I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The purpose of the paper is to explain the “why” and “how” of evangelical inter-disciplinary research methodology.

1.2 Proposed definition of several key terms are listed below:

“Epistemological”:
“Hermeneutical”:
“From hermeneutics, (Gr. hermeneuo: to interpret). It is the theory of interpretation.” Recently, in the narrow sense, it has come to mean “the study of rules or principles for the interpretation of particular texts.” In its broader sense, however, it means “the interpretation and understanding of any act of communication, whether written or oral, verbal or non-verbal (such as symbols or symbolic acts).” As applied to other fields of knowledge, hermeneutics deals with nature of language, meaning, communication and understanding. (See, New Dictionary of Theology, 1987).

“Inter-disciplinary research”:
-“academic and systematic study conducted by using elements (e.g. theory, methodology, etc.) from one or more disciplines in the attempt to achieve a high degree of coherence or unity.”

“Paradigm”:
There are three levels: “macro-paradigm” (paradigm of universal acceptance and well established in all fields of knowledge, i.e., the enlightenment would be a macro-paradigm), “meso-paradigm”(paradigm of partial acceptance), and “micro-paradigm”(paradigm of acceptance in a particular context that may not be accepted in a given different context). (Bosch 1996, 185).

“Research Methodology”:
“ways and approaches employed in academic and systematic study.”

“Theory”:
-“a set of interrelated hypotheses which constitute a tentative explanation of a complex phenomenon of reality.”

1.3 The plan of organization:

The two-fold purpose of the paper is to be achieved by a brief review of the negative consequences of the lack of inter-disciplinary integration in research methodology (the “why”) and to propose to evangelical scholars (the “how”) an alternative way (i.e. inter-disciplinary research methodology) which is theologically sound, theoretically coherent and cross-disciplinary applicable.

II. OBSERVATION OF DISCIPLINARY MYOPIA AND ITS
CONSEQUENCE

There are seven socio-cultural phenomena of negative nature due to the outcome educational goal of producing “specialist” and the resultant “disciplinary myopia”:

2.1 absence of the cultivation of the whole person with holistic perspective and healthy temperament (e.g. curricular problems of the public school system);
2.2 being succumbed to technological domination (e.g. biological engineering over ethics; population control over human values);
2.3 cultural irrelevance of scholarship: (e.g. training of expert instead of cultivation of personhood and holistic learning);
2.4 disciplinary rivalry (e.g. sciences vs. humanities);
2.5 ethical confusion: scientific accomplishment in science and technology (such as organ transplant, cloning, etc.) surpasses ethical formulation;
2.6 fragmentation of knowledge (e.g. modern specialist vs. traditional scholars, technocrat vs. administrator) with a distorted view of reality (i.e. compartmentalized mind set, tunnel vision, etc.);
2.7 giving into the dehumanizing and depersonalizing forces of contemporary society (e.g. the critique of the Marxist, feminist, liberation theologians, etc.).

III. ANTICIPATION OF NEW CHALLENGES AT THE MILLENNIAL CROSS-ROAD

There are seven kinds of challenge at the closing of the 20th Century that would call for evangelical cooperative inter-disciplinary research (i.e. 5 external + 2 internal):

3.1 postmodernist orientation & the tyranny of the “tolerance principle;”
3.2 pluralistic landscape & anti-Christian / anti-establishment sentiment;
3.3 popularity of "hard sciences" at the expense of the traditional studies, e.g. humanities, theological studies, etc.)
3.4 promising bio-medical engineering, run-away technological advancement, and rapid socio-cultural changes;
3.5 powerful and pervasive forces such as New Age Movement, gay & lesbian movement, environmental activist groups, Easternization (e.g. the increasing popularity of homeopathic medicine and acupuncture), etc.;
3.6 polarization of evangelical scholars: the great divide of liberal vs. conservative (e.g. the "wider mercy of God") / charismatic vs. "frozen chosen," the inerrancy debate, the "millenarian fever," “the third wave,” (including debates on “spiritual warfare” mentality, the merits of “territorial spirits” approach),etc.;
power struggle among the intellectual elites of evangelical scholarship that are polarized by disciplinary differences, denominational division, etc. that would prevent genuine cooperation and collaboration of the best scholarship from various disciplines.

