber-Hicks

Charles Behensky

Sally Schwer

Kelly Schimmel Flanagan

Nicholas J.S. Gibson

See next page for additional authors

Recommended Citation

"Yangarber-Hicks, Behensky, C., Canning, S.S., Flanagan, K.S., Gibson, N.J., Hicks, M.W., Kimball, C.N., Pak, J.H., Plante, T., & Porter, S.L. (2006). Invitation to the table conversation: A few diverse perspectives on integration. Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 25, 338-353."

Authors

Natalia Yangarber-Hicks, Charles Behensky, Sally Schwer, Kelly Schimmel Flanagan, Nicholas J.S. Gibson, Mitchell W. Hicks, Cynthia Neal Kimball, Jenny H. Pak, Thomas G. Plante, and Steven L. Porter

Invitation to the Table Conversation:
A Few Diverse Perspectives on Integration

Natalia Yangarber-Hicks[1]
Wheaton College

Charles Behensky
Hope College

Sally Schwer Canning and Kelly Schimmel Flanagan
Wheaton College

Nicholas J. S. Gibson
University of Cambridge

Mitchell W. Hicks
Roosevelt University

Cynthia Neal Kimball
Wheaton College

Jenny H. Pak
Biola University

Thomas Plante
Santa Clara University

Steven L. Porter
Biola University

This article represents an invitation to the "integration table" to several previously underrepresented perspectives within Christian psychology. The Judeo-Christian tradition and current views on scholarship and Christian faith compel us to extend hospitality to minority voices within integration, thereby enriching and challenging existing paradigms in the field. Contributors to this article, spanning areas of cultural, disciplinary, and theological diversity, provide suggestions for how their distinct voices can enhance future integrative efforts

A Few Diverse Perspectives on Integration (Yangarber-Hicks)

Anniversary celebrations generally draw to the gathering table family members and friends who have shared one's life journey. Seeing familiar faces allows the person being honored to reminisce about the joys and struggles of life in an atmosphere of safety and continuity. While this practice of inviting the closest of kin to celebrate special events fits a framework familiar to most of us, the Judeo-Christian tradition offers an alternative model for marking important milestones in life. In biblical times and in the Jewish tradition today, during Sabbath celebrations and other festival meals hosts are encouraged to extend hospitality to guests and visitors outside the immediate family, particularly the poor (Tzedekah and hospitality, n.d.). Moreover, throughout His earthly ministry Jesus, literally and figuratively, invited both outcasts within the Jewish community and Gentiles who had previously been strangers to the God of Israel to fellowship with Him (i.e., Matthew 22: 1-14). As believers, we are called to strive for spiritual unity while recognizing and appreciating the uniqueness of each member of the Body (1 Corinthians 12:12-31). Inviting "others" in our midst to the anniversary celebration not simply as a nice and conciliatory gesture but as a reflection of a vital need all of us share is the goal that inspired this article.

Address correspondence to Natalia Yangarber-Hicks, Ph.D., Psychology Dept., Wheaton College, 501 College Ave, Wheaton, IL 60187-5593

The pursuit of integration between Christian faith and psychology in the last 50 years has produced much fruit despite the lingering lack of consensus regarding definitions of the integration enterprise, criteria for determining truth, and future directions (Hill & Kauffmann, 1996). Perhaps one area of agreement among the various stakeholders is that current and future generations of those committed to integration have much work left to do. Even a cursory survey of literature in the field suggests that important voices and perspectives on Christian psychology have either not made their way to or have been infrequent guests at the integration table (e.g., Canning, Case, & Kruse, 2001). This article is, first of all, an attempt to make room at the celebration for a few of these visitors and let them briefly share their stories. Additionally, it is my hope that after listening to their voices, we will seriously consider how to include these perspectives in the shaping of our daily integrative life and traditions, beyond extending hospitality to them for this special anniversary celebration. As Jacobsen and Jacobsen (2004) compellingly argued in their book *Scholarship and Christian Faith: Enlarging the Conversation*, "Dialogue with those with whom we disagree, or from whom we simply differ, provides ... a critical assessment of our academic work that, taken seriously, will help keep our scholarship honest, preventing us from mistaking our own views as unalloyed truth" (p. 78).

The contributors to the article represent various aspects of diversity, including disciplinary, cultural, and theological. It is important to note that the sampling of these contributors is not meant to be representative of all those who ought to be heard by the larger world of integration. However, the perspectives described in the next few pages are the ones that, for various reasons, have frequently been left out of important conversations by the mainstream community of Christian psychologists. Potential explanations for this absence range from longstanding ambivalence about considering the effects of cultural and other types of particularities on Christian identity (McNeil, 2005) to a lack of properly trained professionals representing certain types of integration (Grace & Poelstra, 1995) to prevalent fears of crossing over into unfamiliar and uncharted professional territory (see Porter, this article).

An examination of existing literature on integration suggests that clinical and counseling branches of psychology have received a disproportionate degree of attention. Vande Kemp (1998) stated that "one of the biggest weaknesses of contemporary protestant Christian psychology is its nearly exclusive emphasis on psychotherapy and the concomitant disinterest in general psychology" (p. 202). The need for a much broader understanding of integration has been expressed by experimental and clinical psychologists alike (i.e., Grace & Poelstra, 1995; Jones, 1996; Struthers, 2005) yet the work remains in its infancy. In part, the challenge posed to all subdisciplines of psychology by the recent explosion of neuroscientific research will require significant reflections and responses from Christians working in these areas (Beck, this issue; Struthers, 2005). The contribution by Charles Behensky in this article addresses these issues directly.

Historically, the roots of CAPS and the entire formal enterprise of integration go back to the Christian Reformed tradition, and its influence has significantly shaped theoretical and research foci of Christian psychology (Serrano, 2001). However, humility and reconciliation compel us to listen to and learn from diverse Christian traditions that our colleagues represent. We need their voices to challenge and broaden our vision in pursuit of our common goal of integrating psychology with faith. Several contributors to the article highlight for us spiritual traditions that have been largely underrepresented in the integration world. Specifically, Messianic Judaism remains an enigma to most evangelical Christians. Messianic Jewish voices are only beginning to be heard in Christian theology and integration; yet they represent an important and historically marginalized perspective for the larger Body of believers. Mitchell Hicks' contribution to the article highlights ways in which Messianic Judaism can enrich our integrative efforts. Furthermore, the visibility of Catholic psychologists was significant in the establishment of APA division 36 (see Plante, this article) yet contributions of Catholics to the integration discourse at CAPS have been limited. Thomas Plante reminds us that Catholicism has much richness to bring to the conversation. Similarly, explicitly Anabaptist perspectives have not been part of the mainstream integration dialogue until recently (see Dueck & Lee's [2005] book for a review of an Anabaptist vision of integration). Here, Cynthia Neal Kimball's comments give us an opportunity to consider it seriously.

Jenny Pak's piece on the importance of culture in understanding personhood challenges us to collaborate with other disciplines as we consider this crucial dimension of self. Additionally, Nicholas Gibson's reflections on the distinctive emphases of the integrative enterprise in the United Kingdom remind us of the need to broaden the scope of our work to international influences. Although the list of underserved populations that require psychological attention and integrative efforts is long and has been the focus of a previous issue of *JPC* (Winter 2002), in this article Kelly Flanagan and Sally Schwer Canning provide a rationale for expanding integrative efforts with children and suggest future directions for incorporating developmental frameworks into the entire integration field. Finally, Beck (this issue) pointed out the lack of sophisticated knowledge and use of biblical and theological material in integrative pursuits to date. In agreeing with his analysis that "we have not extensively involved biblical and theological scholars in our enterprise" (p. 328), Steve Porter's contribution, encouraging both theologians and psychologists to engage in integration, is an attempt to address this deficiency.

