

TemplePsyche: Understanding the Whole Human System

A Conceptual Framework for Exploring Interacting Influences on Human Experience

Paris Tranter

1.1 Origins and Development of the Framework

TemplePsyche developed through an extended process of lived observation, interdisciplinary learning and reflective inquiry. Its origins were not located within a single psychological theory or academic discipline, but within a growing attempt to understand patterns of adaptation and change through a wider systems perspective.

The initial questions emerged through personal experience. Over an extended period of significant reflection and adaptation, changes occurring within different areas of life appeared increasingly difficult to understand in isolation. Psychological understanding alone did not appear to capture the full complexity of what was being observed. This prompted a broader inquiry into the relationships between internal processes, physical functioning, relationships, environment, everyday behaviour, information, meaning and adaptation over time.

Academic study in Counselling and Psychotherapy provided an important psychological foundation for this inquiry. Alongside this, exploration of biological processes, neuroscience and nervous-system functioning widened consideration of the relationship between psychological experience and the body. Systems thinking provided a further conceptual shift by directing attention away from individual components alone and towards interaction, feedback, context and change across interconnected processes.

The development of the framework was also influenced by philosophical inquiry and engagement with historical, religious, mythological and symbolic traditions concerned with questions of human development, suffering, meaning, transformation and self-understanding. These traditions contributed to the questions through which the framework developed, but they are not presented as empirical foundations for its scientific claims.

This distinction is deliberate.

Historical or philosophical parallels may provide material for reflection, interpretation and conceptual exploration. They do not establish biological or psychological mechanisms. Where TemplePsyche makes claims concerning human functioning, the strength of those claims must therefore be determined by contemporary evidence rather than by the historical persistence or symbolic significance of an idea.

The development of TemplePsyche can consequently be understood as a movement from experience towards observation, from observation towards questioning, and from questioning towards interdisciplinary investigation.

The creator's lived experience functioned initially as a site of observation and question generation rather than as empirical validation of the resulting framework. Patterns

experienced or perceived within one individual cannot establish that the same relationships operate within others, nor can subjective observation independently determine the mechanisms responsible for those patterns.

The transition from lived observation to conceptual framework therefore creates a necessary next stage: the propositions generated through that process must be examined independently of the experience from which they originated.

In this sense, TemplePsyche did not emerge from certainty about how human beings function.

It emerged through increasing curiosity about how different dimensions of human functioning may interact.

The walked experience generated questions. Interdisciplinary inquiry provided different ways of examining them. Systems thinking provided a means of considering their relationships. The framework presented within this paper represents an attempt to organise that developing inquiry into a structure that can now be questioned, refined and eventually investigated beyond the individual experience through which it first emerged.

Introduction

Human experience does not occur in isolation. Thoughts and emotions occur within a biological organism; individuals develop within relationships and environments; everyday behaviours influence and are influenced by physical and psychological states; meaning shapes how experiences are interpreted; and the information encountered within modern environments can influence attention, understanding and behaviour. These dimensions may be examined separately for the purposes of research and practice, yet within an individual life they continually coexist.

This observation provides the starting point for TemplePsyche: Understanding the Whole Human System, a developing conceptual framework for exploring human experience through a whole-systems perspective.

The framework proposes that understanding an individual may sometimes require consideration not only of the different influences present within their life, but also of the ways in which those influences may interact. Its central concern is therefore not simply the identification of individual factors, but the relationships that may exist between them.

Whole-person approaches are not new. Engel's (1977) biopsychosocial model significantly challenged biomedical reductionism by proposing that biological, psychological and social dimensions should be considered together in understanding health and illness. Systems perspectives have similarly emphasised interdependence, context and relationships between components rather than understanding complex phenomena exclusively through their individual parts. TemplePsyche develops within this broader intellectual tradition while proposing its own structure for organising inquiry into human functioning.

The framework emerged through a combination of lived observation, academic study and interdisciplinary curiosity. Personal adaptation initially generated questions about why

changes within one area of human functioning appeared to coincide with changes elsewhere. This observation gradually developed into a broader question concerning what might become visible when the person is considered as an interacting whole rather than predominantly through one explanatory lens.

Lived experience, however, is not treated within TemplePsyche as evidence that a proposed relationship is universally true. Personal observation can generate questions and hypotheses, but establishing whether relationships are reliable, generalisable or causal requires appropriate empirical evidence. This distinction between observation and evidence is fundamental to the framework.

TemplePsyche currently proposes seven interconnected domains of inquiry: Biology, Psychology, Environment, Lifestyle, Meaning, Information and Integration. These domains are not presented as seven independent causes of human experience. Instead, they provide an organising architecture through which potentially relevant influences and their possible interactions can be explored.

The central question underpinning TemplePsyche is:

Which interacting parts of this person's whole human system may be contributing to what they are experiencing?

The purpose of the framework is therefore not to provide predetermined explanations. It is to organise inquiry. A factor identified within one domain may lead to questions within another; relationships may be supported by established evidence, remain plausible but uncertain, or prove unrelated. The framework consequently requires uncertainty to remain visible rather than being replaced by assumptions of causality.

This paper introduces the conceptual architecture of TemplePsyche and the rationale for its seven proposed domains. It considers each domain individually before examining how interactions across domains may contribute to a whole-system formulation of human experience. The paper subsequently considers the boundaries and limitations of the framework and identifies areas requiring further theoretical development and empirical investigation.

TemplePsyche is therefore presented here not as a validated model of human functioning, but as a developing conceptual framework and a proposition for further inquiry.

2. The TemplePsyche Conceptual Framework

TemplePsyche conceptualises the human being as a dynamic system whose experience develops through ongoing interaction between internal processes and the wider conditions within which the person lives. Rather than locating human experience exclusively within psychological functioning, biological processes, behaviour or social context, the framework proposes that these dimensions may be considered as interconnected components of a wider human system.

The term system is used within TemplePsyche to describe a collection of interacting elements in which changes occurring within one area may influence, and be influenced by,

conditions elsewhere. This does not imply that every aspect of human functioning is connected to every other aspect in a meaningful or causal way. Instead, it provides a basis for asking whether interactions may be relevant before reducing an experience to a single explanation.

This distinction is important because human functioning is dynamic rather than static. An individual's psychological capacity, physical state, relationships, behaviours, environment and interpretation of experience can change over time. These changes may occur independently, but they may also interact. Consequently, understanding what a person is experiencing at one point in time may require consideration of both their current circumstances and the processes through which their wider system has adapted over time.

Adaptation is therefore an important concept within TemplePsyche. Human beings continually respond to changing internal and external conditions. Some adaptations may support functioning within particular circumstances, while others may become less useful when those circumstances change. From a whole-system perspective, behaviours or responses should therefore not automatically be understood in isolation from the conditions within which they developed or are currently being maintained.

TemplePsyche organises this inquiry through seven proposed domains: Biology, Psychology, Environment, Lifestyle, Meaning, Information and Integration. The domains provide a structure for considering different dimensions of human experience while deliberately maintaining attention to relationships between them.

The boundaries between these domains are not assumed to be absolute. A single experience may be relevant to several domains simultaneously. Sleep, for example, involves biological processes but can also be affected by psychological distress, environmental conditions and lifestyle patterns. Relationships occur within a person's environment while potentially influencing psychological experience, behaviour and physiological processes. Meaning may develop through psychological processes while also being shaped by culture, relationships and information.

The purpose of separating the domains is therefore analytical rather than ontological. They provide different positions from which the same human system can be explored rather than suggesting that the person is literally divided into seven independent components.

This also means that the presence of factors across several domains should not automatically be interpreted as evidence that those factors are causally connected. TemplePsyche distinguishes between observation, possible interaction and established evidence. Where a relationship is supported by existing research, that evidence can inform inquiry. Where evidence is limited or the relevance of a relationship to an individual remains uncertain, the connection should remain a hypothesis rather than becoming an assumed explanation.

The seven-domain structure is therefore proposed as an organising architecture rather than a completed taxonomy of human functioning. Its usefulness depends not simply upon whether relevant information can be placed within each domain, but upon whether considering these domains together supports a more coherent understanding of the interactions, pressures, resources and adaptations occurring across the person as a whole.