Organizations such as ETS/EMS/EPS are the ideal venues for inter-disciplinary cooperative efforts of evangelical scholars/researchers to demonstrate the spirit of unity and to make significant contributions in the “kairos” moment of human history.

IV. THE CHALLENGES IN INTER-DISCIPLINARY RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

As much as one is committed to inter-disciplinary research methodology, if not done properly it will cause the following problems:

4.1 theoretical incoherence
When not well integrated it could lead to eclectic staggering of elements that are not dynamically connected and synthetically interacting.

4.2 methodological imbalance:
The discipline with better development and more powerful approaches may absorb the others without true dynamic interaction and coherent integration.

4.3 practical difficulty:
In the long path towards genuine inter-disciplinary research, practical problems such as mutual suspicions, disciplinary rivalry, methodological contention, etc. will prevent true integration.

Unless hindrances (e.g. barriers and divisions) are removed and problems solved; practical difficulty will hinder the process and pursuit of cooperative inter-disciplinary research.

V. THE ADVANTAGES OF INTER-DISCIPLINARY RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

There can be three advantages to the use of inter-disciplinary research methodology:

5.1 disciplinary synergism:
It integrates into a macro-paradigm what otherwise is a set of independent disciplines of study. The researcher is enabled to widen the scope of knowledge and is opened to see the whole in which the parts interact together for a more
holistic understanding of reality and better theoretical formulations about that reality.

5.2 mutual enrichment:
There is potential for a mutual enrichment among the disciplines which enter in a dynamic interaction. This enrichment would eventually mean a mutual borrowing, questioning, and reformulating of what constituted an individual discipline’s method before entering into dynamic interaction. This process sharpens the precision of a research undertaking, thus securing results that are more systematic and closer to the reality of the subject matter under research.

5.3 research advancement:
This integrated inter-disciplinary approach in research processes, would also secure the right adjustments to problem solving and theoretical proposals for the explanation of phenomena under research. This in turn will increase the acuteness of implementing new paradigms into particular fields of practice or knowledge. In addition, the reality of the vastness of the created order, the diversity of human culture, the complexity of life, etc. requires that comprehensive and coherent understanding be informed by the findings of multiple disciplines and various fields.

VI. COMPARING THE EVANGELICAL AND NON-EVANGELICAL RESEARCH ORIENTATIONS

The research orientations of evangelical and non-evangelical can be compared in terms of hermeneutical, theological and methodological features as shown in Figure 1 below:

*Figure 1 - Evangelical and Non-evangelical Research Orientations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NON-EVANGELICAL</th>
<th>EVANGELICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermeneutical</td>
<td>The context (reality) determines the meaning and application of truth</td>
<td>The biblical text interpreted by the analogy of Scripture must be applied to the reality to which it addresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The biblical text has different layers of meaning and the reader /interpreter plays a decisive role.</td>
<td>The biblical text has only one meaning, and that meaning is the one intended by the biblical author inspired by the Holy Spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biblical interpretation, and also the text itself are relative.</td>
<td>Though given through human agency, the Scriptures is the absolute authority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theological
Science and reason (not the biblical truth alone) provide sure basis of epistemology
High view of Scripture (over tradition)
High view of grace (over human efforts)
High view of faith (over human reason)

Methodological
The scientific method is the only method that is conducive to truth.
Spiritual reality and Christian presuppositions are relevant to methodology

VII. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EVANGELICAL AND NON-EVANGELICAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The description (see figure 2 below) of the epistemological, theological, and hermeneutical aspects of non-evangelical research is based on the official documents of the World Council of churches (“WCC”) after the Sixth Assembly (24 July-10 August 1983, Theme: “Jesus Christ the life of the world” in Vancouver) and Seventh Assembly (February 7-20 1991, Theme: “Come Holy Spirit- Renew the whole creation” in Canberra).

