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PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

In my role as President-elect, and now as President, of PIRI, two, totally unrelated types of query have been consistently directed to me. Because they are important I'd like to take this opportunity to share them with you along with some ideas thereon. The first has been in the form of, “How can I really participate more in PIRI?” The other consists of expressions of concern with respect to perceived “discrimination” against religion among psychologists — those in APA in particular. Both of these concerns require some careful regard as to what PIRI consists of and the context in which it exists.

As an interest-group within APA, we are a semi-organized collection of scientists, practitioners, and scientist-practitioners. Some members are with us because ours is the only outlet for profession-related religious interests in lives otherwise overwhelmingly secular. Others, in their professional activities, are focused upon religion as a critical variable in behavior — either as an influencing dimension in practice or as a major focus in research. And PIRI itself, is a loose federation. Although it has officers, only its devoted Secretary-Treasurer and its equally concerned Historian provide any formal of physical continuity. There is no central office, no central repository of current information, nor “place to go” outside of the personal offices of these two officers. As an organization, we “meet” only in two forms — in person at the business meeting, social hour, hospitality suite and program sessions at the Annual APA Meeting, and by representation through the meetings of the Executive Committee. So — how can you, with all of your disparate interests, possibly “participate” in PIRI? As I see it, there are several ways, some of which are critical, but only indirect through strengthening PIRI itself. The others are more personally gratifying.

First is by voting. Of especially critical impact is the November ballot calling for votes for Council representation. The Council is the power-voice of APA. The more representatives we have, the more voices we have. So, be sure to vote the ballot you receive in November (too many people ignore it), and give PIRI as many of your 10 votes as possible (note that even one counts heavily across many people). Further, vote the nomination ballots if possible. Look through the member list for persons you know to be good workers (not necessarily the same old visible names). Nominate them and also get your friends to do so.

Second, is the Newsletter. If you have ideas for it, send them in. If there are topics you feel need to be covered, write to the Editor. If you are doing something noteworthy, let us know. Use the Newsletter for communication. If you want to know if someone else is doing research related to yours, write a brief note asking about it. You might be surprised at the response.

Third is the APA meeting — both participating in and simply attending. If you have done any research in the field of religion, know of any phenomenal speaker who has relevant things to say, ideas for symposia appropriate to PIRI, let the Program Chair (this year, Dr. Constance Nelson) know about it. But also, if you get to the convention, try to attend the business meetings, the social hour and the hospitality suite as well as the formal program. Let people know if you are interested in helping on a particular Committee or Task Force (be sure to pin it down by giving this information to them in writing complete with your name and address). If you can’t attend annual meetings, then send this to the President-elect who will be having to fill committees when his/her term begins. If you’re not selected by one President-elect, send it to the new one next year. There is no central file to keep track of these things.

Fourth, if you believe that you qualify for Fellow status, let the Fellows Committee Chair (currently Dr. Helen Pettorotto) know about it. Be aware that the criteria for APA Fellow prevail and sheer “interest” in psychology of religion per sé is not enough to qualify. But, if you believe that you have made an impact on psychology, the community, or the world at large through your work in the psychology of religion, by all means check it out with the Committee. This is equally true for Fellows in other divisions who are Members of PIRI. The strength of a division is often judged by its number of Fellows. PIRI’s current 38 Fellows compared with approximately 1200 Members is relatively low. However, it should be noted that this year our Committee had 100% acceptance of its nominations by the APA Membership Committee. We have learned that proper preparation of credentials in terms of the criteria can be a critical factor in successful nominations. So, be sure to obtain the criteria before formulating an application.

The other, unrelated, but important and highly sensitive issue that I would like to address openly concerns repeated statements made to me which reflect a belief in perceived discrimination against PIRI in particular and religion in general by some of our fellow psychologists in APA. We need to be certain that it is truly our interest in religion at which the criticisms are aimed before such perceptions can be held to have real validity. We need to be certain that we truly differentiate “psychology of religion” from a “religion of psychology”; that we separate the effects of religious problems on behavior from study of the problems themselves; that we differentiate theology itself from its effects on behavior. And, above all, in our writings and presentations, make clear that we know the differences and stipulate our focus. From the comments directed to me, it would appear that those participating in the program at the Annual Meeting have been
consistently sensitive to these distinctions. Likewise, the research and observations of our scientist-practitioners tend to be presented in clear focus. It is the area of direct research with religion as a primary variable that most of the comment which I have received has concerned. The comment took two forms — inadequate knowledge of research design and paucity of substantive scholarship. Comments on research design have come predominantly from fellow PIRI members who anguish over having to give negative peer reviews of articles on critically important religious issues in which inadequate design and/or inappropriate data analysis makes the study unpublishable. Such experiences really do hurt our image, even among ourselves. But, an even more serious concern is the paucity of empirical research being submitted, much less reported. As many as eight editors of journals which would readily publish such articles have bemoaned the lack of submitted manuscripts, good or bad. This lacuna creates for the outsider, a very lop-sided picture of the psychology of religion and its role in the furtherance of knowledge. This becomes even more the case when articles based primarily on theology, opinion, or personal belief and experience continue to proliferate disproportionately. To this end, I would urge those of you who are working in this area and/or who have creative graduate students who are interested in religion as a variable, to encourage publication of their empirical ideas and findings. There is a dire need for solid, empirical substantive research in our field. In filling this void, let’s be sure that the quality of our psychology is such as to preclude criticism of our interest in religion.

Mary Reader, President
Psychologists Interested in Religious Issues

CALL FOR PROPOSALS: CAPS CONVENTION

The International CAPS Convention for 1988 will be held in Denver, Colorado April 20-24 at the Radisson Hotel. The theme of the 1988 Convention is "Psychotherapy and Christian Spirituality." Proposals are welcome. For more information contact James R. Beck, CAPS, P.O. Box 10,000, Denver, CO 80210.

EDITOR'S NOTE

The psychology of religion is alive and well. This year’s Division 36 program leaves no doubt about that. Divisional papers and presentations were extremely well-attended. The Hospitality Suite was, in many instances, "standing room only." And many people commented on the quality of our program. As editor of the newsletter, it is also exciting to see our field flourishing. But of course, success is accompanied by problems. In recent issues, it has become more and more of a struggle to "select, cut and paste" among the many fine contributions coming across my desk. After discussion with the Executive Committee, we have decided to expand two of our four yearly newsletters to a 12 page format. While this increases our expenses, it seems justified given the amount of quality material we receive and the fact that the newsletter is our sole Divisional voice. So this is the first of our 12 page newsletters — another sign that, in spite of the "division" of APA, our Division is alive and well.

1987 DIVISION 36 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

TOWARD A RADICAL PSYCHOTHEOLOGY

RICHARD D. KAHOE

MENNA FORTY, INC.

DUNNEGAN, MO 65640

Two years ago, in our Division 36 Hospitality Suite, when I anticipated facing an audience such as you with a presidential address, I told Ralph Hood and Michael Donahue the proposed title as it has been published. Most of my empirical research in the psychology of religion had been in the motivational area, the why and how of religious faith and practice, more specifically the intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations. Now, I thought, it was time to turn our attention to the what of religious faith, the psychological implications of our religious theologies or beliefs. A day or two later I heard Pat McCabe, in his presidential address approach at least part of the issue, noting that, "The role of religion in the experience of the older person has ... not been an object of frequent study. ... The actual consideration of the variations in belief systems and the role that these play in personality organization, coping with stress or contributing to a sense of meaning in life is relatively neglected."