The following sections examine the rationale and scope of each proposed domain, beginning with Biology.

2.1 Biology

The biological domain considers the physical processes and conditions that contribute to human functioning. Within TemplePsyche, biology is not positioned as an alternative to psychological or social explanation, but as one dimension of an interconnected human system. Psychological experience occurs within a living organism, and changes in biological functioning may influence an individual's emotional, cognitive and behavioural capacity while simultaneously being influenced by conditions elsewhere within the wider system.

Human biological functioning involves multiple interacting processes, including the nervous, endocrine, immune and metabolic systems. Genetic and developmental influences, physical health, hormonal processes, sleep and circadian functioning, nutrition, movement, pain, illness, medication and substance use may also become relevant depending upon the individual and the experience being explored. The purpose of the biological domain is not to assume that these factors explain psychological experience, but to ensure that potentially relevant biological conditions are not excluded from inquiry.

The relationship between biological and psychological functioning is particularly important because influence can operate in more than one direction. Psychological and environmental stressors can produce measurable physiological responses, while changes in physical health or biological functioning can influence mood, cognition, energy and behaviour. Research into stress physiology, for example, demonstrates that adaptation to environmental demands involves coordinated processes across multiple biological systems rather than a purely psychological response (McEwen, 1998).

This interaction also illustrates why TemplePsyche does not conceptualise its domains as independent categories. Sleep disturbance may have biological consequences while simultaneously being associated with psychological distress, environmental pressures or lifestyle conditions. Chronic interpersonal stress may originate within the individual's relational environment while involving psychological appraisal and physiological stress responses. Physical activity similarly involves behaviour while interacting with physical and psychological functioning. The location of a factor within one domain therefore does not determine the boundaries of its potential influence.

Biological adaptation is also relevant to a whole-system perspective. The human organism continually responds to internal and external demands in an attempt to maintain functioning. McEwen's concept of allostasis describes the processes through which physiological systems adjust in response to changing demands, while allostatic load refers to the cumulative physiological burden that may arise when adaptive systems are repeatedly or chronically activated (McEwen, 1998). This provides one established example of how repeated conditions within an individual's wider life may become biologically relevant over time.

However, the inclusion of biology within TemplePsyche should not encourage biological determinism. Identifying a biological correlate does not necessarily establish that it is the primary cause of an individual's experience, just as identifying a psychological or environmental factor does not establish causal priority. Biological processes occur within developmental and environmental contexts, and their relevance must therefore be considered alongside evidence from the wider system.

The biological domain consequently asks not simply what is occurring within the body, but whether biological conditions may be interacting with other dimensions of the person's current experience. Its function within TemplePsyche is to ensure that the body remains part of the formulation without assuming that the body alone provides the explanation.

2.2 Psychology

The psychological domain considers the internal processes through which individuals experience, interpret and respond to themselves, other people and the world around them. Within TemplePsyche, psychology includes emotional, cognitive, developmental and relational processes, alongside learning, memory, attachment, coping, perception and patterns of behaviour that develop across the lifespan.

Psychological functioning does not develop independently of the wider human system. From early development onwards, psychological processes emerge within relationships and environments while occurring within a developing biological organism. Experiences are interpreted through existing expectations, memories and learned patterns, while repeated interactions with other people and the surrounding environment may contribute to how individuals understand safety, relationships, themselves and their capacity to respond to future situations.

Developmental and attachment perspectives provide established examples of this interaction. Bowlby's attachment theory proposed that early relational experiences contribute to the development of expectations concerning the self and others, sometimes described as internal working models (Bowlby, 1969/1982). These expectations may influence later relational behaviour and emotional responses; however, attachment patterns should not be understood as fixed psychological destinies. Subsequent relationships, developmental experiences and changing environments can contribute to continuity or change across the lifespan.

Psychological adaptation is therefore central to this domain. Responses that appear problematic when viewed only in the present may have developed within circumstances in which they performed an adaptive or protective function. Avoidance, heightened vigilance, emotional suppression or particular interpersonal strategies, for example, may become understandable when considered in relation to previous experiences and the conditions within which those responses developed. This does not mean that every psychological difficulty should be interpreted as an adaptation, but it encourages inquiry into the function and developmental context of a response before conclusions are reached.

Cognitive processes provide another level of psychological inquiry. Attention, appraisal, memory, expectations and interpretation can influence how individuals respond to events. The same external circumstance may therefore be experienced differently depending upon previous learning, current emotional state, perceived resources and the meaning attributed to the situation. Psychological experience consequently involves not only what occurs around an individual but also how that experience is perceived and interpreted.

Within TemplePsyche, however, psychological explanations should not automatically become the endpoint of formulation. Anxiety, low mood, difficulty concentrating, irritability or emotional dysregulation may have meaningful psychological dimensions while also occurring alongside biological changes, environmental pressures, disrupted routines, relational experiences or other conditions within the wider system. Locating an experience within psychology should therefore generate further questions rather than prematurely closing inquiry.

This is particularly important when psychological labels are used descriptively. A recognised pattern of symptoms may provide valuable information and, where appropriate, support diagnosis and treatment; however, describing a pattern does not necessarily explain why that particular individual is experiencing it at that particular point in their life. TemplePsyche therefore distinguishes between description and formulation. Description identifies what appears to be occurring, while formulation asks what interacting processes may be contributing to its development or maintenance.

The psychological domain consequently explores what the person is experiencing internally, how they have learned to interpret and respond to experience, how those patterns may have developed, and how psychological processes may be interacting with conditions elsewhere within the whole human system.

Psychology therefore remains a fundamental component of TemplePsyche without being treated as the sole location of human experience.

2.3 Environment

The environmental domain considers the relational, social, cultural, material and physical conditions within which human development and everyday functioning occur. Within TemplePsyche, the individual is not conceptualised as separate from their environment. Human beings continually interact with surrounding conditions, while those conditions may provide resources, opportunities, demands, restrictions, safety or sources of ongoing pressure.

Environment extends beyond physical location. It includes relationships, family structures, social networks, education, employment, community, socioeconomic circumstances, housing, culture and access to resources. Different aspects of the environment may become more or less influential across different stages of life, and their relevance cannot necessarily be understood independently of the individual's biological development, psychological processes and previous experiences.

Ecological approaches to human development provide an established foundation for considering these contextual influences. Bronfenbrenner (1979) proposed that development

occurs within multiple interconnected environmental systems, ranging from immediate relationships and settings to broader social and cultural structures. His later bioecological work further emphasised development as a process involving interactions between the individual, their environment and time (Bronfenbrenner and Morris, 2006). Such perspectives demonstrate that understanding an individual may require attention not only to personal characteristics but also to the systems within which development and everyday life take place.

Relationships represent a particularly significant component of the environmental domain. From early caregiving relationships through to friendships, intimate relationships, family systems, educational environments and workplaces, repeated interpersonal experiences may influence psychological functioning and behaviour. Relationships may provide connection, practical support and opportunities for co-regulation, while conflict, instability, isolation or persistent interpersonal demands may contribute additional pressure across the wider system.

Importantly, environmental influences should not be understood as determining individual outcomes. Similar environments can be experienced differently by different people, and individuals may respond to comparable circumstances in substantially different ways. Personal history, developmental stage, biological characteristics, psychological resources, social support and meaning may all influence how environmental conditions are experienced. Within TemplePsyche, environmental factors are therefore considered as conditions that may alter possibilities, pressures and resources rather than predetermined causes of particular outcomes.

The environmental domain also directs attention towards circumstances that may otherwise become individualised. Difficulties experienced by a person may sometimes be interpreted primarily as characteristics of that individual despite occurring within environments involving chronic stress, relational instability, financial pressure, discrimination, social isolation, unsafe conditions or limited access to resources. A whole-system formulation therefore asks whether changing or understanding aspects of the surrounding environment may be as relevant as focusing upon change within the individual.

At the same time, TemplePsyche does not assume that environmental explanations are sufficient simply because contextual pressures are present. Environmental conditions interact with individuals rather than producing identical responses across populations. Understanding their relevance therefore requires consideration of how those conditions are perceived, experienced and responded to within the wider human system.