Three documents have been used to identify the epistemological, theological, and hermeneutical method of evangelical research, respectively they are: the Willowbank Report, the Lausanne Covenant and the Chicago Statement as shown in Figure 2 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>NON-EVANGELICAL</th>
<th>EVANGELICAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Epistemological difference** | - Truth is plurality, diversity, and dialogical (The Ecumenical Review vol. 47, No.4, October 1992, pp. 493-504). It begins with the practice of dialogue. (The Ecumenical Review, vol. 47, No.4, p. 493)  
- Gaining truth is to understand (The Willowbank Report, parag. 5), to interpret (The Willowbank Report, parag. 4), to communicate (The Willowbank Report, parag. 5) the personal and self-disclosure of God in the bible.  
| **Theological distinctiveness** | - Doing theology is an ecumenic activity. Jacques Nicole, 1996.  
- The call to the unity of the church under Ecumenical formation and to fulfill the cosmic vision of the new heaven and the new earth. The Ecumenical Review, vol 48, No.4, October 1996, p. 443. | - Found on the faith that God’s will and plan for human is that λα (already has been called out from the world a people for himself, and sending his people back into the world to be his servant and his witnesses, for the extension of this kingdom, the building of Christ’s body, and the glory of his name! (The Lausanne Covenant, parag. 5).  
- Social responsibility is the result of transformation of life by the good news (The Lausanne Covenant, parag. 5).  
- Affirm that evangelism and social-political involvement are both part of our Christianity (The Lausanne Covenant, parag. 3).  
- Christian presence in the world is indispensable to evangelism (The Lausanne Covenant, parag. 4).  
- To evangelize is to spread the good news that Jesus Christ died for our sin and was raised from the dead according to the Scriptures, and that as the reigning Lord he now offers the forgiveness of sins and the liberating gift of the Spirit to all who repent and believe (The Lausanne Covenant, parag. 4).  
- Affirm the visibility of church in truth, and evangelism of the gospel of reconciliation summons us in unity (The Lausanne Covenant, parag. 7). |
- Common witness to the whole Christian faith, stop proselytism. The challenge of proselytism and the call into to common Christian witness. The Ecumenical Review, vol 48, No.2, pp. 212-221. | - Scripture is true (The Chicago Statement, parag. XI), should always be interpreted on the basis that it is inerrant and inerrant (The Chicago Statement, parag. XII).  
Focus on “Grammatico-historical exegesis” and “Scripture is to interpret Scripture” (The Chicago Statement, parag. XVIII).  
Focus on the authority of the Bible, deny the authority of independent reason over the authority of the Bible (The Chicago Statement, inerrancy and authority).  
Christ and Scripture coalesce into a single fount of authority. The Biblically-interpret Christ and the Christ-centered, Christ-proclaiming Bible are from this standpoint one.  
Focus on justice, peace and integrity of creation for the next millennium (idem). |
### VIII. EXPLANATION AND ILLUSTRATION OF INTER-DISCIPLINARY EVANGELICAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

*Figure 3 – COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EVANGELICAL AND NON-EVANGELICAL RESEARCH METHODOLOGY – CASE STUDY ON “TRUTH”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>LOCATION IN THE CONTINUUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-thematic circle / methodo................................................................. B.B. Warfield “Biblical and theological studies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VS.................................................existential (personal/relational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treschow, Micahel. 1988. The comfort of truth <em>Crux</em> 34, No. 2. March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B. .............................................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a case study on “truth” to explain and illustrate evangelical inter-disciplinary research methodology. There can be three “layers” to the matter: the center, the core and the correlate. As shown in Figure 3 below at each level, there is a different method of assumption, e.g., epistemological (“what is truth?”), hermeneutical (“How to appropriate “truth?””) and thematic circle/methodological complexity (“what is the scope of ‘truth claim’ and how to support one’s ‘truth claim?’”).

Each level of research can be subdivided into three categories and each category can be diagramed in the form of a bipolar continuum (i.e., “A” and “B” at the right column in Figure 3). Researchers and publications are selected to represent the two opposite ends of the continuum. Due to the limitation of the present study, only a small number of evangelical authors are chosen to illustrate the broad scope and the diverse approaches in this case study on “truth.”