It is my hope and expectation that, as a community of Christian psychologists, we will be reminded to extend hospitality to diverse voices within our discipline. To conclude the article, Sally Schwer Canning's piece on hospitality as a metaphor for the provision of psychological care challenges us to integrate this rich Judeo-Christian

practice into our scholarly methodologies and all professional endeavors. Scriptures, Judeo-Christian tradition, and 50 years of experience as a formal organization teach us to appreciate our diverse gifts and callings while maintaining humility and unity. As we gather together for this 50th anniversary of CAPS, let us make room at the celebratory table for new visitors!

Cognitive Neuroscience and Integration (Behensky)

The field of cognitive neuroscience can generally be defined as a search for the neurological bases of thinking. Cognitive activity encompasses a wide range of function including, but not limited to perceptual abilities, movement, memory, language, attention, decision making, reasoning, and intelligence. The cognitive neuroscientist seeks to understand how the brain carries out these processes, though one can also examine how these processes operate under a variety of conditions. Developmentally, we can see a shift toward specialization of different brain regions. Clinically, we can examine how brain activity is altered by both neurological and psychological impairment. The latest sub-fields are affective and social neuroscience, emphasizing the importance that emotion and social context have on cognition.

This breadth in content is paralleled by the levels at which cognition can be studied. One can examine the individual neuron, clusters of neurons within a region of the brain, or the interaction between several regions within the brain. Additionally, the methods employed by those within this field vary considerably. Cellular and molecular methods examine the neuron and its components. We can ask how the presence of certain substances affects the chemical transmission within the brain. Staining methods can identify how different types of neurons are distributed throughout the brain and allow us to see how different brain regions are connected. Electrical recording techniques provide information on brain activity.

As one can see, the field is expansive in terms of content and methodology. There are few human behaviors that are entirely divorced from this field. This kind of coverage means that certain topics within the field will be more amenable to an integrative perspective than others. One can argue that by studying a creation made in the image of God, we are performing an act of worship. There is truth in that perspective,

but we would be remiss in ignoring the other contributions we can make. Humans are fallible beings. We place importance on rationality in decision making, but we often rely heavily on emotion. How are these emotional states manifested within the brain? How do these changes in brain activity affect other processes? For example, anger can cloud our perception and judgment. It can distort our very sense of morality and lead us to engage in behaviors we wouldn't normally consider. We can approach this from theological, behavioral, and social perspectives. Chapter 4 of Ephesians instructs us to get rid of anger, treating one another instead with kindness and compassion. Proverbs 29 describes anger as a path to sin. Yet it can develop very quickly, without foresight or intention on our part. We know how we should act, but that does not always mitigate our aggressive tendencies. A biological perspective can shed light on how these emotions and subsequent behaviors develop. What is it about anger that leads us to override our normal inhibitory processes?

Davidson, Putnam, and Larson (2000) describe a network of structures within the brain which may give rise to aggressive and violent behavior. They discuss this as a departure from our normal mode of emotional regulation and suggest neurological approaches to treatment. A Christian interpretation may prompt one to view this "malfunctioning" as a consequence of the fall. The barriers that separate us from God may be manifest in our neurological functioning. In striving to overcome those barriers, it may be necessary to understand and address our biological limitations. We can seek to view the person as a whole, understanding ourselves and our relationship with God on multiple levels. Our neurological functioning can then be viewed as the vehicle through which God's will operates within us. God has numbered all of the hairs on our heads; is there any reason to suspect that He has not done the same with the neurons inside our brains?

One challenge to pursuing an integrative perspective lies in the outward perceptions of the field. By definition, cognitive neuroscience seeks the biological substrates of behavior, thought, and emotion. This is often misinterpreted as a deterministic view of human existence. Finding a neurological basis for a particular phenomenon does not eliminate personal responsibility or free will. It is true that behavior arises from a biological mechanism; neurons within the brain become active, triggering the activity of additional neurons,

and so on until a behavior is produced. As I type these words, areas within the frontal cortex develop a concept I wish to communicate, language areas within the brain choose the particular words and place them in the proper sequence. This information is relayed to the motor cortex to produce the hand movements necessary to make the proper keystrokes. These signals are then relayed to the spinal cord and out through neurons controlling the muscular contractions of my hands and fingers. All the while, my eyes are constantly scanning the text and as this visual information is processed, I am making continuous comparisons with my original communicative intent. This is still the result of a particular intention on my part; an action in which I willfully engage.

One thing often missing from this perspective is an emphasis on how our own behavior and choices can affect the functioning of our brains. Our biological functioning shapes our behavior, but the relationship is not simply unidirectional. If I spend a month doing nothing but watching pornography, the changes in my brain will reflect it, as will my general views towards sexual behavior, women, and morality (Haman, Herman, Nolan, & Wallen, 2004; Karama et al., 2002; Malmuth & Check, 1985; Marshall, Seidman, & Barbaree, 1991). Alternatively, if I spend a month doing nothing but practicing to write with my left hand, there will be a shift in the functioning of my motor cortex. The choices we make have neurological consequences in addition to behavioral ones. There is a high degree of interdependence between the two.

Ultimately, cognitive neuroscience provides a richer understanding of our human experience. It is necessary, but not sufficient as an explanation. We gain an insight into the development of problematic behaviors and can view treatment as a way of altering our neural connections, without necessarily specifying the best approach. In pursuing an integrative perspective we hope to shed light on our own nature and identify what makes us unique as humans. We also seek to clarify our relationship with God, understanding what leads to our separation. In doing so, we can ask ourselves, "how do we lead lives that follow biblical principles and honor our Creator?" We must have a foundation that includes a thorough understanding of personhood upon which to base our theories. The findings of cognitive neuroscience can serve as one piece of this foundation. There is value to be found in several perspectives and

our task is to identify the points of commonality and determine how the findings of one field can complement and inform those of another.

The integration of Law and grace: A Messianic Jewish perspective (Hicks)

Though Messianic Judaism has existed for over two millennia, its manifestation as a modern-day movement began to flourish in the 1970s as Jews who had accepted Jesus as their Messiah became increasingly dissatisfied with the pressures from traditional Judaism and Christianity to repudiate their heritage (Kjaer-Hansen, 1996). While there exists significant variation in belief and practice, those committed to a Messianic Jewish vision tend to hold two basic things in common. First, they seek to follow Yeshua (Jesus in Hebrew) as the promised Jewish Messiah in a way that reflects traditionally Jewish forms of worship and observance (Robinson & Rosen, 2003). This often involves, but is certainly not limited to, the inclusion of traditional Jewish liturgy, celebrating Jewish holidays as defined by Leviticus 23 and Rabbinic tradition, and worship music taken from or inspired by traditional Jewish melodies. Second, those attending Messianic congregations are generally involved to some degree in activities that involve ministry to the Jewish people and to the State of Israel. Readers interested in a more in-depth analysis of the historical and cultural context of modern Messianic Judaism and accompanying self-identity issues should consult Yangarber-Hicks (2005) and Yangarber-Hicks and Hicks (2005).