Environment is also dynamic. Relationships change, people relocate, employment and financial circumstances alter, communities develop or disappear, and cultural and social conditions shift over time. Changes within the environment may therefore alter demands placed upon the wider system while simultaneously changing the resources available for adaptation.

The environmental domain consequently asks what surrounds the person, what their environment provides, what it demands or restricts, how those conditions have changed over time, and how they may be interacting with other dimensions of the whole human system.

Within TemplePsyche, environment is therefore not treated merely as background context. It forms part of the system within which human experience develops, adapts and continues to unfold.

2.4 Lifestyle

The lifestyle domain considers the repeated behaviours, routines and everyday practices through which individuals interact with their biological, psychological and environmental conditions. Within TemplePsyche, lifestyle is not conceptualised simply as a collection of individual choices. Rather, it represents patterns of living that may both influence and be influenced by conditions across the wider human system.

Lifestyle may include patterns of sleep, physical activity, nutrition, rest and recovery, substance use, daily routines, work–life balance, social activity and other repeated behaviours relevant to an individual's functioning. These factors are considered because seemingly ordinary patterns of daily life can accumulate over time and interact with physical health, psychological capacity and the person's ability to respond to environmental demands.

The relationship between lifestyle and wellbeing is supported across several areas of research. Sleep, for example, is associated with cognitive performance, emotional regulation and physical functioning, while regular physical activity has established relationships with both physical and psychological health. Nutrition similarly provides the biological resources required for physiological functioning. These relationships demonstrate that everyday behaviours should not necessarily be considered peripheral when attempting to understand changes in human experience.

However, TemplePsyche deliberately avoids framing lifestyle exclusively through personal responsibility. Behaviour occurs within context. An individual's ability to sleep adequately, access nutritious food, exercise, rest or maintain consistent routines may be influenced by employment, caring responsibilities, financial circumstances, physical health, psychological distress, housing, relationships and access to resources. What appears initially to be an individual lifestyle choice may therefore also reflect conditions within the environmental, biological or psychological domains.

Influence may also operate in the opposite direction. Psychological distress may disrupt sleep, appetite, movement or everyday routines, while disrupted routines may subsequently contribute additional pressure to psychological and biological functioning. Physical illness may reduce activity, which may affect social contact or psychological wellbeing. Environmental instability may alter eating, sleeping or recovery patterns. Lifestyle therefore provides a particularly clear example of why TemplePsyche emphasises interaction rather than linear explanations.

Repeated behaviours may also function adaptively within particular circumstances. A person may develop routines or coping behaviours that provide immediate relief, regulation or predictability even when those same behaviours carry longer-term costs. Understanding lifestyle patterns therefore requires consideration not only of what a person does, but also of what the behaviour may currently provide, the circumstances in which it developed and the wider conditions that may be maintaining it.

This perspective avoids dividing behaviour too simply into categories of healthy and unhealthy. A whole-system formulation instead considers function, frequency, context and consequence. The relevant question becomes whether a particular pattern is currently supporting the wider system, placing additional demands upon it, or doing both simultaneously.

Lifestyle is also one of the domains through which change elsewhere in the system may become visible. Alterations in sleep, appetite, movement, social engagement, substance use or daily routine may sometimes occur alongside changes in psychological state, physical health, relationships or environmental demands. Such changes should not automatically be interpreted as causes or symptoms; rather, they may provide information that prompts further inquiry across the wider system.

The lifestyle domain consequently asks how the person is living on a repeated basis, what those patterns provide or cost, what conditions make those patterns possible or difficult, and how everyday behaviours may be interacting with other dimensions of the whole human system.

Within TemplePsyche, lifestyle therefore represents neither personal blame nor a prescription for ideal living. It provides a structured area of inquiry into the repeated conditions and behaviours through which human functioning is maintained, challenged and adapted over time.

2.5 Meaning

The meaning domain considers how individuals interpret their experiences and construct an understanding of themselves, their lives and the world around them. Within TemplePsyche, meaning is included because human beings do not simply experience events; they also interpret them. The significance attributed to an experience may influence how it is understood, remembered and incorporated into an individual's wider sense of self.

Meaning may involve personal values, identity, purpose, beliefs, relationships, cultural narratives, existential concerns and an individual's understanding of significant life experiences. For some people, religion or spirituality may also contribute substantially to meaning-making, while for others meaning may be found through relationships, creativity, work, learning, nature, community or other personally significant areas of life. TemplePsyche does not prescribe where meaning should be found, but considers the function that meaning may have within an individual's wider system.

The importance of meaning has been explored across psychological and existential traditions. Frankl (1959/2006), for example, placed the human search for meaning at the centre of his existential approach, while subsequent psychological research has examined meaning in life in relation to constructs including purpose, coherence and significance. Such perspectives suggest that understanding human experience may require consideration not only of what has happened to a person, but also of what that experience has come to mean to them.

Meaning may change over time. An experience interpreted in one way during childhood may be understood differently in adulthood as additional knowledge, relationships and

perspectives develop. Similarly, periods of significant change, loss, adversity or transition may challenge previously established assumptions about identity, relationships or the world. Individuals may subsequently attempt to reorganise their understanding in ways that restore coherence or allow new interpretations to emerge.

From a whole-system perspective, meaning does not exist independently of other domains. Psychological processes influence interpretation, while relationships, culture and wider environments contribute narratives through which experiences may be understood. Biological states may affect cognitive and emotional capacity, and repeated exposure to particular forms of information may influence beliefs, expectations and perceptions. Meaning can therefore both emerge from and potentially influence processes elsewhere within the wider system.

This interaction is particularly relevant when considering adaptation. Human beings may seek explanations when established ways of understanding an experience no longer appear sufficient. Philosophy, religion, spirituality, therapy, creativity or other systems of thought may provide frameworks through which uncertainty, suffering, change or identity can be interpreted. Within TemplePsyche, the psychological or regulatory function that such frameworks may provide can be explored without assuming that the metaphysical claims associated with them are scientifically established.

This distinction is fundamental to the framework. Meaning and evidence are not interchangeable. An idea may carry profound personal, cultural or symbolic significance without constituting empirical evidence about how the physical or psychological world operates. Conversely, recognising that a belief cannot be scientifically demonstrated does not make its personal meaning irrelevant to understanding the individual who holds it.

Historical traditions, philosophy, mythology and symbolism can therefore be considered within TemplePsyche as sources through which humans have expressed and organised questions about identity, suffering, transformation and existence. They are not treated as scientific foundations for the framework. Where scientific claims are made, those claims require appropriate empirical evidence.

Meaning can also provide both resources and pressures. A coherent sense of purpose or identity may support persistence and psychological organisation, while experiences that conflict with deeply held values or assumptions may create uncertainty or distress. The relevant inquiry is therefore not whether an individual's meaning system is objectively correct, but how it functions within their life and how it interacts with other dimensions of their experience.

The meaning domain consequently asks how the person understands what they are experiencing, what matters to them, what gives their life coherence or purpose, what assumptions may have been challenged, and how their interpretation of experience may be interacting with the wider human system.

Within TemplePsyche, meaning therefore represents an essential dimension of understanding the whole person while remaining clearly distinguished from empirical evidence.

2.6 Information

The information domain considers the material individuals encounter, receive, interpret and repeatedly engage with across their everyday lives. Within TemplePsyche, information is treated as a distinct area of inquiry because human beings increasingly exist within environments characterised by continuous exposure to information from interpersonal, educational, cultural, technological and media sources. What enters an individual's informational environment may contribute to what they attend to, learn, question, believe and understand about themselves and the world around them.

Information is not limited to digital media. It may include conversations, education, books, news, advertising, cultural messages, professional advice, family narratives and knowledge transmitted through communities and institutions. Digital technologies have substantially expanded this environment through search engines, social media, online communities, podcasts, video platforms and algorithmically selected content. Consequently, the information available to an individual is not necessarily neutral or randomly encountered; it may be shaped by social relationships, cultural conditions, personal choices and technological systems that influence what becomes visible and repeatedly reinforced.