The basic idea has continued to dog me. Last year I was concerned that Richard Gorsch was coping my idea in his William James Award address — "BAV: A Belief-Based Model for Psychology of Religion." Then at last year’s Society for the Scientific Study of Religion meeting Michael Donahue chaired a symposium on "The Case for Theological Literacy in Psychology of Religion." Graciously Mike acknowledged my hospitality suite remark as the source of his idea, and invited me to participate in the symposium, along with myself, Ralph Hood, Bernie Spilka, and others. Furthermore, my reading led me to a 1976 paper of Bernie’s, which referred to a 1970 paper of his, which proposed "the development of a theological-psychology of religion, the results of which would be theologically informed and relevant to both theology and psychology" (1976, p. 161). In fact, I could not rationalize the intents of my proposal any better than Bernie, whom I shall continue to quote: "One motivation for this approach stemmed from the position that theologians for thousands of years have been speculating on the human condition, and undoubtedly have gained some significant insights into the bases of human action. For psychologists with a 100 year history to put this aside in an effort to rediscover the wheel with their own resources seems rather inefficient and arrogant" (1976, p. 161).

Why then, in the face of precedent going back at least 17 years, and up to yesterday’s symposium on Fundamentalism, do I persever in my present thesis? In the spirit of contemporary personality psychology, I must give two answers — one personal, one situational. For the first I refer back that, in graduate school I coped with the risk of failure by adopting the low-key philosophy of J. Alfred Prufrock, and literally typed out and taped to my desk the quotation from T.S. Eliot’s poem, "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock":

No I am not Lord Hamlet, nor was meant to be;
An attendant lord, one that will do;
To swell a progress, start a scene or two,
Advise the prince; no doubt, an easy tool;
Deferential, glad to be of use;
Polite, cautious, and meticulous;
Ful of high sentence, but as bit obscene;
At times, indeed, almost ridiculous —
Almost, at times, the Fool.
So I feel no need to originate a new movement, but am content to "swell a progress, start a scene or two."

The situational answer takes us to the story about the young Baptist preacher who came to a country church and the first Sunday preached on tithing. While that was a bit sensitive, the congregation felt their tongues and opinions, and waited. But the next Sunday he again preached on tithing; likewise the third. After he preached on tithing on the fourth Sunday also, the deacons met him at the door to ask, "What is this preaching on tithing four times in a row?" "Well," he said, "you ain't tithing yet." I again advance a theologically-based psychology of religion, because we aren't really doing much of it yet.

Let me clarify what I am proposing. I come from a religious tradition in which it is almost a truism that "It makes a difference what you believe." I know that many disagree, in an ultimate sense, but let's hold that issue for later. Casual observation should convince us that belief matters for many people. A few hours ago we heard from Father Curran what it is like to be in a religious group that wants you to believe differently from what you do. Recently the re-elected president of the Southern Baptist Convention, the second-largest religious body in this country, in his own presidential address, passionately appealed for unity within his badly divided group, but holding that the basis of their unity must be doctrinal.

Also we must attend to theology to become a more nearly complete psychology of religion. In Mary Jo Meadow's and my psychology of religion text we have only 11 casual page references to theology, and I find no more in other recent texts. While we have not exhausted the field of intemperate and extrinsic orientations, surely there are many more unanswered questions if we turn toward another direction. While I would not be so radical as to call for a Kuharian paradigm shift, some fresh breezes would be welcome in the psychology of religion. One of the most promising newer theoretical approaches in our field is attribution theory, which is patently cognitive. One attributes beliefs about one's world, and many of these beliefs can come from theological contexts. Nor should we neglect Gorsuch's BAV model, in which the B stands for "Belief." For that reason he has promoted the model as "not-reductionistic," inasmuch as it approaches a faith on the basis of those terms that it most explicitly espouses.

Maybe we should clear up another question. Should we get involved in empirical research on theological beliefs? Perhaps better, "Why haven't we already done more such research?" Obviously the realm of theology can at the same time be most private and yet most sensitive. In short, we can be accused of meddling, whether we study our own faith or somebody else's. In my questionnaire, the "Christian Faith Study," I often get qualifying interlinearations, or comments like, "This was an ambiguous questionnaire," or simply, "Stupid question!" Our beliefs divide us most completely as religious persons, and when we venture objective research in this area our motives are most likely to be questioned.

A propos valutative implications of our empirical findings in psychotheology, one of my earliest students, now a professor of philosophy, made the astute observation that what is good psychology does not necessarily make good theology. However, the research topic at that time — attitudes toward equality for women — suggests that theology and psychology may not long remain incongruent, in a free society at least. My research (Kahoe, 1974) found that Baptist college women's beliefs in equality were congruent with their religion but incongruent with mental health. Within two or three years, in the same population, women's beliefs in equality for women increased substantially. You should recall, too, that not many decades ago the Vatican II Council was called with the explicit goal of bringing Catholic theology into the twentieth century and was, in principle at least, open to insights from all sources, including the behavioral sciences. Nonetheless, as we approach research in psychotheology, we must be superlatively sensitive to issues of ethical treatment of our subjects and extremely humble about the interpretation of our research findings, in whatever forums we share them — lay or professional, orally or in writing, within the faith studied or without it.

As we venture into the terra incognita of empirical study of theology, let's consider what we know, with some degree of certainty, about the psychology of theology. I pose as a basic assumption that most theologies are, or at least in their beginnings were, adaptive in an evolutionary sense. I direct your attention to Marvin Harris's popular anthropological work, Cows, Pigs, Wars, and Witches. Most relevant and convincing are the chapters that show why, in the social heresy of the Indian subcontinent, the Hindu taboo against the slaughter of cows is not irrational, as most Western observers make it, but is in fact the economic salvation of the peoples. Similarly, in the arid Mediterranean climate the Hebrew and Islamic taboos against wine are highly adaptive. If we assume, in a more general way, it makes a difference what you believe, then it stands to reason that the society that survives is more likely to hold beliefs that are adaptive in its particular physical or social environment. Of course if circumstances change and a theological system does not, then the theology may no longer be adaptive, or may even become maladaptive.

Secondly, theology tends to be reactive. Rokeach's classic unobtrusive study reported in The Open and Closed Mind is indicative. Rokeach studied a number of Catholic encyclicals from over many centuries, and noted that not only was each in reaction to a specific heresy, but also that there was a direct relationship between the degree of threat to the church posed by the heresy and the dogmatism of the ensuing decrees. A participant observer in the Assemblies of God denomination noted that the group did not strongly promote theology, except for the doctrine of the Trinity. That emphasis has historical roots in that, early in the group's existence, a unitarian heresy was introduced, and required a strong trinitarian dogma to oppose it. The dogmatic emphasis prevailed, even with the former threat now history.