Many have noted that replacement theology, or the doctrine that the Church has replaced Israel as the focus of God's work on earth, has had significant and arguably disastrous consequences (e.g., Soulen, 1996). Gruber (2005) has examined a number of the obvious and subtle implications of various techniques used by Christian theologians through the centuries to maintain this position. One example will be examined here to demonstrate how Messianic Jewish theology might enrich integrative pursuits.

A consequence of removing the Jewish influence from the interpretation of Scripture was to create what Gruber called an artificial demarcation between the "Old" and "New" Testaments.[2] One manifestation of this split is that the "outdated" Law of the Old Covenant and its supposed focus on justification through works is cast off by many Christian theologians, and is replaced

with a focus on the grace shown to humankind through our Messiah's sacrifice (Juster, 1995). Such a conclusion is not without its support in Scripture, such as when Paul notes that it is not through works but through grace that we are justified (2 Timothy 1:9). But when Yeshua himself was faced with the question of obedience to *Torah*, he responded that not the smallest Hebrew letter would pass away from the Law of Moses until *all* had been fulfilled (Matthew 5:18).

This artificial tension between the works of Torah and the grace of the Gospels, as well as other efforts to erase Jewish influence from Scripture, keeps the reader from appreciating the Scripture as a unified whole (Gruber, 2005). In a critique of this tendency, Gruber has suggested that a new understanding of the law may be required. Specifically, the regulations and sacrificial system for the atonement of sins detailed in Leviticus may be more properly conceived as a manifestation of the grace and love of God. Just as James admonishes the follower of Messiah that faith without works is dead (James 2:17), Jewish tradition does not make such sharp distinctions.

A reexamination of the demarcations between law and grace has begun within Christian theology. For example, Skarsaune (2002) has noted that Yeshua's ethical teachings were a summary of what was commanded in Torah; giving priority to the commands concerning the love of God and neighbor. "There was grace in the giving of the law, and true grace has inescapable principles" (Thompson, 2002, p. 7). Though the Torah will not serve us as a source for intrinsic righteousness, it is an authoritative guide when coupled with the power of our Messiah's atoning sacrifice and the direction of the Spirit (Juster, 1995).

What might this mean for the enterprise of integration of faith and psychology? If we abandon this artificial dichotomy between law and grace, it is possible that we will once again find principles relevant to maintaining a healthy relationship with God, our neighbors, and ourselves. One such principle from Torah that is quite important in Jewish tradition is remembrance. We are called to remember, in various ways and at various appointed times (e.g., feasts, celebrations, the Sabbath) throughout the year, God's rest after creation, sovereignty, blessings, provision, grace, and deliverance (Kasdan, 1993). Such observances draw us into fellowship with God as well as the broader community, thereby challenging the malignancies of the rampant materialism and individualism of Western culture. Future integrative efforts might fruitfully examine the psychological value of this principle at theoretical, empirical, and practical levels.

Though fairly new as a modern movement, Messianic Judaism has the potential of enriching our pursuit of an integration based upon an understanding of Scripture as a unified whole, revelation through the Spirit, empirical findings, and the art of clinical practice. One example of this contribution is a reexamination of the Law as a tree of life to those who approach it an expression of God's grace rather than a legalistic burden.

Catholicism and Psychology Integration (Plante)

The integration between professional psychology in the United States and Catholicism dates back to the early days of American Psychology. In fact, the Psychology of Religion Division (Division 36) of the American Psychological Association initially began as a group of Catholic psychologists and then later integrated psychologists from other religious traditions and denominations. The Roman Catholic Church is the oldest and largest organization of any kind in the world. Over 1 billion of the world's 6 billion people identify themselves as Catholic and about 25% of the American population claim to be Catholic. Although the Church is centered in the Vatican, approximately 80% of the Catholics in the world now live below the equator with the majority in Central and South America, Southeast Asia, and Africa. In previous centuries, Catholicism came to the United States with immigrants from mostly European countries such as Italy, Ireland, France, Poland, and Spain. Today, most new Catholics come from Asian countries such as Vietnam and the Philippines and from Latin America such as Mexico and El Salvador.

The Roman Catholic Church has received an enormous amount of press in recent years regarding the clergy sexual abuse crisis, implications from the novel and recently released major motion picture, *The Da Vinci Code*, the recent death of the popular Pope John Paul II and the subsequent election of the new Pope, Benedict XVI, the recent Vatican instruction concerning homosexual applicants to the priesthood, as well as many other social and cultural matters (e.g., gay marriage, abortion rights). It seems as if the Catholic Church is in the news, one way or

another, on a daily basis. The Church's official stand on contemporary and controversial social and political issues such as abortion, gay rights, divorce, stem cell research, euthanasia, contraception, and other topics chronically place the Catholic Church in the public imagination and in the major media outlets.

However, there is much more to the Catholic religious tradition and Church than what is stated in the news and in popular culture. The Catholic Church is a huge tent with people of many different points of view and perspectives. While some perspectives get a great deal of attention and air time, others that are just as valid, popular, and compelling, may not. Catholicism at its best focuses on the worship of God and of Jesus (who is believed to be both fully human and fully divine) through the ceremony and ritual of Mass, through regular prayer and reflection, and through community service. The Church, again at its best, focuses on the sacredness of life and on social justice issues such as a preferential treatment of the poor and marginalized of society.

Two very specific practices which may differ from other Christian traditions illustrate a unique contribution of Catholicism to the integration of faith with professional psychology. These include: (a) the role and influence of the saints; and (b) the Catholic view of priestly influence. First, the Catholic tradition generally highlights the communion of saints and may include study and prayer of and directed to particular saints for particular reasons. Thus, the examination of the life and legends surrounding saints such as St. Francis of Assisi, St. Claire, St. Ignatius, St. Jude, St. Patrick, St. Teresa, among so many others, and daily celebrations of saint feast days may be rather unique and distinctive in the Catholic tradition. The emphasis on this communion of saints serves to help others have spiritual and religious models as well as to provide inspiration and direction in living a more sanctified life. Research conducted by Bandura (1969, 1986) among others has clearly indicated that observational learning and modeling can be a powerful way to encourage behavior change. Integrating these saintly models into psychological services can be highly productive for many Catholics attempting to secure both models for living and spiritual inspiration. While Jesus serves as a model for all Christians regardless of denomination, saints serve as additional models for living a better life.

Second, unlike other Christian traditions, Catholic clergy primarily include men who take vows of chastity, obedience, and (among the religious orders) poverty. Catholic priests do not have wives, children, homes, or property in the same way that ministers do in other religious traditions. They are also expected to be fully obedient to their local bishop or religious superior who is expected to be fully obedient to the Pope. This vowed lifestyle as well as the hierarchy and centralized structure tends to create an image among many Catholics that priests, bishops, cardinals, and Popes are very different from rank and file Catholics, are perhaps much closer to God and to Truth than others, and have more power over "the flock" than perhaps most other spiritual leaders in other traditions. When these men of the cloth err or commit some offense, such as sexual abuse, the result can be devastating among victims and average Catholics.

In both examples, Catholics often "look up" to both saints and clergy in a way that might be more significant than in other traditions. This tendency may be productive and useful when these models are excellent examples to follow and to pattern one's own behavior after. For example, Mother Theresa of Calcutta was an excellent Catholic model who helped many to give much more fully to the poor and marginalized of society. However, the influence of individual and very human clergy may be too powerful for many Catholics which can result in destructive relationships, beliefs, and even abuse.