The inclusion of Information as a separate TemplePsyche domain does not imply that information operates independently of psychology or environment. Indeed, substantial conceptual overlap exists between them. Information is encountered within an environment and processed through psychological mechanisms such as attention, perception, memory, appraisal and learning. Its separation within the framework is therefore analytical: it creates a deliberate point of inquiry into what information is repeatedly entering the person's system and how that information is being encountered and interpreted.

This distinction has become increasingly relevant within contemporary digital environments. Individuals can now experience repeated exposure to particular narratives, images, beliefs and interpretations at a scale and frequency that differs considerably from earlier information environments. Algorithmic systems may further personalise exposure according to previous engagement, creating informational environments that differ substantially between individuals even when they occupy similar physical or social contexts.

However, exposure to information should not be assumed to produce predictable psychological or behavioural outcomes. Individuals interpret the same material differently according to existing beliefs, developmental experiences, psychological states, social contexts and levels of knowledge. TemplePsyche therefore does not treat information as something that is simply absorbed by a passive recipient. The relationship is interactive: individuals select information, respond to it, reject it, seek additional material and may alter their informational environments through their own behaviour.

Information may also function as both a resource and a source of pressure. Access to reliable knowledge can increase understanding, support decision-making and provide opportunities for learning or connection. Conversely, repeated exposure to threatening, misleading, conflicting or highly stimulating material may create additional demands upon attention and interpretation. The relevant question is therefore not whether information is inherently beneficial or harmful, but what information is present, how frequently it is

encountered, how credible it is, what function engagement with it serves, and how it interacts with the individual's wider circumstances.

The distinction between information and knowledge is also important. Exposure to a claim does not establish its accuracy, just as repetition does not transform information into evidence. Within a framework committed to organising curiosity rather than claiming certainty, the source, quality and evidential status of information therefore require consideration alongside its psychological meaning to the individual.

Information can also participate in feedback processes across the wider human system. Psychological distress may influence the material an individual seeks or attends to, while repeated engagement with particular content may subsequently influence attention, interpretation or behaviour. Social environments can shape informational exposure, while information can influence social relationships and participation. Lifestyle patterns may affect the frequency and timing of media engagement, while digital engagement may in turn interact with sleep, activity or everyday routines. These relationships should be investigated rather than assumed.

The information domain consequently asks what information is repeatedly entering the person's world, where it originates, how it is selected and interpreted, what degree of credibility it carries, what function engagement with it may serve, and how the informational environment may be interacting with other dimensions of the whole human system.

Within TemplePsyche, Information therefore represents the informational conditions within which contemporary human adaptation and meaning-making occur, while recognising that its boundaries and distinctiveness from the psychological and environmental domains will require further theoretical and empirical examination.

2.7 Integration

Integration occupies a distinctive position within TemplePsyche. While the preceding domains provide different perspectives from which aspects of human functioning can be explored, Integration concerns the processes through which experiences, adaptations, knowledge and changes occurring across the wider system may become organised over time. It is therefore both a domain of inquiry and a principle connecting the framework as a whole.

Within TemplePsyche, integration does not imply that a person reaches a final state of psychological completeness or permanent equilibrium. Human systems remain dynamic. New experiences occur, environments change, relationships develop or end, biological conditions alter and previously established understandings may be challenged. Integration is therefore conceptualised as an ongoing process through which the wider system responds to change while attempting to maintain or develop sufficient coherence for continued functioning.

This distinction is particularly relevant when considering adaptation. Human beings continually adjust to changing internal and external conditions. An adaptation may initially

support functioning within one set of circumstances but become less effective when those circumstances change. Conversely, new information, relationships, experiences or resources may allow previously established patterns to be reconsidered. Integration concerns what happens as these experiences are incorporated, reorganised or brought into relationship with what already exists.

Psychological integration may involve developing a more coherent understanding of previously confusing experiences, recognising patterns that were previously outside awareness, or reconciling aspects of experience that had been understood separately. However, TemplePsyche extends the concept beyond psychological insight alone. A person may understand something intellectually while conditions elsewhere within their system remain unchanged. Insight does not necessarily alter biological demands, environmental pressures, everyday behaviour or the informational conditions to which the individual continues to be exposed.

Integration within a whole-system framework therefore asks whether understanding is becoming reflected across the wider organisation of the person's life.

For example, recognising that a particular environment repeatedly creates significant strain represents psychological awareness. If the individual subsequently changes how they respond to that environment, establishes different boundaries, alters repeated behaviours or reorganises aspects of everyday life, the change begins to involve multiple domains. Similarly, acquiring knowledge about sleep, stress or physical activity does not itself demonstrate integration. The relevant question is whether that knowledge becomes meaningfully incorporated into patterns of living and whether those changes interact with functioning elsewhere within the system.

Integration should therefore be distinguished from information acquisition. Knowing something is not necessarily the same as integrating it. Information may be understood cognitively without becoming reflected in behaviour, relationships, meaning or the conditions through which everyday life is organised. TemplePsyche proposes that this distinction may be important when considering why insight or knowledge sometimes produces substantial change and at other times appears to have limited influence.

The concept also provides a way of considering coherence without assuming uniformity. Integration does not require every dimension of the person to be free from conflict or difficulty. Human beings can experience uncertainty, competing needs and contradictory emotions while remaining capable of functioning. Rather, integration concerns the extent to which different aspects of experience can be recognised, held and responded to without requiring them to remain disconnected from the wider understanding of the self and current circumstances.

Integration may also involve reorganisation following disruption. Significant experiences can challenge established expectations, routines, relationships, identities or systems of meaning. During such periods, previous ways of functioning may no longer adequately meet current conditions. The resulting process may involve uncertainty and experimentation as the person attempts to develop a different organisation of experience. From a TemplePsyche perspective, such periods should not automatically be interpreted as either pathology or

growth. Their significance depends upon the individual, the surrounding conditions and the trajectory that follows.

This is important because adaptation and integration are not synonymous. Adaptation describes adjustment to conditions; integration concerns how those adjustments become incorporated within the wider system. An individual can adapt in ways that enable immediate functioning while simultaneously creating costs elsewhere. A behaviour may reduce psychological distress in the short term while affecting physical health, relationships or everyday functioning over time. Whole-system inquiry therefore considers not only whether an adaptation works, but what it provides, what it costs and how sustainable it is across the wider system.

Integration consequently introduces a temporal dimension to TemplePsyche. Understanding a person requires consideration not only of their current state but also of how their system has changed. Previous adaptations may continue to influence present functioning; new experiences may alter established patterns; and changes within one domain may create conditions for further changes elsewhere. Integration is therefore better understood as a continuing process of organisation and reorganisation than as a fixed endpoint.

Importantly, TemplePsyche does not currently propose a universal measure of integration or assume that greater integration can be straightforwardly equated with better health. The concept requires further theoretical definition and empirical investigation. Questions remain regarding how integration might be operationalised, how it can be distinguished from related constructs such as psychological flexibility, coherence or self-regulation, and whether processes described as integration can be reliably observed across different individuals and contexts.

For this reason, Integration should presently be understood as a conceptual proposition within the developing framework, rather than an established measurable construct.

The Integration domain consequently asks: What has the person adapted to? What has changed? What remains disconnected or unresolved? What has been incorporated into understanding and everyday functioning? What do current adaptations provide and cost? And how is the wider system reorganising in response to changing internal and external conditions?

Integration therefore represents the point at which TemplePsyche returns from the individual domains to the person as a whole.

The first six domains create different positions from which the human system can be explored. Integration asks what is happening across them.

It is within this movement—from individual dimensions towards their interaction, organisation and change over time—that TemplePsyche's whole-system perspective becomes most fully expressed.

3. Interaction Across the Whole Human System

The central proposition of TemplePsyche is not simply that multiple dimensions influence human experience, but that understanding may be strengthened by examining the interactions occurring between those dimensions. The seven domains provide an organising architecture for inquiry; however, the whole-system perspective emerges through consideration of what may be occurring across and between them.

Human functioning is rarely static. Biological states change, psychological processes develop, environments alter, behaviours become established or disrupted, systems of meaning evolve and informational conditions shift. Changes occurring within one domain may therefore alter the conditions within which other parts of the system are functioning.

