The question I am addressing has haunted me virtually from the beginning of my association with the field. Early in my graduate career at the University of Michigan, I volunteered to help out in a course called Psychology and Religion. When the students in my discussion section and I discovered that the course was really on the sociology of religion, we agreed to supplement the readings chosen by the head teaching fellow with selections from James, Freud, Jung, Allport, and Fromm. The next year, when I was invited to take over the course, these authors became the main sources.

Refocused on the psychology of religion proper, Psychology and Religion rapidly caught fire, becoming in two or three years the second largest undergraduate course in psychology above the introductory level. I was understandably heady with the success of the course, but I worried about what would happen to it after I left, especially given its history of surviving through the labors of unpaid graduate students with little background in the field. Anxious that the course receive continuing support, I prepared an elaborate apologia for it, a document that included the syllabus, a ten-page introduction to the field, and an extensive summary of course evaluations. I presented this document to the department chair and circulated it to others who I thought might be sympathetic.

The course was funded at last, thanks largely to a chair with a personal interest in the field, and it was finally counted toward the psychology major. Personal consequences also promised to follow. At the suggestion of the chair, I prepared a proposal to take my doctoral exams and to write a dissertation in the field.

After I circulated the proposal, however, the larger reality came home to me. However enthusiastic the students of the 1960s might be about the psychology of religion, professors of psychology during those years were appalled by the prospect of a graduate student specializing in it. At the advice of Gerhard Lenz, a sociologist of religion at Michigan at that time, I postponed working in the field until after I received my Ph.D.

My experiences at Michigan were indicative of the state and status of the field as a whole. In spite of student interest, the study of the psychology of religion was not encouraged by most academic psychologists, and when a course on the subject was offered, it usually meant that a faculty member's idiosyncratic interest was merely being tolerated. Furthermore, as the product of idiosyncratic interest, the psychology of religion course inevitably appeared in many guises, some of them virtually unrecognizable.

In undertaking to write a book on the psychology of religion, I hoped, first of all, to convince a few more psychologists that the subject matter is worthy of their
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attention. For them and their students, then, I wanted to provide an overview of the field, starting from its beginnings. I aspired to do as comprehensive a perspective as I could muster, both in terms of religious traditions and phenomena and in terms of psychological methods, theoretical frameworks, and fundamental issues. I dreamed of a day when the psychology of religion would finally come into its own — with a community of scholars who shared a broad core of knowledge and a common sense of purpose; a journal exclusively on the psychology of religion and dedicated to scholarly and non-sectarian research; and graduate programs that ensured continuity and fostered creativity in the next generations.

Sadly, that dream is still far from fulfillment. Not long after my book first came out, I started receiving letters or telephone calls from students in various parts of the world asking where they could do graduate study in the psychology of religion. My heart rises and then sinks whenever I receive one of these inquiries. Gratifying though it is to learn that someone somewhere has been stimulated by the contents of my book to undertake formal study of the topic, that satisfaction is always short-lived, for I am immediately reminded that, in the United States there are really no graduate programs in the psychology of religion, apart from certain more or less distant relatives in theological seminaries, and virtually no teaching positions in the field.

This situation is not new, of course, but has held from the field's beginnings. While it was possible to do doctoral work in the psychology of religion at Clark University around the turn of this century, this opportunity was the short-lived creation of but a single person with exceptional interests, Stanley Hall. Furthermore, according to the testimony of his two most eminent students in the field, Edwin Starbuck (1937) and James Leuba (1937), Hall was not particularly encouraging. Starbuck had already encountered resistance to his interest during an earlier stint at Harvard, where the experimental psychologist Hugo Münsterberg was reported to be explosively hostile when Starbuck approached him for advice regarding the study of religion. Starbuck succeeded nevertheless in earning a doctorate with a dissertation on the psychology of religious conversion.

But finding a job proved to be another matter. Hoping in 1935 to continue his work in the psychology of religion at some Midwestern university, he was finally forced to pursue instead the subject of mental training as director of the Research Station on Character Education at the University of Iowa (O'Donnell, 1985, p. 220). Thus a most promising early contributor was lost to the field.