Finally, theologies tend to be stated in extremes. In his APA Presidential Address in 1975, Donald Campbell indicated this principle in relation to moral absolutes, and the principle is still valid in many settings. One of the best therapists I know for working with mildly retarded, conduct disordered boys, with sexual acting-out problems, has a well-developed system of moral absolutes for use with such clients. Similarly I recall a discussion of situations ethics, applied to premarital sexual relations. The detailed, abstract, ethical considerations that apply in such relationships were straight from Joseph Fletcher (1966), but aptly answered by, "But that's a long thought for an adolescent in the back seat of a car." Raymond Cattell has observed a social process he calls "the law of coercion to the socio-norm," which I (1985) have related to religious teachings about gender differences. Biological and psychological differences that may be slight but real are intensified by the dogma of a religious and theological system, and become matters of decree.

Extremes, though, tend to provoke opposite reactions, in Hegelian thesis and antithesis. In realms of human social behavior of theological relevance, any thesis, pushed to its extreme is likely to be untenable, if not absurd. Yet Hegelian syntheses cannot always be expected in the theological realm.
Theology may more often operate on a level indicated by the philosopher Niels Bohr, who observed, "The opposite of a correct statement is a false statement. But the opposite of a profound truth may well be another profound truth." In my research on personal theologies of salvation, some respondents found no inconsistency in strongly endorsing both God's grace and human works as the bases for salvation. Similarly, I have often heard the dictum, "Pray as if it all depended upon God, but work as if it all depended on you."

Those generalities are background principles that we must subject to application or verification in any given situation. But now let's get closer to the subject matter of a radical psychotheology. I do not claim the term "psychotheology" as original. The word has occasionally been used to refer to the psychology of religion, as in a Division 36 paper at APA. But rarely has "psychotheology" been used in the "radical" sense I am proposing that we engage deliberately in a program of research into the psychological determinants and consequences of specific beliefs from living theologies and religious faiths.

This charge suggests studying theologies — both institutional and personal — as consequences of social and personality factors, that is, theology as the dependent variable. Perhaps more radically, it suggests studying theology as an independent variable, and seeing what difference (if any) our beliefs do make in our lives — whether we are more or less loving, or moral, or coping, or adjusted, or peaceful, or optimistic. Some basic work may need to be descriptive, but with most of our psychology of religion we should find our most fruitful ground in the study of function, how the theology works in human lives. Previous writings, such as Stern's _Psychotherapy_, can point to some of the relationships we would expect between theology and psychological variables; shortly I shall suggest what I consider to be some promising theological variables.

To interject a negative that may be comforting to some, I would not expect to find much of direct psychological relevance in some of the theological fundamentals that distinguish basic faiths. I'm not sure it would be very fruitful to study, as dependent or independent variables, beliefs in the historical reality of Moses, whether or not Jesus was the Messiah, or the historicity of the golden tablets containing the Book of Mormon. Many of the psychologically fruitful theological dimensions are likely to be found in other dimensions or across any of the major religious faiths.

Now to turn directly to a content of a radical psychotheology, a basic theological question is the epistemological one: By what process do we come to a knowledge of religious truth? The Hegelian extremes are personal experience and authority or tradition. Do we accept what our idiosyncratic, fallible experience tells us, or do we accept the authority of the church fathers, the Bible, or the Qur'an? Or is there some blend or middle ground between the two? What are the consequences of taking any given position on this issue? The question is of more than academic interest to me. For the last ten years, up until last Thursday, I worked for an evangelical social service agency that employed many entry-level workers. A substantial number, particularly of charismatic or fundamentalistic persuasions, felt quite confident in their direct hot line to God. For most of the last ten years my clipboard held a cartoon: two Christian men are talking of a third; one says, "Oh, he shouldn't be held accountable — he says he was under the influence of the Spirit." This became no laughing matter to us, since workers of this conviction were likely to break employment contracts, as God's authority was higher than man's. Further, they often left unpaid debts or other unethical trails behind themselves. If my circumstance causes me to blacken one epistemological extreme, I could as readily caricature the other extreme — the blind followers of authority or tradition. The point is, there are significant faiths that encourage both of the extremes. My casual observations of the personalistic extreme may be distorted, but I believe we should know empirically whether that position is frequently associated with such disregard for social convention and order. Likewise we should know the consequences of the opposite extreme. Then we should also explore descriptively and functionally the alternatives that moderate both extremes.

If we take the word theology literally as, "talk about God," then beliefs about God should be part of our empirical psychotheology. On the dependent variable side much work has already been done, with a substantial literature on the origins of God concepts, particularly relating to parental imagery, following Freudian speculations. An unanswered issue is the extent to which God concepts are influenced by formal church or theological teachings, as contrasted with experiential or personality factors. Still further, do our concept of God — loving or wrathful, just or forgiving — make any real differences in how we live our lives.

As Spinka noted in 1970, theology is also a study of the human condition, and it is only a literal incongruity to speak of the "theology of humanity." When I arrived at George Peabody College for Teachers for doctoral study in 1962, Larry Wrightsman was beginning a research project on "philosophies of human nature." While Wrightsman, a Methodist layman, did not couch his variables in theological terms, they are obviously relevant. His research is now well established in his social psychology writings. Anybody who wants a relatively easy starting point in psychotherapy would do well to start with Wrightsman and further explore the consequences of our theologies of ourselves and our fellow human beings.

Another psychologically potent theological topic is the relationship between God and man. How does man come to relate to God? Most theologies posit a divide that must be bridged. My preliminary research (1986) defined and measured two concepts of salvation that have already been mentioned — salvation by grace and salvation by works. My interest in these concepts was originally spurred by my research on death attitudes (Kahoe & Fox, 1975), which suggested that a theology of works led older Christians into a final spurt of earthly energy, to ensure their final passage through the Pearly Gates. There are surely other psychological consequences of whether one rests on God's grace or one's own good deeds for relationship with the divine.

Another set of theological scales I have developed contrasts two forms of Christian hope (1982). Revolutionary hope measures one's confidence in personal earthly success growing out of Christian faith; eschatological hope measures one's confidence in an eternal reward after this earthly life. While the former showed a slight tendency to be associated with more mature forms of faith, the most striking finding was that the two quite differently defined kinds of hope were strongly correlated with one another. According to many thinkers, what religion has most to offer is the hope that all will work out in the end for the believer. These and other varieties of hope surely should have some significant consequences, as we continue to explore them.

One area in which religious beliefs have shown empirically demonstrable effects is morality (Gorsuch, 1976), though conspicuous exceptions sometimes seem to belie the data. Moral dictates can be held to be separate from theology, but a recent
study of drug usage among Seventh Day Adventist youth makes a strong case that anti-drug prohibitions in that church are rooted in basic theological beliefs (Dudley, Mutch & Craig, 1987). Probably in many churches the relationship between theology and any given moral behavior is more complex than is the SDA and drug study, and therein should lie a fruitful field of study.

A final theological position is perhaps least clearly defined; it is the view that our beliefs per se don't matter all that much. In my Christian Faith Study (1992, 1986) I had thrown in a gratuitous item stating, "Anybody who is really sincere about their beliefs is acceptable to God." Endorsement of this item helped define a factor that included accepting three Salvation by Works items, rejecting two Salvation by Grace items, and rejecting two Eschatological Hope items. Paradoxically, this mixed, post hoc scale had higher internal consistency reliability, both in the initial study and in a replication, than did my carefully crafted and refined ad hoc scales. The scale suggests a liberal, non-orthodox theology that offers some security or solace to the believer. However, there may be more benign interpretations. Michael Donahue has directed my attention to the contemporary Roman Catholic "Doggmatic Constitution of the Church," which provides a parsing of the key item: "Those also who can attain to everlasting salvation who, through no fault of their own, do not know the gospel of Christ or His Church, yet sincerely seek God and, moved by grace, strive by their deeds to do his will, as it is known to them, through the dictates of conscience." I suspect, though, that the key item and the scale would have different implications for a "man on the street" than for a cloistered theologian. The question, then, is, does it matter if you believe that it doesn't matter what you believe?

