

A Biblical Evaluation of Integration Models

통합 모델들의 성경적 평가

유 재 인
(상담학)

초록(Abstract)

본 소고는 통합 모델의 성경적 평가를 연구하는 것이다. 신학과 심리학의 통합은 상담학 분야에 있어서 가장 뜨거운 이슈중에 하나이다. 대부분의 상담가들은 통합의 이슈에 관심을 가지고 있다. 많은 사람들은 신학과 심리학을 통합하는 것을 시도해 왔다. 또한 통합의 과정 속에서 어떤 갈등과 문제고 있다는 것은 사실이다. 이러한 의미에서 성경적인 통합 모델에 대해 고찰해 보는 것은 가치있는 일이다. 즉 본 소고의 목적은 통합 모델들을 성경적으로 연구하고 평가하는 것이다.

먼저 통합 모델을 위한 일반적인 기초를 이해하는 것은 중요하다. 이러한 의미에서 필자는 1장에서 통합 모델의 개념을 다루었다. 통합의 개념 특히 이 용어는 여러가지 다양한 방식들과 많은 목적들로 사용되었다. 왜냐하면 심리학과 신학이 분리되어야 한다는 것과 심리학과 신학을 인위적으로 함께 제시되어야만 한다는 의미가 있기 때문이다.

2장과 3장에서, 필자는 통합의 본질과 범위를 다루었다. 물론 통합의 본질에 있어서는 다양한 질문이 있음에 틀림 없다. 예를들면, 신학은 심리학에 대해 무엇을 말해야 하는지? 학자들은 통합의 본질과 관련하여 다른 의미들을 가지고 있다. 신학과 심리학 사이에는 기본적인 다른 차

이점들이 있다. 다른말로 하면, 신학과 심리학은 그들 자신의 고유한 요소들을 가지고 있다는 것이다.

4장에서, 필자는 통합 모델들에 대해 고찰 하였으며, 비록 많은 통합 모델들이 있지만 필자는 단지 3가지 통합 모델들을 다루었다: 환원주의자 모델, 수정주의 모델, 그리고 전인주의 모델. 필자가 환원주의와 수정주의 모델을 설명할 때 필자는 그들을 세속적인 측면과 신학적인 모델에 근거해서 비교할 것이다. 또한 필자는 전인주의 모델을 인간의 본질과 관련하여 다루었다.

마지막 장에서, 필자는 통합 모델들을 중요한 세 가지 입장에서 평가했다. 먼저 성경은 인간의 모든 필요들을 채워 주기에 충분하다는 입장이다(딤후 3:16-17, 벵후1:4; 3:14-18.)이고, 둘째로, 심리학은 그릇된 과학이라는 논쟁, 그리고 셋째로, 통합이라는 것은 혼합 또는 혼합주의 라는 것이다.

This essay is a study of the biblical evaluation of integration models. The integration of theology and psychology is one of the hottest issues in counselling. Most counsellors are interested in the issue of integration. Many people have attempted to integrate theology and psychology. Also, it is true that there are some conflicts in the integration process. In this sense, it is worth considering a biblical view of integration models. The goal of this essay is to study and evaluate the integration model biblically.

To begin with, it is important to understand the general foundation for integration models. In this sense, I dealt with the definition and models of integration in section I. The concept of integration is specially used in many kinds of ways and many object to this term. The reason is that it implies that one's psychology and theology are separated and must be artificially brought together.

In section II and III, I dealt with the nature of integration and the scope of integration. There can be various questions in the nature of integration. For instance, "What theology has to say to psychology?" In the nature of integration, scholars have different meanings regarding the nature of integration. There are primary differences between theology and psychology. In other words, both theology and psychology have their own unique factors.

In section IV, I examined integration models. Even though there are many integration models, I just dealt with three integration models: The Reductionist Model, Revisionist, and Wholists. When I explain the Reductionists model and Revisionist, I compare them to the secular and theological model. Also, I dealt with the Wholists model regarding the nature of humanity.

In the last part, I evaluated integration models with respect to the three important perspectives. Firstly, the Bible declares itself to be sufficient to meet all human needs, as seen in 2Timothy 3:16-17, and 2Peter1:4; 3:14-18. In other words, the Bible is an essential foundation for a Christian approach to psychotherapy and is very relevant to this area. Secondly, the argument that psychology is a bad science. Thirdly, integration is amalgamation or syncretism.