Hall was himself hard pressed to sustain his American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education, which he had founded in 1934. When the first issue appeared, Leuba wrote to Hall to say that he thought the list of collaborators — which, in addition to Leuba and Starbuck, included George Coe, Jean du Bay, and R. M. Wenley — was surprisingly weak. When Hall took umbrage at this remark, Leuba explained that the fault was not Hall's but testified, rather, to the weakness of the new field (unpublished letter to Stanley Hall dated June 25, 1904, Clark University Archives). More revealing of the field's condition at that time were the erratic appearance of the journal, Hall's heavy reliance on his own and his students' writings for the journal's content, and the modest number of subscriptions — mainly institutional — which together covered less than half of the publication costs. After seven volumes and eleven years, Hall shut down the journal.

Although there were significant publications in the field in the decade that followed — notably Pratt's The Religious Consciousness (1920) and Leuba's The Psychology of Religious Mysticism (1925) — these were again works of solitary scholars and not signs of a burgeoning interest. More telling was the failed attempt, only a few years later, of the Austrian scholar Karl Beth to convene a congress on the psychology of religion at the time of the second world fair in Chicago (1933-1934). According to Starbuck (1937, p. 251), there was simply too little original research to support it. Looking back on this period, to which he himself was a contributor, Robert Thouless (1955) was of the opinion that little had been accomplished. The overall impression at mid-century, he concluded, was of a field that was "likely to continue to yield diminishing returns" (pp. 116, 147).
In my book, and in a forthcoming chapter on the early period of the field (Wulff, in press), I consider a number of factors that are likely responsible for the failure of the psychology of religion to thrive. Various critics have noted the field’s continued entanglement with theology and the practical concerns of religious institutions. Furthermore, some proponents are said to be insufficiently trained in research methods whereas others, if more methodologically sophisticated, are faulted for applying this or that method without giving sufficient thought to its appropriateness. Still other criticisms center on the lack of adequate theoretical frameworks, which are considered a prerequisite for meaningful research.

Those who are more or less content with the quality of existing work in the field point instead to external inhibiting factors, particularly the seeming prejudice against religion of many secular psychologists. There is certainly no denying this century-long disdain, but more important still may be the culture’s shifting intellectual and religious climate. The psychology of religion arose at a time when a critical combination of factors converged, an emerging fascination with religious traditions from other parts of the world, especially Asia; an increasing respect for science in general and a new enthusiasm for applying its attitude and methods in the human realm; and the reformist spirit of progressivism and particularly the Social Gospel movement. The widely noted decline of the field in the 1920s and 30s, then, can be understood in large part as a result of major shifts in this general climate, especially the waning of progressivism after World War I, the parallel decline of liberal Protestant theology, and the resurgent fundamentalism.

"Climate" is a common metaphor, a way of suggesting that there is “something in the air.” It is not really in the air, of course, but in persons, and we might better understand these trends if we looked at some of the individuals who best reflect that climate for us. Let us start with Stanley Hall. He was raised in a New England farming community in “the rigor of the Puritan faith,” as he put it, underwent an adolescent conversion, and chose the ministry as his vocational path. But the profound influence of such writers as Darwin and Spencer, his studies at Union Theological Seminary, his immersion in the life of New York City, and an emancipatory year of study in Germany transformed his religious views and redirected him into the field of psychology. Grateful to be free of his Puritan origins, Hall nevertheless remained deeply interested in religion, which he saw as a way of developing the inner life. It is psychology’s task, he became convinced, to encourage individuals to move beyond any literal and dogmatic understanding of religious myths while yet experiencing through them the deep, inner process of transformation of which they are, he said, projections (Wulff, 1997).