If you are still with me, I have argued that it is important for psychology of religion, and probably for our religious faiths, that we turn to serious study of the implications of our theologies. Further, I have suggested some potentially fruitful topics of study within what I have defined as a "radical psychotherapy." It now remains but to suggest how we might carry out such research. I shall try to minimize the pain of a few methodological notes, and bring this to a speedy close.

In our computerized age someone will be tempted to reduce our theologies to scale items, give an omnibus inventory to a thousand sundry believers, and conduct a factor analysis. When they apply for their research grant, though, they should avoid me as a referee, for I would discourage the effort. Even working with four highly refined religious style scales, Mary Jo Meadow and I (Kahoe & Meadow, 1977) found radically different relationships between different populations, e.g., state university students vs. denominational college students. I have come to prefer ad hoc, conceptually clear, well refined, highly reliable scales to measure salient theological variables. I point to my salvation and hope scales as exemplary. However, caveat are in order here also. My Grace scale, relatively robust among evangelicals, had negligible internal consistency reliability among Catholics (Kahoe, 1986). Kenneth Pargament has found the same phenomenon trying to develop scales to measure different religious variables. Regardless of what you learned in Psych, Measurement I, reliability is not intrinsically a function of an instrument alone! However, even when my Catholic respondents were not measurably reliable on the Grace scale, their scores as a group were strikingly consistent and different from those of other groups, suggesting some kind of reliability. Also, while scoring my scales of 5 or 6 items each, with small groups from discrete denominations, I have observed that sometimes a single item is answered in a deviant way by many members of a particular group. Such problems suggest that, whatever their faults, a single item might appropriately measure a theological position. I am not fully ready to yield to that position, but I could understand somebody's trying that approach.

If we are to study beliefs that are inherent in the theology of a living faith, sometimes we need to look at regular adherents of churches with clearly defined teachings. I found some surprises when I tried my first such study of theology, while I was still in graduate school — over 23 years ago. My group of Unitarians completed my instrument over protest that they did not hold to any creed, but among themselves they were my most consistent group, whereas the very fundamentalist Church of Christ group were the least consistent. Further, the groups that were tied closest together in belief, on my instrument, probably would not have worshipped in the same room together — the Church of Christ and Roman Catholics.

This summer I analyzed some recent data from four denominations in Jasper County, Indiana, on the salvation scales of my Christian Faith Study. Supporting some construct validity, Baptists were the highest on Grace and lowest on Works, while Nazarenes were lowest on Grace and highest on Works. Methodists and Reformed were intermediate. I had conjectured that the more intrinsically religious would be the most open to different theological positions, but that did not prove to be the case. Possibly a different scale such as the Meadow's Observance scale (Kahoe & Meadow, 1977), or Allen and Spilka's Consensual scale would better predict congruence with the teachings of one's church.

One is likely to find, in any church, that a certain percentage of the members belong to the congregation for reasons that have little to do with theology, and may hold beliefs different from the norm. In such cases it may be justifiable to try to eliminate the deviants. For example, in my recent data both Nazarenes and Baptist groups had Grace scores ranging from 21 to 30. When I eliminated the extreme high and extreme low fifth's from each group, the middle three-fifths diverged: 21 to 27 for Nazarenes and 27 to 30 for Baptists. The initial ranges on Works had substantial overlap, but the mid three-fifths ranged from 11 to 14 for Baptists and 15 to 18 for Nazarenes.

I will merely mention the long-repeated but also newly-ignored plea for more creative research than I have done, with less reliance on paper-pencil measures for both independent and dependent variables. If the independent variable is a verbal endorsement of a theological position, some behavioral measure as a dependent variable would prove much more convincing than another verbal measure.

My admiration for Rokeach's unobtrusive measure of religious dogma compels me to suggest that such methods can be effective in our psychotherapy, whether addressing historical or contemporary data. If any of you have followed the schism among Southern Baptists, you can imagine a content analysis of the articles and speeches on both sides, to determine (for example) the degree of compassion, trust, or empathy associated with the respective moderate and fundamentalist adherents.

Finally, another kind of creativity is suggested by the proposed radical psychotherapy. The pursuit of human variables dependent on theological beliefs can turn readily to cultural and cross-cultural questions of crucial import to the world. What shapes the Italian mind, the Irish Protestant mind, the Central American mind, the Afrikaner mind? Surely we can imagine that somehow theologies are likely to be involved. Are the questions beyond the scrutiny of psychological methods? I believe not. The enormity of the questions calls for a response from this group of psychologists who are concerned about religious questions, and who, I believe, are also concerned for
human welfare in the broadest sweep. Not all of us can afford to limit ourselves to the small issues, and I believe a radical psychotherapy would enable us to approach some of the truly significant questions for the future of the human race.

Let me close with a dream. Paul Pruyser, wrote his first book as a psychology of religion couched in explicitly psychological constructs, several years ago I outlined a psychology of religion book based on theological constructs. I have not written the book, in part because a crucial bulk of the empirical data do not exist.

I pulled together my thinking for this address in the process of driving back and forth between Indiana and my new home in Missouri almost weekly this summer. The move to Missouri is in a figurative as well as a literal sense a retreat to the wild forest, where I will be establishing a wilderness-based psychiatric group home. I am unsure of my ensuing degree of professional activity. I am not likely to do much of the research I have proposed today. But in ten or twelve years I may emerge from my Ozark forest, hankering to write that book I had outlined. If the next decade of psychologists of religion, i.e. Division 36, have done their work, there will be the data for my book. If you have done your work so well that one of you has already written the book, I will buy a copy, and return to the forest to read it with great satisfaction, knowing that this hour will have borne good fruit.

The complete set of references is available from Dr. Kahoe.

WILLIAM C. BIER AWARD ADDRESS 1987
Theoretical Models for Church Consultation
or "a good man is hard to find"**

H. Newton Malony
Graduate School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary

Flannery O’Connor wrote a sardonic story of highway robbery and murder entitled "A good man is hard to find." This tale, like many of her other stories, ends with the cynical conclusion that evil is stronger than good and that bad persons go on being bad even in the face of protests and calls for them to change their ways.

In this story, "The Misfit" and his gang of escaped convicts accost a family who have turned off the highway to find a plantation the grandmother remembered seeing as a child. In spite of the grandmother’s claims that The Misfit is a good man at heart, the gang methodically kills the family one by one. The last to be killed is the grandmother who is killed as she reaches out to touch The Misfit proclaiming as she does that he is one of Jesus’ "babies."

If I could be so bold, I would like to use the analogy of O’Connor’s story to talk about psychological consultation with the church. It seems to me that at times psychologists have been like The Misfit while the church has been like the grandmother.

Often, the church, like the grandmother, has interacted with psychologists only by accident on lonely by-roads. When they have been exposed to the counsel of psychologists, they have loudly protested that these ‘misfits’ must have been raised by well-meaning parents and that, surely they can be trusted to do the right thing. Psychologists are good persons, if they did not know it.

