From Silos to Systems: Rethinking Psychological Science Through Interdisciplinary Lenses

Zaib Samraz[1*]

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Interdisciplinary Lense, Psychological Science, Silos to Systems

[1*]Consultant Clinical Psychologist, As-Siraat Dar Al Shifa Hospital, Ahmedpur East, Pakistan.

***Corresponding Author Email:**
zaibsamraz@gmail.com

Psychological science relies on practical rigor and complex ideas. Regardless of noteworthy expansion, this field still battles with a most important issue: the tendency to study human behavior devoid of seeing the larger contexts that effect it and most importantly, outlines it (Uher, 2020). Many up-to-date psychological problems continue to nurture and become more complex over time. These complications are multidimensional and intensely rooted in social, genetic, scientific, and political contexts. Nevertheless, psychological investigation and practice remain limited within precise disciplines. This generates a gap among the complexity of human issues and the means psychological research is organized. Therefore, we must ask, "Has psychology's focus on its own discipline started to decline its significance in the real world?"

Common mental health challenges, such as depression, anxiety, PTSD, and behavioral dysregulation do not get up in isolation. In fact, such issues are deeply influenced by the collaboration between biological vulnerabilities, cultural standards, economic pressures, online environments, and systemic uncertainty. Recent investigation proposes that psychological singularities are shaped by dynamic systems of factors rather than by isolated internal processes (Zhou et al., 2024). Psychological science often highlights individual cases. This methodology tends to oversee systemic and contextual factors. Consequently, the field might yield data that looks solid in theory but falls short in practice.

Interdisciplinarity: A Necessary Correction, Not an Academic Trend

Interdisciplinary approaches are habitually seen as novel or forward-thinking, but they are often misinterpreted. True interdisciplinary approach is not just about plagiarizing terms from other fields, nor is it parallel work under a shared project tag. As an alternative, it includes mingling ideas, methods, and assumptions from diverse disciplines to grab the solution for problems that cannot be understood over one perspective (Choi & Pak, 2006).

Current research shows that interdisciplinarity is now vital for psychological science; it is one of its crucial upcoming pathways. Large scale analyses of psychological research trends disclose a growing understanding that actual growth requires teamwork with neuroscience, public health, education, data science, and social policy (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine [NASEM], 2023). Such a thoughtful move does not diminish psychology's identity; rather, it increases its descriptive or explanatory power as well as practical relevance.

The discipline's own history supports this view. Interdisciplinary incorporation has been key to some of psychology's most noteworthy breakthroughs, from cognitive neuroscience to behavioral decision science.

Existing studies show that reunion of psychological theory with biological, computational, and social models advances both predictive accuracy as well as real world impact (Vahed & Cooper, 2025).

Why Interdisciplinary Psychology Is Urgent in Applied and Low Resource Contexts

The boundaries of isolated psychology are particularly being more visible in low- and middle-income countries including us. Here, mental health issues are mostly connected with shortage of resources, inequality, cultural stigma, and weak structure of the society. In these challenging environments, individual interventions alone do not work and often fails to yield evident outcomes.

Recent interdisciplinary intervention models demonstrate that joining psychological science with community based and public health methods significantly expands mental health results and service access (Zhou et al., 2024). These conclusions disclose an important fact: psychology that is detached from social and structural systems may become irrelevant to those who need help the most.

Trauma research exemplifies this well. Trauma cannot be fully comprehended without looking at neurobiological stress responses, social support systems, cultural stories of suffering individuals, and ongoing structural challenges. Similarly, the fast growth of digital mental health tools needs teamwork among psychology, computer science, ethics, and data management. Without this collaboration, issues linked to privacy, inequality, and unverified interventions increase (Torous et al., 2023). Handling these challenges as just psychological issues does not reflect scientific thoroughness; it highlights gaps in diverse areas.