So what does this analysis suggest for the integration field as a whole? Perhaps because Protestants tend to deemphasize religious hierarchy, they may miss out on modeling after real yet more spiritually mature human beings. On the other hand, there are spiritual and psychological dangers involved in idealization. Religious leaders may use this tendency of the laity to idealize them to ultimately violate this sacred trust, develop narcissistic styles, and abuse power. Sadly, this may well have been the case with the recent clergy abuse crisis in the Catholic Church. Both sex offending clergy as well as religious leaders such as bishops abused the power and trust to get away with terribly egregious behavior in a way that may have been much more difficult in other religious traditions (Plante, 2004a, 2004b). However, the potential for healthy growth and change as well as toxic dependency involved in following leaders resides in all individuals and religious institutions. Future integrative efforts could examine this phenomenon more closely.

Obedience, Servanthood, Mutuality: An Anabaptist Challenge to Psychology (Kimball)

The second article of the *Confessions of Faith in a Mennonite Perspective* (General Board of Mennonite Church Canada and the Executive Board of Mennonite Church USA, 1995), among other things, stresses, "Jesus' obedience and suffering in his work of atonement, his humility and servanthood as the pathway to exaltation, the believers' experience of Christ in the community of faith, the integration of faith and ethics, and peace as central to the character of Christ. These themes belong to the heart of the gospel" (p. 15). An Anabaptist, or Radical Reformation, anthropology would agree with all Christian anthropologies that humans are not what they should be. However, an Anabaptist psychology differs from a contemporary Christian view in the way Jesus is seen, indeed, endorsed, as a primary source for fulfilled humanity and may guide the *telos* of human development (see Dueck & Lee (2005) for a thoughtful Radical Reformation challenge to psychology). As Finger (1989) writes, "... our study of Christ's work has shown that not only do human potentiality and goodness come to fulfillment in him. In opposition to him, human evil and sin reach their heights." (p. 67). As one can readily surmise, the themes of servanthood, obedience, and mutuality in relationship will be important to the Anabaptist psychologist. This is, of course, in direct contrast with contemporary clinical and developmental guides to self-fulfillment or self-actualization!

There is something undeniably profound in penetrating the purpose of the incarnation for understanding human flourishing. There are, therefore, several critical areas where an Anabaptist perspective may yield fruitful dialogue encouraging further understanding about the goal or ideal for human flourishing. Some of these areas include obedience, servanthood, and mutuality.

Jesus came to serve and show us true humanity. Psychology must deal with Jesus' call to serve. Jesus obeyed and served because he loved. His obedience and service did not impinge upon his strong sense of identity and purpose. Indeed, they flowed from his strong character, a character he self-reported as humble and gentle (Matt. 11:28-30). Christ grew in wisdom as he spent time with the elders in the temple (Luke 2:40-52); he relinquished the knowledge of the last days (Mark 13:32); he

emptied himself of power and wealth and became poor that we might become rich (2 Cor. 8:9); he served as a high priest who could understand our weaknesses and temptations (Heb. 4:15); and perhaps most profoundly, he suffered the cross and the separation from God (Matt. 27:46). Jesus Christ, by his very birth, life, and death, taught us about humanity and all believers are called to share in his obedience and servanthood. Yoder (1994) asserts that our imitation of Christ is bound up in the cross: "Servanthood replaces dominion, forgiveness absorbs hostility. Thus—and only thus—are we bound by New Testament thought to 'be like Jesus'" (p. 131). God desires to build within us an identity and a purpose that frees us to love and to serve him. This identity formation occurs within a community of servants, never alone.

We are made in and for relationship. This eschatological hermeneutic (and hence, an Anabaptist psychological integration) suggests a cohumanity or interrelatedness. Who we are as individuals is inextricably bound up with the individuality and characters of others. And yet we are not only products of our communities. We are uniquely selves in relation with other selves and that is a mystery of the *imago dei* and the *telos* of human flourishing.

Indeed, it is only in recognizing and receiving the love and service given to me that I learn to love and serve. We are called to love and serve within a serving community. Psychology and Anabaptist theology integrate naturally in their call for relationship, for example, in the participation of people in communities of mutual sharing and love (ecclesiology) and the profound identity formative role it plays, both individually and collectively. This theological anthropology, embodied in a living ethic, provides a mystery and a paradox which asserts that our true actualization emerges from authentic mutuality expressed in servanthood.

Developmental and clinical questions abound when positing these assumptions. How might we consider identity formation for the adolescent and young adult? Would Anabaptist values impact parenting/child-rearing attitudes and practices that would have differential effects on children's development (e.g., motivations, self-concept, pro-social behavior and moral reasoning, and social competency)? How might clinical outcome measures be impacted by a view on human flourishing that includes obedience, servanthood, and mutual relationships?

These are empirical questions that have significance for our contemporary quest in integration.

Integration of Psychology, Christianity and Culture: Expanding our Understanding of Humanity (Pak)

Since the turn of the century, scholars have been writing about culture, but the topic did not generate much attention in psychology prior to the 1960s (Jackson, 1995). By the early 1970s, multicultural counseling became a legitimate area of interest and the terms *cross-cultural* and *multicultural counseling* began to appear in the literature. A marked increase in publications related to acculturation and racial/ethnic identity came about in the 1990s as more studies included intragroup differences.

However, focus on cultural diversity and culture specific counseling became heavily criticized for perpetuating stereotyped images of cultural differences, oversimplifying a complex phenomenon into an externally focused cookbook approach (Speight, Myers, Cox, & Highlen, 1991), and a lack of conceptual clarity and unifying framework (Betancourt & Lopez, 1993; Ponterotto & Casa, 1991). Due to the sociopolitical origin of the topic, the concept of "culture" became synonymous with "minority" (Gelso et al., 1988) and there continues to be a heated debate on how constructs such as culture, race, and ethnicity should be defined.

Perhaps the most important critique is that the study of culture remains the domain of cross-cultural psychology and there is little collaboration between disciplines. Christian psychologists, for example, have been active in increasing our understanding of how psychology is relevant to Christianity and vice versa, but culture is often excluded from this discussion. This is unfortunate because the integration of psychology and Christianity has much in common with endeavors of cross-cultural psychology. Apart from the pragmatic need to make psychology applicable in both Christian and cross-cultural contexts, the integration of culture and spirituality involves expanding our understanding of human nature.

Various models of self development have been generated from the perspective of psychology and Christianity or psychology and culture. However, to date, little or no discussion has appeared in the literature that would offer a conceptual framework that takes into account various aspects of human development. Present models of identity development tend to be compartmentalized and one-dimensional and the multiple layers of identity such as gender, class, race, culture, and religion are rarely considered in terms of the functioning of the "whole" person or how these different areas intersect and interact to influence human motivation, personality, and behavior.

For instance, where culture, Christianity, and psychology seem to converge is at a point where we seek to understand how human values or worldviews shape an individual's perception, meaning, and choice. In multicultural literature, one widely discussed difference between Western and Eastern cultural views of self is that the former tends to emphasize individualism while the latter interdependence (Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1989). It may be an over-simplification of the model, but what is helpful for our discussion is that it suggests individuals with a different cultural upbringing and socialization may develop and organize self along different worldviews: individual-centered vs. relationship-centered. And, based on these two value orientations, individuals may hold different views about relationship, attitude, identity, and even thinking style (e.g., egalitarian vs. hierarchical; individual rights vs. duties and responsibilities; assertiveness and self-expression vs. respect for authority and obedience; personal ability and achievement vs. group status; analytical vs. global).