주제어: 심리치료, 통전적 전인성, 통합 모델들, 환원주의자 모델, 수정주의자 모델, 전인적 모델

Key words: psychotherapy, Holistic Wholeness, Integration models, Reductionist, Revisionist, Wholists

Introduction

It is true that the issue of integration theology and psychology is one of the main concerns in the counselling field. Most counsellors and psychotherapists are interested in the integrative issue. Many people have researched integration models. Also, it is true that there are various integration models such as the reductionist model, revisionist, and wholists.¹ It worth considering a biblical evaluation of integration models. The goal of this essay is to understand and evaluate the integration model biblically.

I. Definition

Before looking at integration models, it is necessary to examine general foundations for integration models such as the concept of integration and scope of integration. First of all, what is 'integration'? There are many different meaning of the term integration.

The concept of integration is used in a variety of ways and many object to this term, because it implies that one's psychology and theology are separate and must be artificially brought together.

According to Ellison, integration has to do with "psychology and Christianity" and Malony referred to integration in terms of "wholeness and holiness"² Finch also variously mentioned "Christian psychology," "Christian existential therapy," "Psychology and Christianity," and "Psychology and theology" as well Collins also referred to the objects

of integration as "Psychology and theology," "psychology and Christianity," and "psychology and religion".³ On the other hand, Carter and Narramore, more like Collins, referred to "the integration of psychology and theology" as well as to the relationship between "Christianity and psychology." They only tried to maintain their basic conception of integration which involved "wrestling with the relationship between the finding of psychology and the revelation of the Bible".⁴ As examined above, it is true that the word 'integration' is used variously. I will use 'integration' in terms of theology and psychology in this paper.

II. The nature of integration

The integration may be viewed as the attempt to bring our faith confession to bear on our chosen profession. There can be many kinds of questions in the integration of psychology and theology. For example, "What does theology have to say to psychology?" "What difference does belief in God make in the way a psychotherapist assists a troubled individual or community such as family?"

On the other hand, Christians can ask what contribution can the profession of psychology make to theology and the ministry of the Church? How can one share the Good News without considering seriously the nature of human need? In this perspective,(one of the natures of integration is that) one aspect of integration is an attempt to respond to these questions.

However, different scholars have different meanings regarding the nature of integration. According to Guy, "the task of integration psychology

¹ Graham Barker, *Integral studies* (Sydney: Wesley Institutes publishing, 1999).

² Steve Bouma Prediger, "The Task of Integration: A modest Proposal", *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, Vol. 18, 1995.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid.

and theology can be described as the search for ultimate truth concerning the nature of human existence and behavior.” Farnsworth added, “Integration is the conceptual relation of findings that are based on sound methodologies, and the application of these findings in one’s life-embodied integration”.⁵ Gary R. Collins comments following: Integration is an emerging field of study. It seeks (1) to discover and comprehend truth about God and his created universe by scientific methods(including empirical , clinical, and field observations) and the hermeneutically valid principles of biblical interpretation, (2) to combine such findings, when possible, into systematic conclusions, (3) to search for ways of resolving apparent discrepancies between findings, and (4) to utilize the resulting conclusions in a way which enables us to more accurately understand human behavior and more effectively facilitate the changes which help individuals move towards spiritual and psychological wholeness.”⁶

I agree with Collins’ opinion because God created man in the image of God as whole person. In short, the nature of integration is a holistic attempt to interrelate various elements from the one real world on the basis of truth given to us by God, through study of the Bible, human life and history (Stephen M. Clinton 1990).⁷

III. The scope of integration

Basically, there are primary differences between theology and psychology. For example, theology begins with God’s self-revelation in Scripture, nature and history, whereas psychology usually begins with human

⁵ Stephen M. Clinton, “A Critique of Integration Models”, *Journal of psychology and Theology*, Vol. 15, 1996.

⁶ Ibid.,17.

⁷ Ibid.

behavior as observed by other people. This difference sets the two disciplines apart in both method and starting point.⁸

First of all, it is true that the unity of truth and epistemology is one of the important issues in scope of integration. The unity of truth raises the question as to how we know things. Epistemology is therefore the common ground. In this area, knowledge with wisdom is one of the important factors. Because knowledge with wisdom creates freedom and knowing without wisdom can become idolatry.