TemplePsyche conceptualises these relationships as potentially reciprocal rather than exclusively linear. For example, environmental pressure may contribute to psychological distress, while psychological distress may subsequently alter behaviour, relationships or engagement with the environment. Disrupted sleep may influence emotional and cognitive capacity, while psychological distress may itself contribute to further sleep disruption. Information exposure may influence interpretation and behaviour, while existing psychological states and beliefs may influence which information an individual seeks, notices or repeatedly engages with.

These relationships illustrate the possibility of feedback processes within the wider human system. A change in one area may contribute to conditions that reinforce, reduce or modify changes elsewhere. Over time, repeated interactions may create patterns that are difficult to understand when individual factors are considered separately.

This perspective also allows consideration of cumulative load. A person may be capable of adapting to an individual demand when sufficient resources are available elsewhere within their system. However, several demands occurring simultaneously or repeatedly may alter that capacity. Biological strain, psychological distress, relational conflict, environmental instability, disrupted routines or persistent informational demands may potentially accumulate, interact or reduce opportunities for recovery.

TemplePsyche does not propose a universal threshold at which such demands become overwhelming. Capacity differs between individuals and may also vary within the same individual over time. The relevant question is therefore not simply how many pressures are present, but what demands the wider system is currently carrying and what resources are available to respond to them.

Protective factors are equally important within this formulation. Whole-system inquiry should not focus exclusively upon pressure, difficulty or dysfunction. Supportive relationships, physical health, adequate rest, psychological resources, meaningful activity, access to reliable information, financial or environmental stability and a coherent sense of purpose may provide resources that support adaptation elsewhere within the system. The significance of a factor may therefore depend partly upon the wider conditions surrounding it.

This creates a distinction between examining a factor independently and considering its systemic function. The same behaviour, relationship or environment may simultaneously provide something valuable while creating costs elsewhere. A coping behaviour may offer immediate psychological regulation while producing longer-term biological or lifestyle

consequences. A relationship may provide emotional connection while also generating persistent stress. Employment may provide financial stability and meaning while simultaneously reducing opportunities for rest or recovery.

TemplePsyche therefore proposes the questions:

What does this provide?

What does this cost?

What happens elsewhere in the system as a result?

These questions are not intended to imply that every experience can be reduced to a balance of costs and benefits. Rather, they encourage consideration of how the function of one component may change when viewed in relation to the wider system.

Time is also central to interaction. Human systems carry developmental histories. Current responses may have emerged through previous environments, relationships, learning and biological or psychological adaptations. A response that appears disproportionate when considered only in relation to present circumstances may become more understandable when its developmental history is considered. Equally, adaptations that were previously functional may persist after the conditions that originally required them have changed.

A whole-system perspective therefore considers both current interaction and developmental trajectory. It asks not only what is happening now, but how the present organisation of the system may have developed and what conditions continue to maintain or alter it.

Importantly, identifying interaction does not establish causation. Two domains changing simultaneously does not demonstrate that one caused the other, and complex feedback relationships may make causal direction difficult to determine. Biological, psychological, environmental and behavioural processes may also share underlying influences that are not immediately visible within a formulation.

TemplePsyche therefore treats proposed interactions as having different levels of evidential confidence. Some relationships may be supported by substantial empirical evidence. Others may represent plausible hypotheses requiring further investigation. Some may initially appear connected but ultimately prove unrelated.

This is where curiosity over certainty becomes fundamental to the whole-system approach.

The purpose of widening inquiry is not to construct increasingly elaborate explanations for every aspect of a person's life. Doing so could create the appearance of understanding without sufficient evidence. Instead, the purpose is to identify potentially relevant relationships while preserving the distinction between what is known, what is supported, what is hypothesised and what remains unknown.

The whole human system is therefore conceptualised within TemplePsyche as dynamic, contextual and continually adapting. Its components cannot always be understood independently, yet neither should relationships between them be assumed merely because they appear conceptually plausible.

The framework consequently moves through three levels of inquiry:

What is occurring within the individual domains?

What may be occurring between them?

What happens to the organisation of the whole system over time?

The first question identifies potentially relevant conditions. The second explores interaction. The third brings the inquiry towards integration.

It is through this movement that TemplePsyche shifts from a collection of domains towards a whole-system formulation of human experience.

4. Whole Human System Formulation

The conceptual architecture of TemplePsyche leads to the development of what is proposed here as a Whole Human System Formulation. The purpose of this formulation is to provide a structured way of bringing information from across the framework together without reducing an individual's experience to a single explanatory factor.

The guiding question is:

Which interacting parts of this person's whole human system may be contributing to what they are experiencing?

This question reflects the central position of TemplePsyche. Formulation is approached as a process of inquiry rather than a search for one definitive explanation. Information from the seven domains may provide different perspectives upon the same experience, while consideration of interactions between them may identify patterns that are less visible when each factor is examined independently.

Within this approach, formulation differs from description. Description may identify what an individual is currently experiencing, including recognised patterns of emotion, cognition, behaviour or physical symptoms. Such descriptions can be clinically and practically valuable. However, a Whole Human System Formulation asks an additional question: what combination of conditions, adaptations, resources and interactions may help us understand why this particular person is experiencing this particular pattern within their current circumstances?

The distinction is important because similar experiences may emerge within very different human systems. Two individuals reporting anxiety, for example, may share aspects of psychological experience while differing substantially in physical health, developmental history, relationships, environmental pressures, sleep, behaviour, meaning and informational

exposure. TemplePsyche therefore does not assume that similarity at the level of description necessarily indicates similarity at the level of formulation.

The formulation process begins by widening inquiry. Relevant information may be considered across Biology, Psychology, Environment, Lifestyle, Meaning and Information before attention turns towards patterns of interaction and Integration. This does not require every domain to contain an explanation. In some circumstances, one or two areas may be particularly significant; in others, several may appear relevant. Some domains may contain little information of importance to the presenting experience.

The purpose of the architecture is therefore not to ensure that every domain is populated, but to reduce the likelihood that potentially relevant areas are excluded before they have been considered.

Once relevant conditions have been identified, attention moves towards relationships between them. TemplePsyche proposes consideration of pressures, resources, adaptations, patterns of maintenance and possible feedback processes across the wider system. This allows formulation to move beyond a collection of factors towards consideration of how those factors may function together over time.

Protective resources remain as important as sources of difficulty. A Whole Human System Formulation should therefore consider not only what may be placing demands upon the individual, but also what currently supports functioning, recovery, adaptation and change. This prevents the formulation from becoming exclusively deficit-focused and recognises that resilience may emerge through resources distributed across different parts of the wider system.

Adaptation provides another important component. Rather than viewing every difficult behaviour or response exclusively as dysfunction, the formulation may ask what function that response has served within the individual's particular circumstances. This allows consideration of whether an adaptation that once supported functioning remains useful under current conditions and whether maintaining it now creates pressures elsewhere within the system.

This can be expressed through three exploratory questions:

What does this provide?

What does this cost?

What happens elsewhere in the system through its continuation?

These questions can be applied to behaviours, relationships, routines, environments, beliefs or other relevant patterns without assuming in advance whether they are beneficial or harmful. Something may provide regulation, safety, connection, identity or predictability while simultaneously creating different costs elsewhere.

Temporal context is also necessary. Formulation represents a view of the system at a particular point in time rather than a permanent account of the individual. Biological conditions change, psychological understanding develops, environments and relationships

alter, behaviours shift and new information or experiences may change meaning. Consequently, a formulation that was useful at one stage may require revision as conditions change.

For this reason, the Whole Human System Formulation is intended to be dynamic and revisable. New evidence may strengthen an existing hypothesis, weaken it or require an alternative explanation. Areas initially considered important may become less relevant, while previously overlooked factors may emerge.

This revisability also provides a safeguard against the false certainty that can arise from complex formulations. Considering more information does not necessarily mean understanding a person more accurately. Indeed, increasing complexity may create additional opportunities for assumptions and speculative connections. TemplePsyche therefore requires proposed interactions to remain proportionate to the available evidence.