The Real Obstacles Are Institutional, Not Scientific

Regardless of growing signals for interdisciplinary work, psychology still battles change at various levels. Various kind of academic training programs value conformity to outdated disciplines more than the capacity to assimilate different approaches. Funding sources usually favor narrow methodologies, and interdisciplinary projects are often seen as uncertain or lacking focus in Pakistan. In the same way, publication standards support these views by preferring conventional designs and familiar theories resulting in demotivation of researchers who want to go beyond traditional methods that are no longer serving in this area of science.

Studies of interdisciplinary research groups show that the difficulties are more institutional than scientific. Early career researchers often report that interdisciplinary work faces more pushback during peer review, funding decisions, and promotion processes (Young Academy of Europe, 2023). This pushback reflects professional gatekeeping and boundary guarding within disciplines, not worries about scientific quality. Consequently, psychology's institutional structures fall behind the truths it aims to comprehend and resolve.

Toward a Systems Oriented Psychological Science

If we want psychology to grow successfully, then interdisciplinary thinking needs to move from the edges to the center of the field at a speed with which the developed countries are making progress. This change calls for a thoughtful reform. And for this; psychology programs should view systems theory, interdisciplinary research design, and cross disciplinary partnership as indispensable skills, not just optional add on (Uher, 2020). Joint supervision models and integrated research training can introduce students to

numerous viewpoints and expand their methodological flexibility.

In exploration, models that shows an association among psychological biological, social, and environmental factors should not only be encouraged but also reinforced. Mixed methods and community focused methods expand ecological validity and help close the ongoing gap between lab results and real life experiences (NASEM, 2023).

Academic journals also have a significant role in this advancement. Editorial policies that welcome contributions from diverse fields, include reviewers from numerous disciplines, and value conceptual integration more than strict methods can benefit and shape the future of psychological science.

Conclusion: Psychology Cannot Afford Intellectual Isolation

The future of psychological science depends not on conserving stringent limitations, but on accepting knowledgeable modesty and partnership. Human behavior occurs within entangled biological, social, cultural, and technological systems. A science that oversees these systems cannot claim an entitlement to have a full understanding.

The problem is no longer whether psychology should connect with other fields. The more crucial and disconcerting question is if we can justify ongoing intellectual isolation in a world where factors beyond individual control increasingly influence human suffering. Moving from isolated pockets of knowledge to a systems approach is not just a luxury; it is a scientific and moral requirement.

Ethics Statement

This guest editorial did not require ethics approval and informed consent.

Contribution of Author

Zaib Samraz: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing – Original Draft, Writing - Reviewing & Editing

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest declared by the author.

Source of Funding

The author declared no source of funding.

Data Availability Statement

The data sharing is not applicable to this guest editorial as no dataset was used in the current study.

References

Choi, B. C. K., & Pak, A. W. P. (2006). Multidisciplinarity, interdisciplinarity, and transdisciplinarity in health research, services, education and policy: Definitions, objectives, and evidence of effectiveness. *Clinical and Investigative Medicine, 29*(6), 351–364.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2023). *Fostering interdisciplinary research and training in the behavioral and social sciences*. National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/26741

Torous, J., Bucci, S., Bell, I. H., Kessing, L. V., Faurholt-Jepsen, M., Whelan, P., Carvalho, A. F., & Firth, J. (2023). The growing field of digital mental health: Current evidence and the future of technology in psychiatry. *World Psychiatry, 22*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21093

Uher J. (2021). Psychology's Status as a Science: Peculiarities and Intrinsic Challenges. Moving Beyond its Current Deadlock Towards Conceptual Integration. *Integrative Psychological & Behavioral Science*, *55*(1), 212–224. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12124-020-09545-0

Vahed, S., & Cooper, R. P. (2025). Interdisciplinary approaches in psychological science: Expanding

theory, methods, and societal impact. *Nature Reviews Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1038/s44159-025-00468-4

Young Academy of Europe. (2023). Benefits and obstacles of interdisciplinary research: Insights from early-career researchers. *iScience, 26*(12), 108508. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.isci.2023.108508

Zhou, Y., Li, J., & Wang, Z. (2024). Systems thinking in psychology: Integrating biological, social, and environmental determinants of mental health. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1732927. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1732927