The following example may illustrate this phenomenon. Narrative analysis of two generations of Korean American women revealed that cultural values are very deeply ingrained and are a powerful motivation behind an individual's choice (Pak, 2006). For instance, based on traditional Confucian values, the Korean immigrant mothers' hard work in the U.S. is typically interpreted as a duty to her family, rather than an expression of an individual accomplishment. What is surprising to learn from the next generation of Korean American women's stories is that the motivation behind the daughters' achievement is still rooted firmly in the collectivistic rather than in the individualistic orientation. However, what seems to set the next generation of Korean American women apart from their mothers is that they want the freedom to make that choice. They may be willing to perform some of the traditional, nurturing, caretaker roles in the home, but they attach different meanings to them. These women's insistence on asserting their choice is a symbolic

means of exerting their power as co-equal partners in the marriage and family.

The integration of the two seemingly conflicting cultural values is not only necessary for psychological growth and development, but it is also required in order to reach maturity and wholeness in our Christian life. In the first two commandments (e.g., Matthew 22: 37-40), God lays out this principle by reminding us that we must: (a) love our God with all our heart, soul, and mind (i.e., vertical relationship with God requires individual-centered choice and response); and (b) love our neighbor as ourselves (i.e., a horizontal relationship with others requires a relationship-centered interdependence). Although certain cultures may stress one value system more than the other, either extreme can result in sin or dysfunction (e.g., narcissism, enmeshment, depression). For a healthy development of self, we need a balance of both "I" consciousness and "we" consciousness.

In the field of human sciences, we have a long tradition of each discipline (e.g., psychology, sociology, anthropology, theology) focusing only on its particular area of study with little integration. In the real world, however, individuals are multi-dimensional and various aspects of life interact to form dynamic, complex layers of meaning. In order to expand our present formulation of human nature, we must engage in open and creative dialogue with multiple disciplines. Moreover, because culture shapes how individuals organize and interpret meaning, Christian psychologists must attend not only to the spiritual, but also cultural values of individuals coming from different backgrounds in order to offer the most accurate understanding and intervention.

UK Perspectives on the Integration of Psychology and Christianity (Gibson)

At first glance, British efforts to integrate psychology and Christianity appear to lag by several decades behind those of their American cousins. Despite giving rise to such prominent integrationists as Leslie Weatherhead, Frank Lake, and Malcolm Jeeves, there is little sense that the UK has 50 years of sustained or programmatic integrative research to celebrate. Indeed, the British Association of Christians in Psychology (BACIP) will not celebrate its 50th anniversary until 2039 and has yet to move beyond supporting members in their personal integration into advancing the state of the field.

Closer inspection of contemporary British work on the interface of psychology and Christianity, however, reveals two distinctive approaches that could contribute to wider integrative efforts. One approach meets the challenge expressed by Porter (this article) to involve theologians and philosophers in the integration dialogue; the other considers how psychology of religion research may be carried out in a way that is both more sensitive to and more useful to Christianity as it is lived.

The dominant approach to the integration of psychology and theology in the UK has much in common with dialogical work on the interface of science and faith (cf. Polkinghorne, 1998; Watts, 1998). Rather than trying to subsume one discipline within another or merge them to create a "Christian psychology," the approach has been to set up a dialogue between theology and psychology at multiple points of interface. Besides the obvious interface between Christian pastoral care and mental health, each discipline can offer complementary perspectives to the other regarding non-clinical concerns. This approach is best exemplified by Fraser Watts' (2002) pioneering book *Theology and Psychology*. Here Watts considers how theological reflection on topics such as evolutionary psychology, consciousness, artificial intelligence, and the self can enrich psychological understandings of human nature and how psychological perspectives on doctrinal topics such as divine action, salvation history, and eschatology can enrich systematic theology. So, for example, our understanding of what Scripture means by hope in eschatological terms is enriched by considering psychological distinctions among hope, optimism, and wishing (cf. Averill, Catlin, & Chon, 1990). Other work in a similar dialogical vein has engaged with prayer (Watts, 2001), the interpretation of the Gospels (Watts, in press-b), and forgiveness (Watts & Gulliford, 2004).

This distinctive of British integration work reminds us of the importance of integrating the full scope of basic psychological theory and research with theology in all its breadth. While many people may first approach integrative issues from an applied perspective, there is no good reason why integration as a field should maintain its current lopsided focus on clinical and pastoral issues. Indeed, a willingness to deal with more fundamental issues on the interface of psychology and theology—and to do so in a way that is credible on both sides of the interface—is

necessary if applied integration is to move beyond Christian anthropologies often lacking in psychological and theological sophistication.

Watts and colleagues also take an unusually integrative approach to empirical work on the interface of psychology and Christianity. Their approach can best be characterized in terms of a three-way conversation between theoretical work, empirical data, and Christianity as it is actually lived. This conversation is mediated by hypothesis generation and testing on the one hand and by education on the other. It is important to note that this conversation includes crosstalk between theory and data from psychology of religion and theory and data from other subdisciplines of psychology, such as social cognition and cognition and emotion.

For example, one ongoing area of British work concerns religious cognition. A review of the social cognition literature regarding self and person schemas predicts that people hold multiple dynamic concepts of God that are flexible enough to tolerate internal conflict and that are affected by context (for review see Gibson, 2006, ch. 2). Further, a consideration of knowing God from the perspective of Christian experience suggests that knowledge about God can be held on a mere intellectual level or on a deeper, more influential, experiential level (Packer, 1975), a hypothesis that finds support in cognitive psychology and information processing modeling (Watts, in press-a; Watts & Williams, 1988). Seemingly ignoring what is predicted from basic psychological theory and a passing acquaintance with Christianity as it is lived, psychologists of religion have tended to rely on survey methods to measure God concepts and in so doing have made the over simplistic assumption that people hold a single concept of God that is without internal conflict and that is used at all times and in all situations (Gibson, in press). In revealing deficiencies in current measurement tools for God concepts, therefore, this dialogue among theory, data, and Christian experience led to the development of cognitive non-self report measures that seem able to distinguish between the cognitive processing of God-related material occurring at a propositional, doctrinal level ("head-knowledge" or "professed theology") and that occurring at an experiential, affective level ("heart-knowledge" or "lived theology") (Gibson, 2006).

This conversation between psychological data and Christianity as it is lived can also be continued by feeding back data to research and education within Church contexts. Going beyond a

focus on the psychology of counseling and therapy, British workers have drawn on psychological theory and data more broadly and applied it to the whole spectrum of work of the Church, including topics such as teaching and preaching, whole-life religious and spiritual development, and the social and organizational processes of church life. This approach is best exemplified by the applied psychology of religion textbook *Psychology for Christian Ministry* (Watts, Nye, & Savage, 2002).

The benefits of a dialogical approach to psychology of religion should be readily apparent and can enhance the entire integration field. Psychologically valid descriptions of Christianity as it is lived can enrich our understanding of how best to carry out Christian ministry in a broad range of contexts. In turn, a better understanding of religious processes in psychological terms can influence the development of more general psychological models.

Child Clinical Psychology and Integration (Flanagan & Canning)

With advances in integrative thought in the past 25 years and the acknowledgement of child clinical psychology as a specialization only eight years ago (Roberts & Sobel, 1999), we are poised to embark on an exciting exploration of integration within this specialty. However, despite several calls for increased theory, research, and practice of integration in child clinical psychology (e.g., Canning, Case & Kruse, 2001; Hathaway, 2003; Sisemore & Moore, 2002), the output in this journal has consisted of two articles subsequent to a special issue in 2003 dedicated to the topic. Perhaps there are few scholars specializing in this field or few who are interested in engaging in scholarship endeavors. It may also be that our approaches to integration have not lent themselves well to the kinds of considerations encountered through studying and interacting with children—namely, they have not been sufficiently developmental in nature.