A useful formulation should consequently distinguish between:

what is known;

what is supported by available evidence;

what is being hypothesised;

what remains uncertain;

and what further information may be required.

The Whole Human System Formulation is therefore not intended to produce a definitive map of another human being. It provides a structured representation of current understanding that remains open to revision.

At this stage of TemplePsyche's development, the formulation should be understood as a proposed conceptual application of the framework rather than a validated assessment or clinical instrument. Its reliability, practical utility and relationship to existing approaches to formulation require future investigation. It should not be used as a substitute for medical assessment, established clinical procedures, diagnosis or professional judgement within appropriately trained disciplines.

Its proposed value lies instead in the question it keeps open:

Before arriving at an explanation, have we considered enough of the person and the systems within which they are living?

In this sense, Whole Human System Formulation represents the practical expression of TemplePsyche's wider principle: understanding begins not with certainty about another person, but with disciplined curiosity about the interacting conditions shaping their experience.

5. Curiosity Over Certainty: An Epistemological Principle

A central principle of TemplePsyche is curiosity over certainty. This principle reflects the position that broadening inquiry should not be confused with increasing certainty. Considering more dimensions of human experience may reveal potentially important relationships, but it may also increase the number of possible explanations. A whole-system perspective therefore requires a disciplined approach to what can and cannot reasonably be concluded from the information available.

Human experience is complex, and the same observable outcome may arise through different combinations of conditions. Anxiety, fatigue, withdrawal, difficulty concentrating or changes in behaviour, for example, may occur within substantially different biological, psychological, environmental and behavioural contexts. TemplePsyche therefore resists the assumption that recognising a pattern necessarily explains the processes through which that pattern developed.

Curiosity within the framework is not intended to mean indefinite uncertainty or an unwillingness to reach conclusions. Where strong evidence exists, conclusions should reflect that evidence. Instead, curiosity refers to maintaining openness to alternative explanations and ensuring that the confidence attached to an interpretation remains proportionate to what is actually known.

TemplePsyche therefore proposes a distinction between observation, evidence, hypothesis and uncertainty.

An observation identifies something that appears to be occurring.

Evidence provides support for particular relationships, mechanisms or interpretations.

A hypothesis represents a possible explanation that may warrant further investigation.

Uncertainty identifies what cannot currently be established from the available information.

Maintaining these distinctions is particularly important when considering interactions across domains. The fact that two factors coexist does not demonstrate that one caused the other. Similarly, an established relationship at a population level does not necessarily establish the mechanism operating within a particular individual's experience. Research can inform formulation, but its application to an individual requires attention to context and appropriate limits on inference.

The principle of curiosity over certainty also requires awareness of confirmation bias. Once an explanation begins to appear coherent, there may be a tendency to prioritise information that supports it while overlooking information that challenges it. A whole-system formulation should therefore remain capable of asking:

What else could explain this?

What evidence would challenge the current interpretation?

What information might be missing?

Are relationships being observed, or merely assumed?

This creates an important role for disconfirming information. Evidence that challenges a formulation should not automatically be treated as an obstacle to the framework. It may instead indicate that an existing interpretation requires modification, that another domain deserves greater consideration, or that the proposed relationship was incorrect.

The same principle applies to TemplePsyche itself. The framework should not be protected from evidence that challenges its architecture or assumptions. Its seven-domain structure is a conceptual proposition and should remain open to revision if theoretical analysis or empirical investigation demonstrates that alternative distinctions are more useful or that particular domains cannot be meaningfully differentiated.

Curiosity over certainty therefore operates at two levels.

At the level of the individual, it discourages premature conclusions about why a person is experiencing something.

At the level of the framework, it prevents TemplePsyche from treating its own conceptual architecture as established fact.

This position is especially important when knowledge is drawn from multiple disciplines. Psychological, biological, social and behavioural research may operate through different methodologies, levels of analysis and standards of evidence. Bringing these areas into conversation can broaden understanding, but interdisciplinary synthesis should not erase the limitations or uncertainties within the evidence being considered.

TemplePsyche consequently proposes that a whole-system perspective should be both expansive and bounded: expansive enough to consider interacting influences that may otherwise be overlooked, and bounded enough to distinguish evidence-supported understanding from speculation.

This principle also protects against another potential limitation of whole-system thinking: the temptation to construct an explanation for everything. Not every detail within a person's life will be relevant to what they are currently experiencing, and not every apparent connection carries explanatory significance. The purpose of TemplePsyche is not to create the most complicated possible formulation, but to support a sufficiently broad inquiry from which relevant patterns may be identified.

Curiosity therefore functions alongside critical thinking. It asks questions while also evaluating the quality of possible answers. It allows uncertainty to remain where uncertainty is warranted and permits conclusions to strengthen when appropriate evidence becomes available.

Within TemplePsyche, curiosity over certainty is therefore not an absence of knowledge. It is a position towards knowledge: one that remains willing to investigate, revise and distinguish what is known from what is merely believed to be known.

The framework consequently begins from a question rather than an assumption and remains open to the possibility that the answer may differ from what was initially expected.

6. Potential Applications and Utility of TemplePsyche

TemplePsyche is proposed as an organising framework rather than a replacement for established psychological, medical or multidisciplinary approaches. At its current stage of development, its potential utility lies primarily in providing a structured way of widening inquiry and considering how different dimensions of human functioning may interact.

Several possible applications follow from this proposition. These include psychological formulation, psychoeducation, reflective practice, interdisciplinary thinking and future research. However, these applications remain theoretical until the framework's usefulness, reliability and limitations have been investigated empirically.

Psychological Formulation

One potential application of TemplePsyche is within psychological formulation. Formulation seeks to move beyond description towards an individualised understanding of the factors that may contribute to the development and maintenance of a person's current experience.

A whole-system perspective may support this process by encouraging consideration of biological, psychological, environmental, lifestyle, meaning-related and informational conditions before attention turns towards their possible interactions and integration.

The proposed benefit is not simply the inclusion of additional information. Rather, TemplePsyche may provide a structure through which practitioners can consider whether a factor understood within one area has implications elsewhere in the person's wider system.

For example, psychological distress may be considered alongside changes in physical health, relationships, sleep, everyday routines, meaning or informational exposure. This does not imply that all these dimensions are necessarily relevant or causally related. Instead, the framework provides a structured opportunity to ask whether they warrant consideration.

Any clinical application would require appropriate professional competence and further evaluation. TemplePsyche should not currently be regarded as a validated clinical assessment or intervention.

Psychoeducation

TemplePsyche may also have potential as a psychoeducational framework.

People are frequently exposed to explanations of human experience that emphasise one dimension of functioning. While specialist explanations can be valuable, a whole-system perspective may help individuals recognise that thoughts, emotions, physical states, environments, relationships and repeated behaviours can exist within a wider network of influences.

Psychoeducation based upon TemplePsyche would therefore not aim to provide individuals with definitive explanations for their experiences. Instead, it could encourage reflective questions about what is happening across different areas of life and what relationships may warrant further exploration.

This may also help communicate an important distinction between influence and inevitability. The presence of a risk factor, difficult environment or previous experience may alter the probability of particular outcomes without determining an individual's future. A systems perspective can therefore accommodate both constraint and possibility: people are influenced by the conditions within which they develop while remaining capable of adaptation and change.

Reflective Practice

A further potential application concerns reflective practice.

Professionals working with complex human experiences inevitably interpret information through their own disciplinary training, theoretical orientation and assumptions. A framework that deliberately widens inquiry may provide a prompt for considering whether important dimensions of a person's experience have been overlooked because attention has become concentrated within one explanatory lens.

TemplePsyche may therefore function as a reflective question:

What part of the wider system might I not currently be considering?

This does not require every professional to become an expert across every domain. On the contrary, recognising the boundaries of one's expertise is fundamental to responsible interdisciplinary thinking. Identifying a potentially relevant biological, social or environmental issue may indicate the need for further assessment or collaboration rather than an attempt to interpret that issue outside professional competence.

Interdisciplinary Understanding

TemplePsyche may also provide a common conceptual structure through which knowledge from different disciplines can be considered together.