Psychologists, in turn, have often ignored these plaintive pleas and, like The Misfit in O’Connor’s story, they have run rough-shod over the church. They have failed to realize the church’s uniqueness and have applied their insights or misjudged it’s value in a ruthless, intolerant manner.

"Good men (sic) have been hard to find", as the grandmother stated. "Good consultants have been hard to find," might be a conclusion the church could draw.

The intent of my presentation on this occasion of receiving the William Bier Award for Contribution to the Applied Psychology of Religion by Division 36 of the American Psychological Association is to describe some models of church consultation which might make it easier for the church to say, "Good consultants are EASY to find."

I would hope that these models would, at the same time, honor the integrity of psychologists as psychologists. It is my firm conviction that psychologists can function as unbiased students of human behavior while they utilize their insights in helping the church become an even greater force for good in human life.

In proposing these models I draw on my experience as director of a Church Consultation Service in the graduate school in which I teach, as evaluator of ministerial and missionary candidates for several denominations, as teacher of consultation and management skills to graduate students in both psychology and theology, as chair of over twelve dissertations relating the social/behavioral sciences to the church, and as consultant to many local churches on issues of problem solving, self study, leadership training, and conflict management.

As might be inferred from this involvement, the church has been an important part of my personal and professional involvement. I consider the church to be a vital and positive part of common life. I honor its influence in my own development and I admit openly to having accepted its call to ordained ministry—a commission under which I continue to serve. Psychology has always been, for me, a means to making the church more effective.

Countering the Bias of ‘Individualism’

These comments about my own stance lead me to the first hurdle which I feel must be overcome among those psychologists who would consult with the church. This hurdle is the ‘bias toward individualism’ which pervades contemporary psychology. Such bias makes many psychologists suspicious of organized religion.

One of the more cogent observations of this bias was given by James Dittes in his discussion of the presumptions underlying the intrinsic-extrinsic orientation to religious research (see Dittes, 1971). Here he observed that many scholars are like Gordon Allport, the originator of the intrinsic-extrinsic dichotomy. As a function of their own solitary training and independent study they become suspicious of social groups as well as the historical process. They prefer individual autonomy rather than group conformity. This is often apparent in their societal attitudes but it is very clear in their religious opinions. They prefer individual intrinsic religion to extrinsic group religion. Like William James they think of private individual religious feelings as “first-hand religion” and organized religious behavior as “second-hand religion.”

This is nowhere more apparent than among clinical and counseling psychologists who spend much of their time in working with individuals. In their effort to encourage independence and autonomy it is quite easy for them to perceive social groups, such as the church, as constraining and inhibiting. In fact, among the most dehumanizing groups in society, the church is often seen as one of the worst.

In confirmation of this impression, we found in our research on spiritual issues in psychotherapy among California psychologists that while they had often been raised in one of the
major religious traditions, as adults they had abandoned organized religion and tended to be religious in individual, unorthodox, non-institutional ways. They reported that their clients frequently raised spiritual issues in psychotherapy but that where these issues referred to organized religion they most often reported to the church to have been constraining or inhibiting. (see Shafaranske and Malony, 1987).

Thus, it is no accident that many psychologists would need to overcome an anti-institution, pro-individualistic bias if they would be "good" consultants with the church. By scholastic training and by professional experience, psychologists have tended to be the MOST non-traditional among scientists in general and among social/behavioral scientists in particular. In a study of a random sample of the members of the American Psychological Association this truth was demonstrated conclusively (see Ragan, Malony, and Bein-Hallahmi, 1980).

Interestingly enough this same preference for individual as opposed to group religion is shared by many church leaders themselves, as Dittes has pointed out in another volume entitled The Church in the Way (1967). Here he notes that for many ministers the 'church' gets in the way of their religious message. It is a necessary evil rather than an essential component of religious life. Thus, they perceive church administration as a bothersome requirement they fulfill in order to have time for helping persons pursue their individual religious interests.

Dittes proposes a point of view which pictures the church as an unavoidable factor in responding to the divine. He concludes that private religion is narcissism and, for practical purposes, nonexistent. He concludes that the church is the avenue through which personal religious experience is fostered and expressed. It is a sufficient means to that end.

I do not mean to imply that such a suspicion of institutional religion is totally in error. We have all heard enough horror stories of dehumanizing and repressive religious organizations to know that religious groups are not sacrosanct. They are cultural entities who, in spite of their superlative claims, share all the vicissitudes of history. They are subject to the inroads of brutality and violence along with all other groups. There is grandeur and misery in organized religion.

I do mean to imply that if one is to be a good 'church' consultant it will be necessary to counter the suspicions one has regarding the value of organized religion lest one's consultation become implicitly riddled with an individualistic bias. Where this bias occurs, psychologists either refuse to consult with churches or, when they do, they provide unrealistic help. Thus, they end up being no better than 'The Misfit' in O'Connor's story.

Consultation theory and the ethos of the American Psychological Association mandate that consultants only consult with those organizations whose value they can espouse. While it is not absolutely necessary, nor may it be always advisable, that church consultants be church 'members,' it is, nevertheless, essential that such consultants affirm the value of organizational life and, at the very least, not be antagonistic toward the world view of religion.

**Consultant Roles**

Turning to more practical concerns, I would like to define consultation and detail several roles which I believe psychologists are able to play in church consultation.

**Consultation** is a process whereby a professional contracts with a client in an effort to assist the client in answering a question or solving a problem. Although consultants on occasion are permanent employees of the clients to whom they consult, more often they are temporary assistants. It is important that the dynamics of outsiders attaching themselves to intact social systems be well known by consultants if they are to be helpful and effective.

However, those psychologists who are permanent employees of churches to whom they consult often play one of four roles that I believe are available. One role that they play is that of "participant." The other consultant roles are "researcher," "resolver," and "trainer." Although these roles are not mutually exclusive, let us consider each of them separately.

Playing the **participant** role includes inherent assets as well as liabilities. There is no question but that when one is a member of, or employed by, the organization to which one is consulting that a certain amount of objectivity is lost and a certain amount of conflict-of-interest is involved. There is, at the very least, a subtle pressure to maintain one's job or to justify the group ideology. On the other hand, there is enough distinctiveness involved to suggest that unless one is a participant in such a unique group as the church one will not have enough intuition to know how to ask the proper questions much less interpret the answers. I took this position in an article entitled "The Lord's house needs built-in shrinks." (Malony, 1976)

Sufficient to say, there are two sides to the participant role. Presently many psychologists who consult with churches are participants to one degree or another. Perhaps this is because church leaders know them better and trust them. There exists a long tradition of the "participant observer" in psychology. At the very least, those psychologists who would consult with churches need to involve themselves in the culture to some degree.

However, the importance of outsiders should not be ignored. Outsiders bring a fresh, objective perspective which the church needs. There is always the danger of incestuousness when only insiders are used.

The second role for church consultants to play is that of researcher. This is the role that is most often played by academics as contrasted with practitioners. Because they have undertaken a program of research which involves investigating the impact or dynamics of church life, these researchers often probe the inner workings and interrelationships in the church.

At times these researchers may be called upon to undertake special projects as in the Readiness for Ministry Studies conducted by the Search Institute (Schuller, Strommen, and Brekke, 1980). At other times they initiate their own investigations as in one study of social competence and 'fit' with the congregation/synagogue (see Pargament, Tyler, Steele, 1979).