Recent developments within child clinical psychology, namely that of developmental psychopathology, provide an opportunity to engage in a richer, more elaborated integrated conversation. Developmental psychopathology is concerned with normal adaptations across development, abnormal reactions to stress or adversity, and the relationship between normal and abnormal (Cicchetti & Cohen, 1995). This

framework evolved as a response to the tendency in clinical psychology to extrapolate knowledge from clinical practice and research with adults and apply, often ineffectively, theoretical and clinical models downward to children. It is our contention that a similar process has occurred within our approaches to integration, with rare and insufficient consideration being paid to developmental processes and differences. The absence of a developmental perspective ultimately undercuts our ability not only to fully understand difficulties in childhood from a Christian perspective but also to provide a richer understanding of development and change as it relates to clinical issues across the life span.

Those who engage in integration efforts recognize that theoretical models that do not incorporate the holistic nature of beings (with emotional, behavioral, cognitive, spiritual aspects) are reductionistic. This recognition is even more important in working with children who are a part of and affected by multiple systems (i.e., family, school and neighborhood, ethnicity, religion, culture). Developmental approaches allow and call for an exploration of the interaction of multiple aspects of the person and his or her environment across time. The core feature of development, that of change and growth, itself deserves our attention from a biblical worldview (de Oliveira, 2004), from both the perspective of creation and the fall. Such explorations could impact our understanding of the presentation and definition of both health and pathology. These facets of developmental psychology when coupled with abnormal psychology can be applied across the life span and enrich our integrative discourse. For example, within this approach we might better be able to explore how individuals can receive and experience God's redemption when faced with life's adversity across development and within the context of and in constant interaction with a fallen world.

There exist several examples within this journal of developmentally-sound integration work pertaining to child clinical psychology. For example, reviews of developmental considerations and empirical findings of (non)normative processes that are important for our understanding of psychopathology have been presented (Clements, 2004; de Oliveira, 2004; Hathaway & Barkley, 2003; Josephson, 1993; Passmore, 2004). Others have explored risk and protective factors, and the impact of psychopathology on children's spirituality with suggestions for how the religious community could help (Hathaway & Barkley, 2003; Passmore, 2004; Rondeau, 2003). Finally, developmentally appropriate tools within religious contexts and practical approaches to counseling have been developed (Hathaway, Douglas & Grabowski, 2003; Mauldin, Lough & Thurston, 2003; Sisemore, 2003).

These exemplars draw from theoretical and empirical literature on normative and maladaptive processes (e.g., dysfunctional family interactions, self regulation, identity development, spiritual formation) informed by various disciplines (e.g., developmental psychology, family theory, theology) to explore their topics and offer potential interventions. We wish to encourage further efforts such as: (a) appreciation for the ways in which a Christian appraisal of maturation and change might impact our theories and interventions with psychopathology and the promotion of coping with life's challenges; (b) the identification and analysis of the reciprocal influences of risk and protective factors over time that affect functioning (e.g., faith, forgiveness, or spiritual rebirth); and (c) an explicit, intentional incorporation of children's contexts in our theoretical and clinical models to structure our role in helping children, their caretakers, and other involved community members (e.g., creation of a hospitable context for families). In order to respond adequately to growing mental health needs, and those of children and adolescents in particular, an explicit recognition and evaluation of developmental considerations, in both normal and abnormal processes, from a Christian perspective is paramount.

Is Theology at the Table? (Porter)

I take it that there is not much question as to *whether* theology, and thus theologians, should be invited to the integration table. Indeed, one prevalent way of understanding the theoretical dimension of integration is that what we are attempting to integrate are psychological insights and theories with *theological* insights and theories. In other words, theology as a discipline appears to be inherent to what we mean by the term "integration." So the question is not so much *whether* theology should be a meaningful partner in the integration dialogue, but rather, *is* theology a meaningful partner in the integration dialogue? I will leave the reader to his or her own judgment, but my own observation is that when it comes to integrative endeavors, the psychological input far

outpaces and outweighs the theological input. In other words, my sense is that most integrative writings that grace our journals and bookshelves are often quite profound when it comes to psychological concepts and theory, but rather thin when it comes to theological concepts and theory. If this is an accurate assessment (of course, there are exceptions), what can be done to strengthen theology's role in the integration endeavor?

First, we need to intentionally recruit theologians and philosopher-theologians into the integration conversation. Most graduate schools of theology do not prepare theologians to do integration or even alert them to the existence of such an enterprise. Theology, like most modern disciplines, encourages specialization *within the field of study* and so the idea of taking one's field of study and engaging with data and concepts from a distinct discipline is a foreign notion. Nevertheless, I find many theologians (and many more philosopher-theologians) intrigued by the idea once they are shown that integration is a two-way street—that is, that integrating psychology with theology allows one to offer a fuller account of the matter in question (e.g., the nature of sin). So we need to be on the lookout for theologians and philosopher-theologians who might catch a vision for a career specializing in integration. Some of our undergraduate or graduate students in psychology who have a penchant for theology should be counseled to seek a terminal degree in theology—perhaps rather than psychology—in order to take up the theological side of the integration endeavor.

Second, evangelical theologians need to get out of the rut of highly specialized, narrowly focused biblical investigation and begin to offer comprehensive theological treatments of practical issues with at least an eye to psychological language, questions, and insights. Grudem (2000), a prominent evangelical systematic theologian, contends that most current work in evangelical theology deals with detailed, technical research (e.g., what does the Greek word χ mean?) that is rarely thoroughly applied to real-life problems. To the degree that this is true, this provides a major barrier to integration, for psychology's dialogue partner is not adequately prepared to enter into the discussion. To add to Grudem's point, when evangelical theologians do provide whole-Bible treatments of culturally relevant issues (e.g., gender), they rarely do so in meaningful interaction with non-theological

disciplines (e.g., psychology) that offer additional insights into the topic at hand. This leads to a theological/biblical exposition that is difficult for non-theologians (e.g., psychologists) to engage with, for the theological/biblical treatment is developed and put forward in a manner that gives the impression that what the Bible says on the matter is *all that there is to be said.* Theology will have a more prominent place at the integration table when theologians construct whole-Bible treatments of contemporary issues which are developed in light of psychological concerns and perspectives.

Lastly, psychologists with little or no training in theology need to be encouraged to try their hand at biblical and theological research. Based on a commitment to what is called the clarity or perspicuity of Scripture, Grudem (2000) is quite optimistic that thoughtful and careful biblical investigation by the non-theologian can lead to a fairly penetrating understanding of a biblical topic. But this optimism goes unrealized in the face of what Grudem calls "exegetophobia":

> For reasons I do not fully understand, within our lifetimes it seems to me a change has occurred whereby New Testament and Old Testament studies seem to the outsider to be so specialized that very few scholars outside those disciplines feel competent to interpret the Bible in any published article. They suffer from what we might call "exegetophobia"—the fear of publishing any written exegesis of their own, flowing no doubt from a conviction that they do not really understand any part of it, or that any understanding they have might be overthrown by specialists with technical knowledge unavailable to them. (p. 11)

While formal training in theology always helps and collaboration with a theologian is fruitful, one must never underestimate what can be accomplished with a study Bible, two or three good commentaries, and a Bible dictionary/encyclopedia. Of course, these tools need to be coupled with the same amount of energy and care that would be put into collecting and interpreting psychological data. But if we truly believe that in some sense Scripture is God's word about the matters it addresses and that Scripture addresses matters which have some overlap with and

import to psychological issues and concerns, then the motivation to do the required research will be there.