Human experiences frequently cross disciplinary boundaries. Psychological practitioners may encounter issues involving physical health; medical professionals may encounter significant psychological or social conditions; educators may observe behavioural changes occurring within wider family or developmental contexts; and social or community services may work with individuals whose circumstances involve multiple interacting pressures.

A whole-system framework could potentially support communication across these perspectives by providing shared areas of inquiry while preserving the specialised knowledge required within individual disciplines.

However, interdisciplinary breadth should not be confused with interchangeable expertise. TemplePsyche does not propose that knowledge from one discipline authorises practice within another. Its purpose is to support recognition of interaction and, where appropriate, the need for collaboration.

Research and Theory Development

The framework may additionally provide a structure for generating research questions.

Rather than assuming relationships between domains, TemplePsyche can be used to identify interactions that require investigation. Research might examine whether particular domains can be reliably distinguished, which interactions are most relevant within particular populations or experiences, and whether whole-system formulation contributes information beyond that obtained through existing approaches.

The framework itself should also remain an object of investigation.

Questions concerning the distinctiveness of the seven domains, the conceptual status of Integration, the boundaries between Information and Environment, and the usefulness of the proposed formulation process cannot be resolved solely through theoretical argument. These questions require systematic investigation.

In this respect, TemplePsyche is not presented as the conclusion of an inquiry.

It is intended to generate further inquiry.

Public Understanding of Human Experience

Finally, TemplePsyche may have potential as a way of communicating complexity outside academic and professional settings.

Public discussions of human behaviour can sometimes move rapidly towards singular explanations or labels. A whole-system perspective may provide an accessible alternative question:

What else might be contributing to what we can see?

This does not require abandoning useful diagnostic, psychological or biological knowledge. Instead, it encourages recognition that a description at one level of analysis may coexist with relevant processes elsewhere within the person and their environment.

The potential value of TemplePsyche therefore lies not in claiming to provide a complete explanation of human experience, but in encouraging a broader and more organised process of inquiry.

Whether the framework ultimately achieves that purpose remains an empirical question.

Its usefulness should therefore be determined not by the intuitive appeal of whole-system thinking, but by whether future theoretical and empirical investigation demonstrates that TemplePsyche contributes meaningful understanding beyond approaches already available.

7. Limitations of the Proposed Framework

TemplePsyche is presented as a developing conceptual framework, and several limitations must be acknowledged at this stage. Identifying these limitations is consistent with the framework's principle of curiosity over certainty. The purpose of proposing a conceptual architecture is not to establish its correctness in advance, but to create something sufficiently clear that its assumptions can subsequently be examined, challenged and refined.

The most significant limitation is that TemplePsyche has not yet been empirically validated. The seven-domain architecture represents a theoretical proposition rather than an established model of human functioning. Although individual concepts and relationships considered within the framework may be supported by existing bodies of research, this does not constitute evidence for the validity of TemplePsyche as a framework in its entirety.

This distinction is fundamental. Evidence demonstrating that sleep influences psychological functioning, for example, may support consideration of interactions between biological, psychological and lifestyle processes. It does not demonstrate that TemplePsyche provides the most appropriate structure through which those relationships should be organised. The framework itself therefore requires evaluation independently of the evidence supporting its individual components.

A second limitation concerns the boundaries between domains. Human functioning does not naturally divide into discrete categories, and considerable conceptual overlap exists within the proposed architecture. Sleep may be conceptualised biologically while also representing a lifestyle pattern. Relationships may form part of the environment while simultaneously contributing to psychological development and meaning. Information is encountered within environments but processed through psychological mechanisms.

These overlaps are partly intentional because TemplePsyche conceptualises the domains as different positions from which an interconnected system can be explored. Nevertheless, excessive conceptual overlap could reduce the clarity or usefulness of the framework. Future theoretical and empirical work will therefore need to examine whether the proposed domains can be defined with sufficient distinction to justify their inclusion.

The Information domain requires particular examination. Information has been separated from Environment because contemporary informational exposure may represent a sufficiently significant dimension of human experience to warrant deliberate inquiry. However, it remains possible that Information could be conceptualised as part of the environmental or psychological domains rather than as an independent area. Its position within TemplePsyche should therefore remain open to revision.

The conceptual status of Integration also requires further development. Unlike the preceding domains, Integration may not represent an equivalent category of influence. Instead, it may function as a process through which experiences and adaptations occurring across the other domains become organised over time. Future work will need to determine whether Integration is most coherently understood as a seventh domain, a meta-domain, an organising process across the framework, or some combination of these.

This question is particularly important because the architecture of a framework should be determined by conceptual and empirical usefulness rather than by the appeal of a predetermined number of categories. The seven-domain structure should therefore remain open to modification if investigation indicates that a different organisation provides greater clarity or explanatory value.

A further limitation concerns complexity. Whole-system thinking can widen inquiry, but greater complexity does not automatically produce greater understanding. Considering numerous possible influences may increase the risk of speculative connections,

over-formulation or the construction of explanations that appear coherent without sufficient evidence.

TemplePsyche therefore faces a continuing tension between breadth and usefulness. A framework that considers too little may overlook relevant interactions, while one that attempts to incorporate everything may become impractical or unfalsifiable. Determining what constitutes a sufficiently broad but manageable formulation will require further development.

Related to this is the risk of causal overinterpretation. The identification of factors across several domains does not establish relationships between them. Even where research demonstrates associations at a population level, those findings cannot automatically establish causal processes within an individual. TemplePsyche therefore requires explicit differentiation between evidence-supported mechanisms, reasonable hypotheses and relationships that remain uncertain.

The framework may also be influenced by creator bias. TemplePsyche has developed through a combination of lived observation, academic study and interdisciplinary inquiry. The experiences, interests and theoretical perspectives of its creator have inevitably influenced which questions were asked and how the initial architecture was constructed.

Acknowledging this influence does not invalidate conceptual development, but it reinforces the importance of exposing the framework to perspectives beyond those involved in its creation. Independent academic critique, interdisciplinary review and eventual empirical investigation will be necessary if TemplePsyche is to develop beyond its originating perspective.

Another limitation concerns cultural applicability. Concepts relating to individuality, meaning, lifestyle, relationships and integration may be understood differently across cultures and communities. A framework developed within one cultural and academic context should not assume that its categories or underlying assumptions translate universally. Future development should therefore examine how the architecture is understood across different cultural, social and socioeconomic contexts.

Professional application creates additional boundaries. TemplePsyche brings together areas of inquiry that cross disciplinary boundaries, but recognising an interaction does not provide competence to assess or intervene within every domain. A psychological practitioner identifying a potentially relevant medical issue, for example, would require appropriate referral or collaboration rather than attempting to operate beyond their professional competence. Whole-system thinking must therefore coexist with clear boundaries of expertise.

Finally, TemplePsyche currently provides a conceptual language for organising inquiry rather than a validated method for predicting outcomes or determining intervention. It should not be assumed that a more comprehensive formulation necessarily produces better outcomes, nor that changes made within one domain will predictably generate changes elsewhere.

These limitations define the present boundaries of the framework rather than representing conclusions about its future value.

TemplePsyche is being proposed at a stage at which its architecture can be clearly described but must still be tested.

Its development should therefore remain consistent with the same principle it proposes for understanding human beings:

remain curious, make claims proportionate to the evidence, and allow new information to change the formulation.

8. Directions for Future Research

The development of TemplePsyche from a conceptual proposition towards an evidence-informed framework requires systematic investigation. The purpose of future research should not be to confirm the framework as originally proposed, but to examine whether its concepts are sufficiently clear, whether its architecture is useful, and whether the relationships it encourages individuals or practitioners to consider can be investigated reliably.

An initial priority is conceptual clarification. Before the framework can be meaningfully evaluated, each domain requires sufficiently precise definition. This is particularly important where conceptual boundaries overlap. Research and interdisciplinary review could examine whether Biology, Psychology, Environment, Lifestyle, Meaning and Information represent useful distinctions, and whether Integration is best understood as a domain, a process operating across domains, or a broader organising principle.

The proposed seven-domain architecture itself should also remain an empirical question. Future investigation should examine whether seven domains provide the most coherent organisation of relevant information or whether domains should be combined, separated or reconceptualised. The architecture should not be retained simply because it provides a symmetrical or intuitively appealing model.