The second factor is the Scripture as a source of truth. The Scripture as a source of truth can be examined in terms of four relationships. That is, regarding man’s relationship to God, man’s relationship to man, man’s relationship to creation, and man’s relationship to him/herself.

Thirdly, integration will be dealing with psychology as a source of truth when it does not contradict Scripture and it is consistent with Scripture. In addition, truth as an attribute of God is also an important factor. All truth contains some data about God. For example, the closer one moves toward special revelation the more certain one is of sourcing truth. At any rate, the issue of the scope of integration can influence the relationship between theology and psychology in the integration process.

IV. Models of integration

There are various integrative models. Eck (1996) has written a helpful summary of 27 models of integration, organizing them into three major paradigms: the non-integrative, the manipulative, and the non-manipulative.⁹

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Tan Siang-Yang, “Integration and Beyond: Principled, Professional, and Personal,” *Journal*

Whereas Carter (1996) emphasized that there are four basic approaches academically to integration: Christianity against psychology, Christianity of psychology (usually held by those of a liberal theological persuasion), the parallels model (Christianity and psychology are both seen as equally important but essentially separate fields), and Christianity integrates Psychology.¹⁰ According to Steve Bouma-Prediger, he proposes a typology of four different kinds of integration. That is, interdisciplinary, intradisciplinary, faith-praxis, and experiential integration.¹¹ Dr. Graham Barker also divided into three classes, models of integration: The reductionist model, revisionists, and wholists.¹² In this paper, I will examine with priority given to Graham Barker's view.

1. The Reductionist Model

There is an inherent conflict between psychology and Christianity. The reductionist model can be divided into two reductionist views: secular reductionists and theological reductionists.

Secular reductionists deny the spiritual as well as insist irrelevance of faith. Their treatment involves removing faith. In short, psychology reductionists insist that theology is unhealthy at all. Freud, Ellis and Skinner belong to this secular reductionist group.

Whereas theological reductionists emphasize the superiority of special revelation. Spiritual reductionists treat scientific psychology as hostile. In other words, science is hostile to faith or Scripture. In short, spiritual

reductionists insist psychology as a science is hostile. They believe that psychology promotes unbiblical behaviours. J. Adams is one of the theological reductionists. According to Adams, "why do people have emotional problems?" Adams explains with two answers: organic or sin (Lawrence J. Crabb). This means that pathology is either organic or sin.

A major current need is for some reversals of reductionism and healing of some of the dichotomies into more holistic, integrative models that can accommodate more than one model of thought and practice, while not losing the benefits that the limited scope of modernity research can provide when properly applied.¹³

This model has several problems. The first problem is that defensiveness that excludes communication and therefore a lack of understanding of other positions. The second problem is limits the source of truth to one revelation modality. Thirdly, this model produces a view of sin that is restricted to behaviours (cf. 1 Sam. 16:7). The fourth problem is that it reduces the reality of life to a narrow band. Another problem is that 'scientism' argues that science is the only way to knowledge therefore disregarding scriptural models.

2. Revisionists

Revisionists recognize the validity of both psychology and theology but modifies the contents to justify its position is called.

Secular versions of revisionism regard religion like any other discipline. In other words, religion can be a positive or negative thing for humanity

of Psychology and Christianity, Vol. 20, 2001.

¹⁰ Ibid..19.

¹¹ Steve Bouma Prediger, op. cit, 21.

¹² Graham Barker, *Integral studies* (Sydney: Wesley Institutes publishing, 1999).

¹³ John A. Ingram, "Contemporary Issues and Christian Models of Integration: Into the Modern/Postmodern Age", *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, Vol. 23. 1995.4.

depending on its usage. Secular versions help promotion of the benefits of 'holistic being' as man is a spiritual, moral being. Proponents of secular versions are Fromm, Jung, May and Mowrer etc.

Secular versions recognize that religion has value as myth and symbolism such as hope and sacrifice motifs. In other words, theology has many kinds of positive ideas. For instance, healthy (vs unhealthy religion), tolerance of all faiths (vs promotes sin and guilt), protection of the habitat (vs holds to authoritarian absolutes) and promotes the unity of mankind (vs promotes exclusivity) etc. They treat the Bible as one of many sacred texts. It is more beneficial in promoting healthy living relationships. In short, religion is seen as means not an end. In addition, syncretistic natural reductionism willing to absorb from religion if not challenging.