Perhaps the next frontier in integration is biblical and theological research. I say this because while there is much psychological theory and research being generated which is germane to theology, there is very little contemporary theology being generated of sufficient depth and richness to sustain a profitable integrative dialogue.

Moving the Feast, Changing the Menus, Sharing the Table: Implications of Traditional Hospitality Practice for Christian Psychological Care (Canning)

Theologians have recently reminded us that Christian "practices can be a generative focus for rigorous theological reflection" (Bass, 2002, p. 9). Historically-based Christian practices are relevant to Christian professional psychologists for several reasons. Practices are engaged in by communities, not just individuals, over time; they both preserve tradition and respond to changing conditions. They address fundamental human needs and conditions and are inextricably linked to our convictions, both reflecting our beliefs and helping to shape them through experience (Dykstra & Bass, 2002; Volf, 2002)

The practice of hospitality extended by Jews and early Christians provides a rich model of a faith-formed, community-based tradition of caregiving (Pohl, 1999). Hospitality, in the form of food and shelter within the home, was to be extended by the people of God to the alien, the orphan and the widow. Recipients were viewed wholly and as holy, not simply as carriers of needs to be met (Pineda, 1997). In the surrounding cultures, hospitality practices were built upon formal expectations of reciprocity and the worthiness of the recipient (Pohl, 1999). In contrast, believers were to welcome those who could offer least advantage to their host and who could not be expected to repay.

The foundation of this practice was God's unmerited hospitality to Israel, not social preservation or cohesion. Personal sharing with vulnerable strangers or fellows was to flow out of deep dependence and gratitude to the God who chose an undeserving people, brought them into covenant, delivered them from slavery, fed them with manna in the desert and gifted them with a land full of promise when they themselves had been strangers in a strange land.

Contemporary images of hospitality are of a practice that is homey, entertainment-focused, and confined predominantly to the immediate circle of a nuclear family. This image is a far cry from biblical accounts and would serve as a poor model for Christian psychological care. Stories of hospitality in the biblical narrative are often socially disorienting, even subversive, adding up to "hard work under risky conditions" (Pineda, 1997, p. 35). The "least of these" figure prominently in these stories, even as hosts—Rahab and the widow of Zarephath, to name two.

At the same time, biblical hospitality brings blessing and is transformative for both host and guest. This transformative quality and the element of surprise blur the line between roles in many of the stories. "Needy strangers turn out to be angels, beggars are somehow Jesus in disguise. Resources are in short supply yet miraculously sufficient..." (Pohl, 1999, p. 23). God manifests Himself through the host-guest encounter, revealing His character and providing unanticipated blessings for the participants.

Conclusion (Yangarber-Hicks)

As the previous piece suggests, the promise of personal transformation and blessing is given to hospitable hosts. I hope that the invitation to the "integration table" that *JPC* has extended to a few diverse perspectives in these pages is the beginning of richer and more inclusive conversations within CAPS for years to come. Whether we are in the position of guests or hosts, may all of us strive to learn from diverse colleagues in our midst.

Notes

1. After the primary author, all contributors to the article are listed alphabetically here, and in parentheses after the title of the section they have authored.

2. In fact, Gruber (2005) has taken issue with identifying these two sections of the Bible as "testaments" for two major reasons. First, a testament is "a last will, a solitary declaration of how to dispose of one's property after death" (p. 41). Obviously, we believe that God is very much alive and therefore is unlikely to provide a testament about anything. Gruber has made the argument that the appropriate term is "covenant," which is a proper translation of the Hebrew word *brit* found in Jeremiah 31:31-32 and the Greek word *diatheke* found in Hebrews 9:15-18. Second, this mistranslation dating back to the Latin Vulgate text has had the enormous impact of presenting "an imaginary conflict between the two parts. It fuels the illusion that Tanakh [Old Covenant], the foundational part of the

Scriptures, has passed away. And whereas the New Covenant is a demonstration of God's faithfulness to Israel, the 'New Testament' becomes for many a declaration that God has rejected [ethnic] Israel" (p. 41).

References

Averill, J. R., Catlin, G., & Chon, K. K. (1990). *Rules of hope.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Bandura, A. (1969). *Principles of behavior modification.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bass, D. C. (2002). Introduction. In M. Volf & D. Bass (Eds.), *Practicing theology: Beliefs and practices in Christian life* (pp. 1-9). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Berry, W. (1996). *Another turn of the crank.* Washington, D.C.: Counterpoint.

Betancourt, H., & Lopez, S. R. (1993). The study of culture, ethnicity, and race inAmerican psychology. *American Psychologist, 48,* 629-637.

Canning, S. S., Case, P. W., & Kruse, S. L. (2001). Contemporary Christian psychological scholarship and 'The least of these': An empirical review. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 20,* 205-223.

Cicchetti, D., & Cohen, D. J. (1995). Perspectives on developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D.J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology, Vol. 1: Theory and methods* (pp. 3-20). Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.

Clements, M. L. (2004). For the sake of the children: Effects of marital conflict in intact families. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 23,* 58-62.

Davidson, R. J., Putnam, K. M., & Larson, C. L. (2000). Dysfunction in the neural circuitry of emotion regulation – A possible prelude to violence. *Science, 289,* 591-594.

de Oliveira, E. A. (2004). A reformed evangelical approach to developmental psychology and the Bible. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 23,* 12-21.

Dueck, A., & Lee, C. (Eds.) (2005). *Why psychology needs theology: A radical-reformation perspective.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Dykstra, C., & Bass, D. C. (2002). A theological understanding of Christian practices. In M. Volf & D. Bass (Eds.), *Practicing theology: Beliefs and practices in Christian life* (pp. 13-32). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Finger, T. (1989). *Christian theology: An eschatological approach* (Vol. II). Scottdale: Herald Press.

Gelso, C. J., Betz, N. E., Friedlander, M. L., Helms, J. E., Hill, C. E., Patton, et al. (1988). Research in counseling psychology: Prospects and recommendations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 16,* 385-406.

General Board of Mennonite Church Canada and the Executive Board of Mennonite Church USA (1995). *Confession of faith in a mennonite perspective.* Scottdale: Herald Press.

Gibson, N. J. S. (2006). The experimental investigation of religious cognition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England.

Gibson, N. J. S. (in press). Measuring God images. In G. L. Moriarty & L. Hoffman (Eds.), *God image handbook: Research, theory, and practice.* Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press.

Grace, C. R., & Poelstra, P. L. (1995). Excellence in pedagogy: Some obstacles to integration for the Christian psychology professor. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 23,* 237-243.

Gruber, D. (2005). *The separation of Church and faith (vol. 1: Copernicus and the Jews).* Hanover, NH: Elijah Publishing.

Grudem, W. (2000). Do we act as if we really believe that "the Bible alone, and the Bible in its entirety, is the Word of God written"? *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 43,* 5–26.

Haman, S., Herman, R. A., Nolan, C. L., & Wallen, K. (2004). Men and women differ in amygdala response to visual sexual stimuli. *Nature Neuroscience, 7,* 411-416.

Hathaway, W. (2003). Integration in clinical child psychology: Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 22,* 99-100.

Hathaway, W., & Barkley, R. A. (2003). Self regulation, ADHD, and child religiousness. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 22,*101-114.

