

Alison Rozzi

Assignment 4

In 2 or 3 paragraphs (or more, if you like), summarize and critique (using Critical Thinking) the Transformational view.

The transformational psychology as presented by Coe and Hall is an attempt to redesign traditional psychology in relation to Christianity, along with rethinking the nature of modern science. They believe that doing science should ultimately be an act of faith and love. They also believe that each psychologist should do the work of psychology "afresh in the Spirit" while being grounded in reality and faith. They believe doing psychology within a tradition should be secondary to the primary task of doing psychology anew in the Spirit. The goal is to learn and discover, to set off on our own course, and to reexperience and redesign the process of doing psychology and its end product. Basically I interpret them as ambitiously wanting to do a complete overhaul of psychology as a science and redesign it to be thoroughly and purely Christian in nature. They do not see Christianity and science as separate, but rather as one continuous study.

They believe that there are a set of Christian realities that need to be used as the foundation for their version of psychology. They say that it is central to transformational psychology to "start with the Christian realities, lives as the redeemed, the beloved of

God, reflecting the depth of our hearts' desire for an unbounded love."The central realities and truths that Coe and Hall outline are that God exists, that we are created in His image, that we are sinners saved by grace, that we are a new creature in Christ, our ultimate purpose is loving neighbor and God, this is only accomplished by transformation into the image of Christ, and God has revealed these truths in Scripture and in the believers experience.

Coe and Hall believe that doing psychology well is to do it as a form love, of contemplation and loving of God in the very act of studying persons, and the anything less is a form of academic dysfunction and curiosity. They believe psychology should enrich both the researcher and the science, and if its not then it isn't fulfilling the transformational approach. They go on to say that the nonbeliever is unable to do psychology well and is dysfunctional as a psychologist. Albeit I understand where they are coming from, I feel as though this an alienating and almost ignorant statement. There is a lot of valuable psychological research that has come from nonbelievers, and to write off their work as "dysfunctional" does not seem appropriate to me.

In 1 or 2 paragraphs (or more if you like), summarize and critique (using Critical Thinking) the Levels-of-Explanation response to the Transformational view.

Myers shared my belief that Coe and Hall have an ambitious agenda. He says that although he's not exactly sure what this science will look like, he encourages them

to go for it. Myers also believes that a more modest agenda may be in order due to the fact that all scientists, including Coe and Hall, are subjects to their own realities and fantasies. He believes Coe and Hall would be better off trying to bridge religion and science than trying to do a complete overhaul of the two. Myers also call out ne of my biggest issues, being that Coe and Hall states that secular scientists are unable to fully do psychology, essentially diminishing the incredible work and research done by secular psychologists. Myers does not believe that psychology can be uprooted and changed completely into a religion.

In 1 or 2 paragraphs (or more if you like), summarize and critique (using Critical Thinking) the Integration response to the Transformational view

Jones seemed fairly defensive in his response, as I believe he felt as though they were criticizing his own work and views on integration. Firstly, he acknowledges that Coe and Hall's approach has a clear commitment to the biblical authority over reality and to critical realism. I agree that they definitely have prioritized the scripture and biblical truths at the foundation of their ideas. Then Jones states that they were only sharply distinct when discussing the integration view, but that they distorted it and its limitations into an "unflattering caricature".

Jones also expresses his concern about the "seeming spiritualized individualism" of the transformational view. Along with myself, he was taken back by the idea that prior work outside of Christian psychology should be set aside and disregarded. Jones third

concern is Coe and Hall's indirect criticism of other integrative approaches as understanding their Christian foundations as mere assumptions instead of actual knowledge. Jones goes on to talk about his own work, and how Coe and Hall misconstrue the points being made just because of the wording that he used that included the word "presumptions".

In 1 or 2 paragraphs (or more if you like), summarize and critique (using Critical Thinking) the Christian Psychology response to the Transformational view.

Roberts states that his aim is to support and clarify the main claims made by Coe and Hall. Roberts does this first by elaborating on epistemology, or the study of knowledge; while Roberts agrees with Coe and Hall that the character of a psychologist makes an impact on his research, he acknowledges that they say little about the nature of the knowledge being discussed. Roberts states the three kind of knowledge found in psychology and Christian life and explains how they interact with one another. Roberts believes that Coe and Hall do not distinguish Transformational Psychology from Christian Psychology, and that Coe and Halls paper could be used as a supplement for Christian Psychology. In summary, Roberts believed Coe and Hall's insights need to be refined, deepened, and perfected.

In 1 or 2 paragraphs (or more if you like), summarize and critique (using Critical Thinking) the Biblical Counseling response to the Transformational view.

Powlinson seems to be overwhelmingly in agreement with Coe and Hall. Powlinson expresses that he believes Coe and Hall communicate exactly what it means to understand and help people in a Christ-like manner. He goes on to say Coe and Hall deserve praise for the way they reckoned with the intellectual effects of sin. Powlinson states that Coe and Hall's awareness that sin "systematically distorts even psychological perception is refreshingly clear-minded". He also appreciated what the other responses found ambitious, this being Coe and Hall's call to engage in firsthand work. Powlinson believes when we study people afresh, biblical faith and practice will demonstrate a relevance and depth regarding all things psychological. I am still struggling to understand exactly what it means to study someone "afresh". Powlinson goes on to discuss similarities between biblical counseling and Christian psychology, stating they share the same goals. Powlinson's main criticism is that Coe and Hall rely too heavily on the monastic tradition, which causes them to stumble.