In the Bible, there are several dimensions of “truth” including: quality of proposition (2 Chr. 18:15, Ps 15:2, Prov. 8:7; 22:21; John 16:7, Rom. 9:1), quality of persons and things in general, “truth” can be classified into “ultimate truth” and “other truth.” Since “God is” is true and this truth is neither created nor finite. It is therefore the “ultimate truth” which is inseparable from the Triune God Himself. It is the very essence of His being, of His self-consciousness and of His loving action. For there is but one God who exists in three persons, sharing the same in essence. Of the Triune God, the Son is begotten of the Father and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. His self consciousness derives from His being, and the loving action depends on his being and self consciousness. Thus, the “ultimate truth” is both a matter of reality, of proposition, and of action as found in the incarnate and inscripturate Word of God (i.e. special revelation).

In addition to the “ultimate truth,” there is also “other truth” which is derived from the “ultimate truth” by fallen man based on his interpretation of the “ultimate truth,” his perception and conception of the creator and the created order. Since the understanding of reality should be holistic and comprehensive; neither an individual nor researcher of one discipline can claim to have the final, complete and absolute appropriation of “truth.” A unified and coherent understanding of any chosen focus or research requires information and input from multiple number of fields of knowledge (or disciplines) obtained through the use of multiple number of methodology.
Using the matter of “truth” as a case in point, as shown in Figure 3, there are three layers and three levels. In answering the question, “What is truth?” there are three types of continuum. First, the continuum of “propositional” vs. “existential.” This denotes the understanding of truth either as an “objective and rational reality: or a “subjective, personal and relational reality.” Second, the continuum of conceptual vs. concrete. In this continuum, truth is understood as either “propositional, symbolic and categorical” or as “concrete as in the cases of the Incarnate Christ and the Inscripturated Word.” Third, there is a continuum of “absolute” vs. “relative.” In this continuum, truth is understood as either “revealed, absolute and objective: or as “relative, subjective and cultural.”

As to the question: “How to appropriate truth?” there are three types of continuum in the hermeneutical efforts of appropriating truth. The first continuum represents two different hermeneutical assumptions: the “literal” vs. “allegorical.” The second continuum is “historical” vs. “contextual” which begins from focusing on the historical understanding of truth and ends with the emphasis on the contextual understanding of the truth. The third continuum is “critical” vs. “epistemological”, i.e., either by “critical method” or by “faith.”

What is the scope of truth claim? There are three types of thematic continuum. First, the continuum of “focus” vs. “peripheral,” i.e., either by studying one “focus of theme” or by a “multiplicity of themes or narrative” due to the “polymorphous character of truth.” (See Lewis and Demarest 1987:45-58, listing “truth: essential to spirituality,” “truth: the criterion of authentic spiritual experiences,” “truth: indispensable to distinctively Christian service.”)

The second continuum is “stem” vs. “cluster” in terms of methodological complexity. In this continuum, the scope of related disciplines can be in the pattern of “stem” or “cluster.” The third continuum is from “uni-directional / uni-dimensional” to “multi-directional/multi-dimensional” in terms of methodological complexity. In this continuum, the research is conducted either “uni-directionally” or “multi-directionally” so that either a “single discipline” or “multiple numbers of related disciplines” is/are employed to support one’s “truth claim.”

As shown in Figure 1, evangelical research is to be biblically based, hermeneutically sound and methodologically inter-disciplinary, Figure 4 outlines the procedures and process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAYER</th>
<th>LEVEL &amp; FOCUS</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CENTER</td>
<td>Textual: morphology word study</td>
<td>critical study: literary Criticism form criticism historical criticism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the published works selected to illustrate evangelical inter-disciplinary methodology, the authors of Integrative Theology (Lewise & Demarest 1987:7-58) are more articulate in the necessity and methodology of inter-disciplinary approach. They proposed a six-step approach which has been closely followed in each chapter: the problem; historical hypotheses; biblical teaching; systematic formulation; apologetic interaction; and relevance for life and ministry.