In almost every case where consultants play the researcher role, the implications of their investigations for church organizational functioning are clearly stated. Many reports of this type of consultation are reported in the Review of Religious Research whose publishing guidelines require that the policy implications of the investigations be included. Even when it is a case of "research that can be applied," as contrasted with "applied research," these practical applications and are a part of this researcher's consultant role. A clear illustration of this type of consultation can be seen in Richard Gorsuch, a well known social psychologist of religion. He combines the roles of participant and researcher and calls himself a "minister to ministers."

The role of resolver is next. It and the trainer role to follow are by far the most typical roles church consultants play. Resolver refers to that type of situation in which psychologists are asked by churches to help in the solving of problems, the determination of goals, the managing of conflicts, or the evaluation of programs. This type of consultation is time-limited, client initiated, problem focused, and system involved.

This resolver role is the one about which most books on
consultation skills are written. Interestingly enough it is the role that is fraught with the greatest frustration for both psychologist and the church. There is a decided tendency for the church to overspiritualize its internal processes and, thus, to resist either engaging or accepting a psychological interpretation of the issues. There is an opposite danger among psychologists. They have a tendency to underspiritualize the life of the church and to be impatient with attempts on the part of the church to deny its humanity. Getting problem ownership and gaining credibility are the overarching concerns to which the role of resolver consultant have to be directed.

Potentially, however, this is the role which can be of greatest service to the church. Psychologists are specialists in human behavior and their knowledge and skill can greatly enhance the functioning of the church. Where the church is willing to look at itself from a human point of view, psychologists can be of real value.

The last role of psychological church consultants is that of trainer. Trainer is the role in which most clinical and counseling psychologists feel most comfortable in playing because it involves their being asked by the church to come and instruct in areas with which they are most familiar. Courses in child development, parenting, interpersonal relationships, handling grief, and counseling skills are but a few examples. Workshops in single living, resolving conflicts, and planning for marriage are other illustrations. Moreover, it is becoming common for churches to engage psychologists to train and supervise their lay counselors and to train their staffs in leadership and problem solving.

The training role, like the resolver role, is time-limited and topic-focused. It does not usually involve programmatic self-study or problem identification — tasks which plague the resolver role. Rarely does it require the psychologist to interact with the ideology of the church. Good parenting is good parenting wherever it is found. Therefore, training is typically the role which psychologists like and which involves them the least in the organizational life of the church.

These four, the participant, the researcher, the resolver, and the trainer, are the most typical roles played by psychologists who are consultants with the church. They are not exhaustive nor are they mutually exclusive.

Another example of this multiple role playing might be when a church engages a psychologist to help it engage in a self-study. The contract might include not only a research component but also a resolution component in which the psychologist might lead the church in identifying with the issues which the research raised. Thereafter, the consultation might include training of leaders in some new endeavor which the church decided to undertake. Thus, several of the consultant roles could be involved.

I turn next to a substantive issue. What are the issues to which psychologists are invited to consult with churches in one or more of their roles as participants, researchers, resolvers, or trainers. For this I turn to a model I conceived in an earlier article entitled “Psychology and the church: a model for relating” (see Malony, 1973).

The Psychologist/Church Relationships: A Model

The model to follow illustrates how psychologists can function in the various roles described above to help the church accomplish its mission.

Several assumptions about the meaning of "psychology" and of the "church" are presupposed in this model. Psychology is understood to refer to "that scholarly discipline, scientific field, and professional activity which studies human behavior." Human behavior includes the feelings, the thoughts, the words, and the acts of human beings. In the model these four aspects are parts of the dimension labeled "behavior." Thus, in consultation with the church, psychologists would be able to deal with any or all of these aspects of human behavior.

Psychology studies human behavior with three ends in mind: understanding, explaining, and influencing. These three aspects of psychology's tasks are part of the dimension labeled "method."

By understanding is meant the 'what' of behavior. Psychologists can help the church become aware of what is happening. They can assist in devising ways to observe and describe church behavior. By explaining is meant the 'why' of behavior. Psychologists can help the church determine the causes of what is observed. They can assist in drawing conclusions about what led up to the church behavior which is observed. By influencing is meant the 'whether' of behavior. Psychologists can help the church change behavior. They can assist in making certain behaviors occur which the church determines it wants to make come to pass.

To sum it up, psychologists are those who can consult with the church in an effort to help the church understand, explain, and influence human feelings, thoughts, words, and actions.

Turning next to the term 'church,' a behavioral science rather than a spiritual understanding is implied in the model. Here the church is described as including "four P's": a place, a people, a plan, and a program. There is a sense in which any voluntary organization could be similarly understood. In the case of the church, it has a building and an address. Thus, it is a 'place.' It is a social group of people who come together because they share certain values, beliefs, and concerns. Thus, it is a 'people.' Further, the church, like other organizations, has a product to sell or a message it intends to communicate. In this sense, it is a 'plan.' Finally, the church engages in certain activities and sponsors certain events. It has a 'program' which it undertakes and presents to the public.

This basic model is the framework around which church consultants who are psychologists should relate to the church. It is a structure which should be clear to psychologists as they undertake church consultation. It is a model which should be shared with and clearly understood by the church in order that the church knows what it can expect from such a consultation. I believe it is a readily comprehended matrix which allows both psychologists and the church to focus their concerns and answer their questions. Whether psychologists play the role of participant, researcher, resolver, or trainer they can utilize this model to specify the consultant contract and provide explicit service.

I began this essay by referring to Flannery O'Connor's well known story "A good man is hard to find," I suggested that psychologists had often been like 'The Misfit' in her story. They have crudely and rudely run rough-shod over the church just as 'The Misfit' did over the captured grandmother and the family. I suggested that the church has often been like the grandmother. The church has looked at psychologists just as the grandmother looked at 'The Misfit'. The church has insisted that psychology must have had fine, upstanding parents and that underneath all the bravado psychology must be "good." Alas, many psychology-church relationships have ended up no better than 'The Misfit-grandmother relationship in O'Connor's story. Truly "a good man (sic) has been hard to find." Fortunately, such presentations as this, however, will change these events. My hope would be that good church consultants would someday be EASY to find!