Sacred (Holy) versions of revisionism tend to be dominated by a more liberal, existential theology. A priority is given to the behavioral sciences and psychological theory. There is no credence given to any "supernatural" phenomena. The focus of sacred versions is only upon the humanitarian aspects of faith such as love, freedom and responsibility.

Theological revisionists consider that sin and separation and personal salvation are redefined. These are often viewed as offensive and discriminatory. They also tend to promote psychological schools as though they are Christian. They revise and absorb scriptural tenets into theories and then label them 'Christian' such as early Crabb.

Orthodox Christian meaning are replaced with psychological constructs. For example, James and Savary insist as follows:

The energy channelled to the three ego states by the Inner Core is a positive personal force- a Power for good and growth. We term the force the power within. Others may prefer to call the source of this inner power God, Spirit, Nature, Ground of Being or some other

name. Paul the Apostle was referring to this power within when he asked, "Do you know that God's Spirit swells in you"? to describe the Power Within, Jesus used the water -of -life symbol. "If anyone thirsts," he said, "let him come to me and drink." As Scripture says, from within him will flow rivers of living water ... people never need to run out of this inner power since its source is the divine power creatively pulsing deep down with everything in the universe.¹⁴

Many revisionists follow the analytical models of psychoanalysis, particularly the model of Carl Jung. For example, the symbolic approach seeks balance between the conscious and the unconscious. Scott Peck, John Sanford, and S. Hiltner are examples of revisionists.

3. Wholists

The major integrative issue of wholists is the nature of man. There are several premises in the model of wholists. The first premise is unity of truth in world and Word. The second premise is unity of human. Human was made in the image of God. This means special creation, moral agency, and inherent by God. However, human is fallen and human has marred the image of God. Personal and corporate sin is the result. Therefore, human is a contradiction in theological terms. The sin of human affects all of human. The third premise is the fallibility of human, his methods and his interpretations. The fourth premise is that the Holy Spirit is essential to know truth. Lastly, neither psychology nor theology is complete sciences. Generally, sacred wholists hold to the five premises. In addition, in the role of therapy, the role is one of

¹⁴ James, M. and Savary M., *The power at bottom of well: transactional analysis with a biblical perspective* (NY, USA : Harper & Row, 1974), 20.

the reconciliation: human to God, human to self, human to human, and human to world.

According to Benner, he proposes that psychotherapy and spirituality are two inseparable aspects of personality. Moreover, he emphasizes the unity of the psychological and spiritual reality- there is a “deep interdependence” between these -are aspects of human personality and they are on a “psychospiritual continuum.”¹⁵ Modern psychotherapy occupies a domain of human experience which is very close to pastoral care and spiritual guidance.

However, there are limitations in this model of integration. Interpretation of the truth is limited by human imperfection. Thus, there are potential errors in the way both theologians and psychologists present the picture of our world.

V. Evaluation of integration models

It is true that various integration models have been presented regarding the process of integration. I have discussed three models: The Reductionists model, Revisionists, and Wholists. However, there are some dangers and limitation in the process of integration.

The process of integration is complicated in part because in many areas, and especially in psychology, adequate scholarship requires interacting with scientific theories and clinical models that are questionable from a Christian standpoint.¹⁶ A better approach would be a biblical or scientific

humanism which would apply the best of biblical and secular truth to enhance understanding of redeemed “new creatures in Christ” (2 Cor. 5:17).¹⁷

Jones and Butman (1991) mention that there are several core arguments that have been advanced against the integration of theology and psychology. Firstly, the Bible declares itself to be sufficient to meet all human needs such as 2 Tim 3:16-17 and 2 Peter 1:4; 3:14-18).¹⁸ I disagree with the argument that psychologists should not study anything other than the Bible in order to meet human needs, that Scripture is the only resource needed for effective counseling. Because the truths of psychology are not as trustworthy as the truths of Scripture, that does not invalidate those truths. Furthermore, the observations of secular psychologists are not invalid simply because he or she is an unbeliever.