Hathaway, W., Douglas, D., & Grabowski, K. (2003). Faith situations questionnaire: Childhood normative data. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 22,*141-154.

Hill, P. C., & Kauffmann, D. R. (1996). Psychology and theology: Toward the challenges. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 15,* 175-183.

Jacobsen, D., & Jacobsen, R. H. (2004). *Scholarship and Christian faith: Enlarging the conversation.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, M. L. (1995). Multicultural counseling. In J. G. Ponterotto, J. M. Casas,L. A. Suzuki, & C. M. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of multicultural counseling* (pp. 3-15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jones, S. L. (1996). Reflections on the nature and future of the Christian psychologies. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 15,* 133-142.

Josephson, A. M. (1993). The interactional problems of Christian families and their relationship to developmental psychopathology: Implications for treatment. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 12,* 312-328.

Juster, D. (1995) *Jewish roots: A foundation of Biblical theology.* Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image Publishers.

Karama, S., Lecours, A.R., Leroux, J., Bourgouin, P., Beaudoin, G., Joubert, S., et al. (2002). Areas of brain activation in males and females during viewing of erotic film excerpts. *Human Brain Mapping, 16,* 1-13

Kasdan, B. (1993). *God's appointed times: A practical guide for understanding and celebrating Biblical holidays.* Clarksville, MD: Messianic Jewish Resources, Intl.

Kjaer-Hansen, K. (1996). Neither fish nor fowl? In K. Kjaer-Hansen (Ed.), *Jewish identity and faith in Jesus* (pp. 9-18). Jerusalem: Caspari Center.

Malmuth, N. M, & Check, J. V. P. (1985). The effects of aggressive pornography on beliefs in rape myths: Individual differences. *Journal of Research in Personality, 19,* 299-320.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implication for cognition,emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224-253.

Marshall, W. L., Seidman, B. T., & Barbaree, H. E. (1991). The effects of prior exposure to erotic and nonerotic stimuli on the rape index. *Annals of Sex Research, 4,* 209-200.

Mauldin, J., Lough, J., & Thurston, N. (2003). "You are special": Shame and grace in children's literature. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 22,*155-159.

McNeil, J. D. (2005). Unequally yoked? The role of culture in the relationship between theology and psychology. In A. Dueck & C. Lee (Eds.), *Why Psychology Needs Theology: A Radical-Reformation Perspective* (pp. 140-160). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Packer, J. I. (1975). *Knowing God.* London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Pak, J. H. (2006). *Korean American Women: Stories of acculturation and changing selves.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Passmore, N. L. (2004). Adoption and the father heart of God: Helping adoptees deal with issues of identity and loss. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 23,* 165-175.

Pineda, A. M. (1997). Hospitality. In D. C. Bass (Ed.), *Practicing our faith: A way of life for a searching people* (pp. 29-42). San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons.

Plante, T. G. (Ed.). (2004a). *Sin against the innocents: Sexual abuse by priests and the role of the Catholic Church.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Plante, T. G. (2004b). Bishops behaving badly: Ethical considerations regarding the clergy abuse crisis in the Roman Catholic Church. *Ethics and Behavior, 14,* 67-73.

Pohl, C. D. (1999). *Making room: Recovering hospitality as a Christian tradition.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Polkinghorne, J. (1998). *Belief in God in an age of science.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ponterotto, J. G., & Casa, J. M. (1991). *Handbook of racial/ethnic minority counseling research.* Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Roberts, M. C., & Sobel, A. M. (1999). Training in clinical child psychology: Doing it right. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28,* 482-489

Robinson, R., & Rosen, R. (2003). The challenge of our Messianic movement—part 2. *Havurah, 6* (3).

Rondeau, H. (2003). Our lost children: Bipolar disorder and the church. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 22,*123-130.

Serrano, N. (2001). A history of the Christian Association of Psychological Studies: 1954-1978. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Wheaton College, Wheaton, IL.

Sisemore, T. A. (2003). Christian counseling for children: The five domains model. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 22,* 115-122.

Sisemore, T. A., & Moore, R. L. (2002). Embracing the call to the least of these: Welcoming children in Jesus' name. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 21,* 318-324.

Skarsaune, O. (2002). *In the shadow of the temple: Jewish influences on early Christianity.* Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.

Soulen, R. K. (1996). *The God of Israel and Christian theology.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Speight, S. L., Myers, L. J., Cox, C. I., & Highlen, P. S. (1991). A redefinition of multicultural counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 70,* 29-36.

Struthers, W. M. (2005). Snark or Boojum? Trends in the integration of psychology and Christianity. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 24,* 195-209.

Thompson, M. B. (2002). *The new perspective on Paul.* Cambridge, UK: Grove Books Limited.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review, 96,* 506-520.

Tzedekah and hospitality (n.d.). Retrieved May 29, 2006 from http://www.shemayisrael.co.il/publicat/hazon/tzedaka/Tzedakah_and_Hospitality.html

Vande Kemp, H. (1998). Christian psychologies for the twenty-first century: Lessons from history. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 17,* 197-209.

Volf, M. (2002). Theology for a way of life. In M. Volf & D. Bass, (Eds.), *Practicing theology: Beliefs and practices in Christian life* (pp. 245-263). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Watts, F. N. (Ed.). (1998). *Science meets faith: Theology and science in conversation.* London: SPCK.

Watts, F. N. (Ed.). (2001). *Perspectives on prayer.* London: SPCK.

Watts, F. N. (2002). *Theology and psychology.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate.

Watts, F. N. (in press-a). Implicational and propositional religious meanings. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion.*

Watts, F. N. (Ed.). (in press-b). *Jesus and psychology.* London: Darton, Longman and Todd.

Watts, F. N., & Gulliford, L. G. (Eds.). (2004). *Forgiveness in context: Theology and psychology in creative dialogue.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Watts, F. N., Nye, R., & Savage, S. B. (2002). *Psychology for Christian ministry.* London: Routledge.

Watts, F. N., & Williams, J. M. G. (1988). *The psychology of religious knowing.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Yangarber-Hicks, N. (2005). Messianic believers: Reflections on identity of a largely misunderstood group. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 33,* 127-139.

Yangarber-Hicks, N., & Hicks, M. W. (2005). Messianic believers: Exploratory examination of cultural identity and psychotherapy experiences. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 24,* 219-232.

Yoder, J. H. (1994). *The Politics of Jesus* (2nd Ed). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Authors

Charles Behensky, PhD is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Hope College in Holland, MI.

Sally Schwer Canning, PhD is Associate Professor of Psychology at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL.

Kelly Schimmel Flanagan, PhD is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL.

Nicholas J. S. Gibson, PhD is Assistant Research Coordinator of the Psychology and Religion Research Group at the University of Cambridge in England.

Mitchell W. Hicks, PhD is Assistant Professor of Counseling and Human Services at Roosevelt University in Schamburg, IL.

Cynthia Neal Kimball, PhD is Associate Professor of Psychology at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL.

Jenny H. Pak, PhD is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Rosemead School of Psychology/Biola University in La Mirada, CA.

Thomas Plante, PhD is Professor and Chair of Psychology at Santa Clara University in Santa Clara, CA.

Steven L. Porter, PhD is Assistant Professor of Philosophy and Theology at Talbot School of Theology/Biola University in La Mirada, CA.

Natalia Yangarber-Hicks, PhD is Assistant Professor of Psychology at Wheaton College in Wheaton, IL.