In addition to the works cited in Figure 5, selected works are listed below in accordance to three categories: primary research (i.e. inter-disciplinary with integration), secondary research (i.e. integrative but not multidimensional enough) and peripheral research (i.e. prevalent single focus):

*Figure 5 - Illustration of Evangelical Inter-disciplinary Methodology*
| Primary | 1. God has created an orderly universe and controls it according to a coherent plan
2. True scientific research cannot contradict God’s truth but confirm it. | Research proceeds by these three sets of assumptions
Research methodology (including the scientific method) proceeds by using systematic procedure & coherent thinking | D.F. Kelly
Poythress, Lewis & Demarest |
| Secondary | 1. God has created also the secondary cause which is in operation.
2. Supernatural phenomena cannot be subjected to the scientific method | through research process the second causes are established in nature & society. | John Frame |
| Peripheral | 1. Scientific observation about natural phenomena must not become the rule for interpreting special revelation.
2. Evangelical scholarship is an attempt to relate biblically revealed truth to various fields of knowledge. | Research methods are used as tools and not the norm for interpretation of special revelation. | Poythress |

8.1 PRIMARY RESEARCH:


8.2 SECONDARY RESEARCH:


¹This work is post Khunian which endeavours to spell out the connections between sicence and religion at the methodological level.
By nature and history, missiological research is relatively more inter-disciplinary than other fields of evangelical enquiry thus several works are chosen in Figure 6 as illustrations.

Figure 6 - Illustrations in Integrative Missiological Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>INTEGRATION</th>
<th>PUBLICATION</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>MAIN FEATURES/AIMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. CHARLES KRAFT   | communication theory and social sciences with theology                      | Christianity in Culture                                    | 1984 | *He attempts at multi disciplinary integration.  
*Conceptually coherent with simplicity  
*Betrays the Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy. |
| 2. CARSON          | theology and philosophical pluralism and postmodernism                      | The Gaging of God; Christianity confronts Pluralism         | 1996 | * Describes the main truths of postmodernism  
*Describes the changes in Western culture  
*Describes how Christian thought can interact with postmodernism |
| 3. DAVID BOSCH     | philosophy of science, mission theology and missions History                | Transforming Mission; Paradigm Shifts in Missions Theology  | 1991 | * Draws from philosophy of science: by applying Kuhn=s Progress of Scientific Revolutions. And from Kung=s application of paradigm shifts in Church History.  
*Identifies the main six paradigms shifts in the history of theology of Mission (see Appendix 1)  
*Identifies the main influences of the Enlightenment in Christian thinking (see Appendix 2) |
| 4. MARK B WOOD-    | Social Sciences, Philosophy, and Religion                                   | Paradigm Wars: World Views for a New Age                   | 1996 | *Proposes A larger integration vision through analyzing paradigm clusters into a dynamic interaction between complementary opposites  
*Identifies the ten most significant Atransforming challenges and the different responses by society, including religion (spiritual realm).  
*Develops the concept of convergences of the different paradigms in the rising culture which is holistic. |
IX. PROPOSAL FOR COOPERATION OF EVANGELICAL SCHOLARS IN INTER-DISCIPLINARY RESEARCH

There are three types of basis for the cooperation and collaboration of evangelical scholars in inter-disciplinary research, i.e. motivation, means and motto: (3 + 3 +3)

In terms of motivation, evangelical scholars share in common: “the cultural mandate (general),” the Great Commission (specific), and “the cultural war” (as illustrated by the works of Dockery 1995, Huntington 1996, Woodhouse 1996).

There are three means for cooperation and collaboration: inter-disciplinary exploration, inter-institutional cooperation, and long-term research project and publication.

There are three mottoes for cooperation and collaboration: to the glory of the Father, in the name of the Son and by the empowerment of the H.S., and on the foundation of God’s Word - the Bible.

X. CONCLUSION

Evangelical researchers have been reminded in this brief study the necessity (the “why?”) of inter-disciplinary research methodology and have been introduced to ways (the “how?”) of doing it in terms of illustrations and explanation. This session being the first of a “three-year series” is a good start in this direction.

WORKS CONSULTED


---

*This work is post Khunian which endeavours to spell out the connections between science and religion at the methodological level.*
especially pp. 1-36


   Note: The author analyzes the theological method of A.A. Hodge and Charles Hodge.
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