Therefore, the Bible is an essential foundation for a Christian approach to psychotherapy and is very relevant to this field. While the Bible provides us with life’s most important and ultimate answers as well as the starting points for knowledge of the human condition, it is not an all-sufficient guide for the discipline of counseling.¹⁹ It is absolutely true that the Bible is inspired and precious, but it is also a revelation of limited scope, the main concern is its presentation of God’s redemptive plan for his people and the great doctrines of the faith.²⁰

Secondly, the argument that psychology is bad science. Christians, such as Adams, who recognize this premises think of Scripture against

¹⁵ David Benner (ed.), *Care of Soul: Revisioning Christian Nurture and Counsel* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2004), See, David Benner (ed.), *Psychology and Religion* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1988),

¹⁶ Stanton L. Jones & Richard E. Butman, *Modern Psychotherapies* (Downer's Grove: IVP, 1001), 23.

¹⁷ John A. Ingram, “Contemporary Issues and Christian Models of Integration: Into the Modern/Postmodern Age”, *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, Vol. 23. 1995.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

psychology. In other words, the holder of one view dismisses the other as being harmful and/or irrelevant.²¹ Psychology is not necessarily ‘bad science’. Christians should carefully look at any way of knowing that helps us better understand the human condition, even if that way of knowing does not conform to some narrow definition of “good science.” On the other hand, Christians should acknowledge that some areas of psychotherapy are not good science, or good reason, or good intuition or anything else; they are rather examples of slipshod argumentation and speculation.²² In some cases, Christians need to use different methods and theory of psychology. Also, Christians need to develop new theories to incorporate the useful insights from secular theories.

The third argument is that integration is amalgamation or syncretism. This position assumes that psychotherapy systems are religious systems and the second position is that “the goal is to integrate or amalgamate the truth of Scripture with the so-called truth of psychology to produce a hybrid that is superior to the truth of each.”²³ However, if Christianity depends on psychotherapy or psychology too much, there can be danger in Christianity.

Psychology and theology are both vulnerable to error because of human fallibility. Thus theology does not necessarily have functional authority over psychology (if the two are in conflict, but the theological inquiry was done poorly). Theology is more dependable than psychology because of the object of its inquiry, the Bible.²⁴ If a process of integration is holistic and includes the Bible along with psychology and other disciplines

it has a good chance of synthesizing all truth without systematic bifurcation. The human investigators are alike in their pursuit of truth, and the fields are only functionally diverse.²⁵ Thus, theology has functional authority over psychology.

The models of integration need to be evaluated in terms of theory and practice. We should ask something like following questions: What fundamental insight and convictions, derivable from the Christian world view (as found in Scripture, books of theology, etc), are relevant to the type of psychotherapy? Are the foundational assumptions of various types of counseling particularly significant or problematic from the standpoint of the Christian faith?

Christians and non-Christians need to pay more attention to practical integration, rather than simply theoretical integration. In a critique of practice, significant and basic questions follow: What are the implications and results when many kinds of theories of counseling or psychotherapy are put into practice? How do these coincide or conflict with my ultimate objectives as a Christian counsellor? How does the use of the various type of counselling contribute to the Kingdom of God?

Tan suggests that his practicing of the Common Disciplines has made a great difference in his spiritual life as well as in his work as a therapist. Also, he goes on to state that he believes that the spirituality of the therapist is crucial for God’s healing power to be released in therapeutic relationships.²⁶ In this sense, I would insist that extensive reading in psychology, theology, and integration, along with the practice of these disciplines would be a useful way for the new professional to approach the daunting task of developing one’s integrated theory of psychology.

²¹ Garry R. Collins, *Psychology and Theology: prospects for Integration* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), 37.

²² Stanton L. Jones & Richard E. Butman, op cit, 23.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Tan Siang-Yang, op. cit, 20.

²⁵ Stephen M. Clinton, op. cit, 19.

²⁶ Tan Siang-Yang, op. cit.

We can dupe ourselves by believing we are unique in every sense but Christian counsellors share several factors with our non-Christian colleagues. Firstly, the problems that are addressed in Christian counselling are often the same problems addressed by other counsellors: depression, anxiety. Secondly, we can share common theoretical bases. Thirdly, we can share interaction strategies and techniques and the immediate goals.