The completestet of references is available from the author.
HIGHLIGHTS OF THE 1987 COUNCIL OF REPRESENTATIVES’ MEETING

1. Minutes of the February 1987 meeting were approved.
2. Fellows: 154 Fellows were elected, including Dr. Mary Jo Meadow and Dr. Hendrika Yande Kemp.
3. New Divisions: The proposed Divisions of Psychological Assessment and Peace Psychology failed to obtain the necessary 2/3 vote essential for approval. The petition of the proposed Division of Transpersonal Psychology was withdrawn by the Board of Directors because the necessary additional signatures were not obtained.
4. Vacancy on the Board of Directors: The election of Joseph Matarazzo as President-Elect leaves a one-year vacancy in 1988 for his unexpired term on the Board. After lengthy discussion, 17 procedures for filling this vacancy, Council voted for selection of this year’s runner-up, Lenore Walker, to serve the unexpired term (1988-89) of Matarazzo. It was further voted that the Committee on Structure and Function of Council (CSFC) should develop new procedures for filling such vacancies.
5. AIDS Prevention: Ethnic Minority Issues: The motion that APA develop recommendations on AIDS prevention within ethnic minority populations and communicate these to public and private agencies conducting AIDS Education and Prevention was approved.
6. ICD-9-CM Diagnosis “Homosexuality” and DSM III Diagnosis “Ego Dystonic Homosexuality”: A motion that APA urge its members not to use the 302.0 “Homosexuality” diagnosis in the current ICD-9CM or the 302.00 “Ego-Dystonic Homosexuality” diagnosis in the current DSM III or future editions of either document was approved.
7. Sevilla Statement on Violence was approved for endorsement.
9. By-law Amendment on Pro/Con Statements: A 2/3 vote rather than a 90% vote requirement was approved to determine if a pro/con statement is to accompany proposed by-law mailings to the membership.
10. CIRP Amendment to August 1986 APA Resolution on South Africa: In offering this amendment, the committee on International Relations wished to specify that American psychologists should not collaborate on projects which contribute to the perpetuation of the apartheid system instead of simply “projects”. Defeated.
11. Half-Time Internships: Approval of the motion that APA encourage internship centers to adapt their programs to the changing needs of selected students and not to discriminate against them. APA should encourage internship centers to give consideration to special cases.
12. Committee on Professional Service Review: This Committee is to be discontinued. Motion to house professional service review in the Office of Professional Practice, as part of its marketing program was approved.
13. Establishment of Division 12 Journal via an affiliation between Division 12 and the Pergamon owned and published journal, Clinical Psychology Review was approved.
14. APA Support of Proclamation of National Eating Disorders Awareness Week (April 24 - April 30, 1988) was approved.
15. Periodic Membership Opinion Surveys: Council approved allocation of $25,000 of its FY 1988 contingency fund to assist in establishing an in-house capability for conducting periodic opinion surveys of the APA membership.
16. Clinician's Research Digest: The motion for APA to acquire this publication, January 1, 1988 (assuming contract negotiations of such a transfer are successful) was approved.
17. Name Change for Committee on Animal Research and Experimentation to Committee on Animal Research and Ethics was approved.
18. South Africa's Malreatment of Children: The motion that APA participate in the post card campaign (organized by the Lawyers' Committee for Human Rights under Law) to demonstrate in a coordinated manner, opposition to the detention of children in South Africa (Estimated cost $400) was approved.
19. Psychological and Behavioral Classification Series: Council approved allocation of $23,000 from its contingency fund to produce a series of volumes that both respond to the needs of psychologists and current information on taxonomy and classification.
20. Interim Report of Group on Restructuring (GOR); dated August 27, 1988: After careful review by Council, Council adopted the following resolutions:
   1. That the tenure of the members of GOR be continued so that further work on the restructuring plan might go forward. Specifically, GOR is directed to:
      a. Complete detailed planning to implement this proposal of reorganization.
      b. Prepare cost estimates for the proposed new governance structure and compare those estimates with the existing costs of governance.
      c. Prepare the necessary bylaw amendments to implement the proposed structure.
      d. Draft transition plans to implement the recommended structure in an orderly and least disruptive fashion.
   2. That the expenditure of the funds needed to accomplish this set of tasks be authorized.
Council commended GOR for its work while not endorsing its report in principle, encouraged them to continue and requested that detailed recommendations of GOR should be given to Council members at least 3 weeks before Council meets to consider them.
21. Finances:
   (2) Psychology Today is still a major problem to APA. PT is expected to show a cash deficit of $1.4 million in 1987 and $1.9 million in 1988. The Board of Directors has appointed Woody Katzoff as PT's publisher.
   (3) Council on recommendation of the Board of Directors approved unanimously an allocation of $300,000 to the Science Directorate. It is intended that the Science Directorate will launch a series of initiatives, such as:
      a) Distinguished Scientists Lecture Programs
      b) Distinguished Panel Program to increase participation at regional meetings
      c) Arranging a variety of other activities relating to the national convention, co-sponsoring free-standing scientific conferences, etc.

Respectfully submitted
Virginia Staudt Sexton
Mary Jo Meadow
DIVISION 36 AWARD WINNERS

H. Newton Malony, Jr., was selected as the recipient of the Bier award for Division 36. Dr. Malony is currently Professor of Psychology and Director of Programs in the Integration of Psychology and Theology at Fuller Theological Seminary. He has provided outstanding service to the field through his work as past president of Division 36, past president of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Western Region, and Council Member of the Religious Research Association and Society for the Scientific Study of Religion. Dr. Malony has been at the forefront of efforts to integrate theological and psychological concerns in applied work. He has edited or authored over 15 books including The Nature of Man; A Social Psychological Perspective (with Richard Gorsch), Psychology and Religion: A Bibliography of Historical Bases for Psychoanalytical Integration (with Hendrika Vande Kemp), and Is There a Shin in the Lord's House? How Psychologists Can Help the Church.

Kenneth J. Pargament was the recipient of the James award for Division 36. Dr. Pargament is currently Associate Professor of Psychology at Bowling Green State University. He has been the editor of the Newsletter for the past two years, on the editorial board of the American Journal of Community Psychology, and editorial consultant to five other journals. A clinical-community psychologist, his work includes over 25 publications which integrate an interest in the role of religion in the coping process, with an interest in religious congregations as resources and constraints to the members. His recent publications include: God and the just world: Causal coping attributions to God in health situations, JSR, 1986, Religion and the problem solving process: Three styles of coping, JSR, in press; and, Religion in American Life: A community psychology perspective, in the Handbook of Community Psychology.

Virginia Stauff Sexton was the recipient of the Division's first Distinguished Service Award. Dr. Sexton was selected for this award because of her immense and singular contributions to our Division. She was a key leader in the organizations which preceded Division 36. She almost single-handedly accomplished its status as an APA Division. She has continued to be a critically important source of wisdom and guidance for the Division since its beginning. Dr. Sexton is currently Distinguished Professor of Psychology at St. John's University and Professor Emerita in the City University of New York. Her leadership roles in the American Psychological Association are too numerous to mention. Currently she is a member of the Task Force on Centennial Celebrations and is also a council member of our Division. Dr. Sexton has authored over 100 publications including five books, among them History of Psychology: An Overview and Phenomenological, Existential, and Humanistic Psychologies.

CALL FOR 1988 AWARD NOMINATIONS

The Awards Committee invites nominations for the 1988 Distinguished Service Award, the William James Award, and the William C. Bier Award. The Distinguished Service Award is given to individuals who have served Division 36 for more than seven years in a significant way. The William James Award focuses on contributions to basic research and theory in the psychology of religion and related areas. The William C. Bier Award honors contributions that apply data and theory from religion and allied areas in order to integrate such findings and ideas with those of other disciplines, notably philosophy, theology, sociology, anthropology, etc. Please send names of nominees and a statement of your reasons for making each nomination as later as December 1 to Dr. Bernard Spitta, Chairman, Awards Committee, Department of Psychology, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80208-0204.