A useful early stage of development may involve expert and interdisciplinary review. Researchers and practitioners from psychology, psychotherapy, neuroscience, medicine, public health, sociology, systems science and related disciplines could evaluate the framework from their respective areas of expertise. Such review may identify conceptual omissions, unsupported assumptions, disciplinary overlap or areas requiring greater precision.

Qualitative research may provide another important stage of investigation. Interviews or focus groups with practitioners and potentially individuals using the framework for structured reflection could explore whether the proposed domains are understandable, whether relevant areas of experience appear to be missing, and whether the whole-system perspective generates questions that participants consider meaningful or useful.

However, perceived usefulness should not be treated as equivalent to validity. A framework may feel coherent or intuitively persuasive without necessarily improving understanding or

outcomes. Qualitative findings would therefore represent one stage of development rather than evidence that the framework itself is effective.

Future research could subsequently examine the reliability of whole-system formulation. If different appropriately trained individuals were provided with the same information, would they identify similar relevant domains and interactions? Alternatively, would the breadth of the framework allow substantially different formulations to emerge from the same material? Establishing the degree of consistency achievable within the framework would be important before stronger claims regarding practical utility could be made.

The proposed relationships between domains also require investigation. TemplePsyche does not assume that all domains interact equally or that every theoretically plausible relationship is meaningful. Research could therefore examine specific interactions rather than attempting to validate the entire framework through a single study.

For example, studies might investigate how environmental pressures interact with sleep and psychological functioning, how patterns of information exposure relate to meaning-making or behaviour, or how changes across several areas of functioning unfold over time. Many such relationships are already studied within existing disciplines. TemplePsyche's research task would therefore involve determining whether organising these relationships within a whole-system architecture contributes additional conceptual or practical value.

Longitudinal research may be particularly relevant because the framework conceptualises human functioning as dynamic and adaptive. Cross-sectional assessment can identify conditions occurring at one point in time but may be less able to illuminate processes of adaptation, feedback and reorganisation. Following changes across domains over time could provide greater insight into whether the interactions proposed within whole-system formulations correspond with observable developmental or behavioural trajectories.

The concept of Integration represents a particularly important research challenge. If Integration is to remain a central component of TemplePsyche, it will require clearer operational definition. Research would need to establish what observable or measurable processes constitute integration and how these differ from established constructs such as psychological flexibility, coherence, self-regulation, adaptation or resilience.

Similarly, the Information domain requires targeted investigation. Contemporary information environments have changed substantially through digital media and algorithmically organised content, but this does not automatically justify Information as an independent domain within TemplePsyche. Future work should examine whether treating informational exposure separately provides meaningful explanatory or formulative value beyond existing psychological and environmental concepts.

Comparative research will ultimately be necessary. TemplePsyche should not be evaluated only by asking whether people find it useful in isolation. Its value should be considered in relation to established approaches.

Future studies might therefore ask whether Whole Human System Formulation identifies relevant information not captured through existing biopsychosocial or psychological formulations, whether it improves interdisciplinary communication, whether it increases or

reduces formulation complexity, and whether any additional information identified leads to meaningful differences in understanding or decision-making.

Research should also consider possible unintended consequences. A whole-system framework could potentially increase understanding, but it could also encourage excessive self-monitoring, speculative connections or unnecessarily complex explanations. Investigation should therefore examine not only potential benefits but also circumstances in which the framework may be unhelpful or inappropriate.

Cultural evaluation will also be necessary. TemplePsyche should not assume that concepts developed within one social and academic context carry equivalent meanings across populations. Collaborative research involving different cultural and socioeconomic perspectives could examine whether the proposed domains reflect relevant dimensions of human experience across contexts or whether the architecture requires adaptation.

Ultimately, empirical investigation should be capable of changing TemplePsyche.

Evidence may support some aspects of the framework while challenging others. Domains may require redefinition. Proposed relationships may prove unsupported. Integration may require reconceptualisation. Alternative architectures may demonstrate greater usefulness.

Such findings would represent development rather than failure.

This position reflects the epistemological principle underlying the framework: curiosity over certainty requires a willingness not only to investigate an idea, but to allow the results of that investigation to alter the idea itself.

TemplePsyche should therefore be understood as the beginning of a research programme rather than its conclusion.

Its central research question is not:

How can TemplePsyche be proven correct?

It is:

What would we need to investigate to determine whether this way of organising whole-human inquiry is useful, reliable and supported by evidence?

9. Conclusion

TemplePsyche: Understanding the Whole Human System has been proposed within this paper as a developing conceptual framework for exploring interacting influences on human experience. Its starting position is that human beings cannot always be adequately understood by examining biological, psychological, environmental or behavioural processes in isolation from the wider conditions within which those processes occur.

The framework organises inquiry across seven proposed domains: Biology, Psychology, Environment, Lifestyle, Meaning, Information and Integration. These domains are not intended to represent independent causes of human functioning or a complete taxonomy of human experience. Instead, they provide different positions from which potentially relevant aspects of the same interconnected human system can be explored.

The central proposition of TemplePsyche lies not simply within the identification of these domains, but within the consideration of interaction between them. Changes occurring within one area of human functioning may alter conditions elsewhere, while repeated interactions may contribute to patterns of adaptation, maintenance, pressure, protection and reorganisation over time.

Integration occupies a distinctive position within this architecture. While the preceding domains help identify potentially relevant dimensions of experience, Integration directs attention towards how experiences, adaptations, knowledge and changes may become organised across the wider system. Its precise conceptual status remains open to further investigation.

From this architecture, the paper has proposed the concept of Whole Human System Formulation, guided by the question:

Which interacting parts of this person's whole human system may be contributing to what they are experiencing?

The purpose of this question is not to replace established diagnostic, medical, psychological or multidisciplinary approaches. Nor is it intended to imply that every human experience requires a complex explanation. Instead, it provides a structured prompt to consider whether potentially relevant dimensions or interactions may have been overlooked before conclusions are reached.

This approach requires particular attention to uncertainty. TemplePsyche distinguishes between what can be observed, what is supported by evidence, what remains a hypothesis and what is currently unknown. The coexistence of factors does not establish causation, and the intuitive coherence of an explanation does not establish its accuracy.

For this reason, curiosity over certainty has been proposed as a central epistemological principle of the framework.

Curiosity does not require the abandonment of conclusions where evidence supports them. Rather, it requires that confidence remains proportionate to evidence and that interpretations remain open to revision when new information emerges.

The same standard must apply to TemplePsyche itself.

The framework described within this paper has not been empirically validated. Questions remain concerning the distinctiveness of its domains, the conceptual position of Information and Integration, the reliability of Whole Human System Formulation, its cultural applicability and whether the framework provides meaningful value beyond established approaches.

These questions require investigation rather than assumption.

Consequently, TemplePsyche should presently be understood as a conceptual proposition and developing programme of inquiry, rather than an established theory or validated clinical model. Its future architecture should be shaped not by a commitment to preserving its original form, but by theoretical development, interdisciplinary critique and empirical evidence.

The framework began with a question about what becomes visible when human experience is considered across interacting systems rather than predominantly through individual parts.

That question remains open.

What changes when we stop looking at parts of a person in isolation and begin exploring how the whole human system interacts?

TemplePsyche does not propose that the answer is already known.

It proposes that the question is worth investigating.

REFERENCES

Bowlby, J. (1982) *Attachment and Loss. Volume 1: Attachment*. 2nd edn. New York: Basic Books. (Originally published 1969.)

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979) *The Ecology of Human Development: Experiments by Nature and Design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. and Morris, P.A. (2006) 'The bioecological model of human development', in Damon, W. and Lerner, R.M. (eds.) *Handbook of Child Psychology. Volume 1: Theoretical Models of Human Development*. 6th edn. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Engel, G.L. (1977) 'The need for a new medical model: A challenge for biomedicine', *Science*, 196(4286), pp. 129–136. doi: 10.1126/science.847460.

Frankl, V.E. (2006) *Man's Search for Meaning*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press. (Originally published in English in 1959.)