What makes counselling Christian? What makes a Christian in Psychology a Christian Psychologist? I agree with Bufford who concludes: Christian counselling is primarily about character-about the personal godliness of the counsellor.²⁷ Therefore, the core of consecration counselling is the person, life, and work of the counsellor. Inevitably such consecrated shapes the counselling in myriad subtle ways and at times it will shape counselling profoundly.²⁸ However, apart from the explicit involvement of spiritual interventions and resources, most of the techniques and intervention strategies the counsellor employs and even many of the goals, will look familiar to counsellors who operate from other world views.²⁹

VI. Conclusion

I have discussed a biblical evaluation of integration models. The integrative issue is one of the important topics in counselling. The integration of psychology and theology can be a stimulating intellectual exercise, but ultimately our integration efforts must improve our ability to help others and to minister to their needs.³⁰

²⁷ Bufford K. Roger, *The Human Reflex: Behavioral Psychology in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids Michigan: Harpercollins, 1997).

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Garry R. Collins, op. cit. 37.

Personal or intrapersonal integration including the spirituality of the integrator is the most fundamental and foundational category of integration, without which biblical integration of psychology and Christian faith in the principled and professional (clinical or practice category) areas cannot be substantially achieved.³¹

Tan states the importance of Holy Spirit's ministry in counselling.

that the most significant reason for the foundational importance of intrapersonal integration and the spirituality of the integrator, is a biblical one: it is Holy Spirit who teaches us all things (John 14:26) and guides us into all truth (Jn. 16:13), and hence the Christian psychologist or other mental health professional.... must first of all, and above all, be a Spirit-filled or spiritual person in order to more fully understand and appropriate truth, including 'psychotheological' truth.³²

I concur with Tan. Though techniques and methods are important factors in counselling, the most important factor is the Holy Spirit's ministries because the Holy Spirit is the best adviser, guider, comforter, and counsellor. In addition, I agree with Jones and Butman's statement: Good integrators must be committed to evaluation and assessment of their endeavors.³³ The most important thing is that the biblical balance needed when making use of psychology requires a great deal of wisdom. There are too many wrong teachings in the world and a human without the guidance of the Holy Spirit and God's word, should not be trusted with the great task of dealing with the nature of human. Theology and

³¹ Tan Siang-Yang, op.cit, 22.

³² Tan Siang-Yang, op.cit, 35.

³³ Stanton L. Jones & Richard E. Butman, op. cit, 23.

psychology do not need to be incompatible. There are many useful principles of Scripture that invalidate certain theories of psychology, and those theories should not be used in intervention. I am sure that God can and does work through the careful use of psychology to benefit those He created when they seek God's counsel as they filter through it.

[Bibliography]

- Barker Graham. *Integral Studies*. Sydney: Wesley Institutes, 1999.
- Benner David (ed.), *Care of Soul: Revisioning Christian Nurture and Counsel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books, 2004.
- _____. *Psychology and Religion*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1988.
- _____. *Psychotherapy in Christian perspective*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Books Publishing, 1987.
- Bulkley Ed. *Why Christians can't trust psychology*. Eugene: Harvest House Publishers, 1993.
- _____. *Psychotherapy and the Spiritual Quest*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Hodder & Stoughton Religious, 1989.
- Clinton M. Stephen. "A Critique of Integration Models", *Journal of psychology and Theology*, Vol. 15, 1996.
- Collins R. Garry. *Psychology and Theology: prospects Integration*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.
- Carter L. & Narramore, L. *The building of psychology: An integration of psychology and Christianity*. Tyndale House, Wheaton, 1996.
- Ingram A. Ingram John, "Contemporary Issues and Christian Models of Integration: Into the Modern/Postmodern Age", *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, Vol. 23. 1995.4.
- Jones L. Jones & Richard E. Butman, *Modern Psychotherapies*. Downer's Grove: IVP, 2001.
- Kirwan T. William. *Biblical concepts for Christian counselling*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Prediger Steve Bouma. "The Task of Integration: A modest Proposal," *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, Vol. 18, 1995.
- Roger K. Bufford. *The Human Reflex: Behavioral Psychology in Biblical Perspective*. Harpercollins, 1997.
- Siang-Yang Tan. "Integration and Beyond: Principled, Professional, and Personal," *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, Vol. 20, 2001.
- David G. Benner. 전략적 목회상담. 이정기 역. 서울 예영미디어, 2001.
- Lawrence Crabb. 성경적 상담학 개론. 전요섭 역. 서울 아가페문화사, 1995.