CALL FOR RECORDS 1982 - 1985

Records of Division 36 business meetings from 1982 to 1985 when Dr. Sidesits was Secretary-Treasurer were lost in the mail. In the interest of maintaining a complete archival record of our Division, we are seeking copies of these records. If you have any of these records, please send a copy of them to Dr. Margaret E. Donnelly, 75 Henry Street #22C, Brooklyn, New York 11201.
MINUTES OF INCOMING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Psychologists Interested in Religious Issues

The meeting was called to order by President Reader at 7:12 a.m. over a continental breakfast prepared by Drs. Reed and Kahoe. Present were Drs. Carey, Donnelly, Hood, Kahoe, McCabe, McLean, Nelson, Palouzian, Pargament, Reader, Shafranske, Spilka, Stern, Vande Kemp and White. Dr. Ed Redicks was an invited guest.

Dr. Reader reviewed the list of committee and task force appointments: Newsletter Editor: Ed Shafranske, [spring issue] Regional Affairs: continued by Ralph Hood Membership: Ray Palouzian Program Committee: Constance Nelson, chair, assisted by Vincent White, John Gardner (Hospitality Suite Chair) and Song Yang Tan (1988 chair).

Fellows: Henry K. Misik, chair, assisted by Frank Farley and David Myers

Awards: Chaired by Spilka, assisted by Pat McCabe and Dr. Reed's appointment.

Link to BSEF and Ethics Committee: Justin Carey

Continuing Education: Ed Shafranske

Link with APA on Centennial: Virginia Sexton

Task Force on Religion and Textbooks: Hood and committee

Task Force on Training in Diversity: Altmaier, Bardi, Bergin, Prost

Committee on Women in Psychology: to be appointed

Archives: There was a discussion of who is responsible for requesting that speakers send materials to the Newsletter and the archives. It was agreed that a tactfully worded letter of congratulations could include this request.

Policies and Procedures Manual: Dr. Donnelly was asked to draft a handbook, which should be based on policy statements in records of Executive Committee Meetings. Newsletter editor will include a "call for records" of the 1982-1983 period when Dr. Sideritis was secretary-treasurer, as those records were lost in the mail. Current and past chairs should send summaries of procedures to Dr. Donnelly.

CONFERENCE CALLS are scheduled for January 30, 1988 and March 5, 1988. [The latter may be changed to March 12 if Dr. Sexton is not available on the 5th. The calls will begin at 11:00 a.m. Eastern time (8:00 Pacific time).

Splitting of Secretary-Treasurer's Position. It was moved that this position be split into two separate positions and that these offices be elected in different years. Such a change would require a by-law amendment and cannot be implemented in the next election. This can be handled by electing a secretary-treasurer next year, then having that person remain as secretary and electing a treasurer in 1989. The motion was approved. It was moved, seconded and passed that the by-law amendment be included with the presidential letter and call-for-nominations. Dr. Vande Kemp will draft the amendment to be included on the ballot, and will write a rationale statement.

Elections. Nominations are needed for the following offices in 1988: President-Elect, Secretary-Treasurer, Member-at-Large, Council Representative (for the term beginning in February 1989).

Dr. Meadew made a motion that our funds be moved out of APA. After discussion, this motion was tabled.

Dr. Donnelly noted modifications that should be made in the newsletter. These were noted by Mrs. Vande Kemp and proceeded for the records.

History. Dr. Vande Kemp summarized plans for the APA centennial. Dr. Redicks presented her proposal for a possible history of PIRL. After lengthy discussion, it was moved, seconded and passed that we make archival records (minutes, newsletters) available for his research, with the understanding that he will pay all expenses involved.

Council of Representatives. Both new divisions (Peace Psychology, Assessment) were voted down. Planning for reorganization will continue.

There was discussion about whether the Hospitality Suite chair could be appointed as a member of the program committee without by-law amendment. It was agreed that he/she could simply be appointed as a consultant.

Continuing Education. After discussion, it was agreed that the chair could approve workshops for CE credit without involving the rest of the executive committee. Collaboration with other groups was encouraged. Dr. Stern raised the issue of whether we should begin subgroups or interest groups in the division. No motion was made.

WELCOME TO NEW MEMBERS OF DIVISION 36

The following new members, associates and affiliates were approved at the APA meeting of PIRL, effective as of January 1988. We welcome our new participants in PIRL and look forward to their active involvement in our flourishing division.

Members

Junie M. Allman
John A. Aragona
David W. Avocado
Mark W. Baker
Rodney L. Bassett
Frank M. Bernt
Gary L. Banker
Betty J. Bryan
Brenda Byrne
Martha L. Campbell
Gail E. Chandler
Linda A. Charney
Michael L. Chave
Terry L. Clay
Beth A. Taylor-Carey
Joseph J. Coons
Lous J. Cozinho
Patricia J. Dahn
James B. DeBoe
John F. Delaney
Daniel J. DeWitt
Quintin D. DeYoung
Agnis M. Donovon
Donald W. Durham
James L. Duff
Michael Ehrig
Paul D. Entin
Cleveland K. Evans
Frank Farley
Martin J. Finno
Carol J. Fitzpatrick
Jan S. Freeman
Robert J. France
William J. Gammon
John D. Gartner
Robert G. Granger
Ross H. Grunow
Daniel M. Griffin
Patricia A. Hafer
James Harrison
David A. Hermance
Zipora Herza
Dale M. Hilly
Doris Howard
Barney R. Howe
Craig T. Issacs
Carlton T. James
Donald M. Keen
Howard Kostin
Mary J. Keihe
Joseph E. Kennel
Mark L. Kuehn
Robin J. Lewis
Billy R. Liewer
Lee E. Lipsker
Lewis M. K. Long
David Lukoff
Monty L. Lynn
Anne C. Magen
Lawrence J. Manita
William C. Martin
David F. McAnulty
William C. McCann
Donald E. Moore
Gisela Barreto-Morales
Joseph M. Moran
Christine Muellerweg
William H. Mullins
Terence J. Neary
John R. Neder
William J. Nicholson
Kathy P. Nyberg
Breda C. O'Sullivan
Vernon R. Padgett
David E. Pescio
Ronald J. Pekala
Ann B. Pratt
James E. Radker
David G. Rasmussen
Richard B. Rice
William T. Riley
Kathleen Y. Ritter
Harold B. Robb
Valda N. Robinson
Gae H. Roid
Patricia A. Schertenlader
T. W. Schwartz
David S. Shavne
Paim Shawk
John L. Shefton
Deborah B. Sherman
Mary V. Solano
Randall L. Sorenson
Chen Nan Tai

Murray Fondow
Michael R. Frantow
Mary E. VanderGoot
Bryan VandenGen
David S. Voss
Wade K. Weil
William H. Watson
Robert D. Weber
John E. Wilson
Tae Wook
Greg D. Wood

Associate Members

Bruce E. Atkinson
Robert A. Ball
Isolde Sommer Cohen
Patricia E. Colby
Joseph A. Erickson
Victoria R. Fahlgren
Michael Fiala
Keith St. Harris
William L. Hartlau
Stephen M. Huggs
John A. Hubla
Steve R. Kemperman
Paul A. Munson
Debra A. Neumann
David D. Ream
Martha A. Robbins
Sharon K. Ruyle
Carol A. Siefker
Scott A. Sommerville
Michael Teo
Roman D. Thein
Mitchell A. Woutersdorf

Support Affiliates

Robert Lee Beilke
Russell D. Bishop
Mark F. Greiner
Jeffrey Alan Hayes
Nestor Ricardo Mantilla
Davis Earl Massey
Edward W. Mendez
Debra Ann Neumann
Katherine Ann Scherman