Leuba serves as another example. Raised in a religious home in Switzerland, Leuba (1927) likewise underwent an experience of conversion, although in his case it was at the hands of visiting members of the Salvation Army. The decisive factor, he said, was their moral ideal, not their doctrine. for Leuba had long had doubts about biblical teachings. Much like Hall, Leuba was deeply influenced by his studies of the physical and biological sciences, especially his readings of Darwin and Huxley. Gradually and almost imperceptibly, he grew away from his religious origins and finally chose a career in science — ultimately the new science of psychology. Although Leuba said he did his psychology of religion in his spare time, he was a dedicated and prolific writer on the subject. Three themes can be distilled from his writings: (1) scientists, especially those who are knowledgeable about the workings of the human mind and who are eminent in their fields, tend not to believe in God and immortality; (2) mystical experiences may be satisfactorily accounted for in terms of psychology and physiology; and (3) the essential values of theistic traditions, particularly those values that reflect the spiritual urge toward moral perfection that lies in each of us, can be fostered by nontheistic religious societies developed in the light of scientific knowledge.

George Coe offers yet another example. The son of an orthodox Methodist minister, Coe expected to follow in his father’s footsteps. Yet he, too, was deeply influenced by Darwin’s The Origin of Species, (Continued on page 4)
and on a fateful Sunday morning he solemnly embraced the scientific method for settling both intellectual and spiritual questions. Although he enrolled in the liberal Boston University School of Theology, he soon abandoned theology because of its reliance on untested authority. He worked instead toward a doctorate in philosophy, which at that time still included psychology. As he read the writings of persons prominent in the Social Gospel movement, participated in settlement work and local political reform, and read in the new social psychology, he came to see the function of religion as the development of personality in the context of relations with others. One of the first to apply scientific method to religious experience, Coe eventually dedicated himself to the religious education movement.

Ever committed to the social gospel, his last book, *What Is Religion Doing to Our Consciences*, criticizes the churches for perpetuating a class economy and thus for failing to address social injustices (Wulff, in press-a).

In these and still others of early contributors, we find a similar pattern: childhood beginnings in orthodox piety, a period of transition to a more liberal outlook that was promoted by the study of science and the impress of the Social Gospel, the discovery of psychology, which, like other social sciences early in this century, was deeply imbued by the spirit of progressivism; and finally, a new, more humanistic understanding of religion and the conviction that psychology has an important role to play either in reforming religious tradition or in fostering deeper and more adequate understandings of it. Promoting that role through research and writing became their common goal.

With the swing toward religious conservatism in the 1920s, such liberal views were in many circles no longer welcome. Indeed, they were explicitly identified as dangerous to religious faith. Professor of Education Charles Ellis (1922), for example, who was concerned about the growing influence of psychologists of religion in the training of religious educators, identified the writings of James, Leuba, Pratt, and Coe, among others, as antagonistic to the evangelical Christian outlook. In combination with other factors, including the rapid ascendance of behaviorism and the economic depression, which forced colleges and universities to drop expendable courses like the psychology of religion, the postliberal religious mind sent the field into a sharp decline.

The revival of the field, beginning around 1950, was unquestionably facilitated by Gordon Allport's *The Individual and His Religion*. Here was a book distinctly different from the works of the inaugural period. The most conspicuous shift was from a psychology of religious processes, contents, and institutions to a psychology of religious persons. Although an interest in individual differences was present from the beginning, such differences served mainly to shed light on religious processes or to assist in evaluating or interpreting religious content. With Allport, religious persons and their variations became an exclusive preoccupation, seemingly an end in themselves. A closer look at his life and work as they related to religion will provide an interesting contrast to those we have just reviewed from early in this century.

Allport was born into the home of a kindly family doctor in the American Midwest. Allport's grandmother was a founder of the Free Methodist Church, an offshoot of the revivalist Holiness Movement inspired by John Wesley's doctrine of perfection. His mother was deeply committed to the church and its principles of strict church attendance, camp meetings, plain living, and family prayers. As an undergraduate at Harvard, Allport found his religious views evolving into a humanistic religion, essentially Unitarian in spirit, but he soon rejected it in favor of the more devotional and mystical Anglo-Catholic Episcopal tradition of Boston's Church of the Advent, with which he developed a lifelong association. Allport both studied in, and — as a professor — was initially appointed to, Harvard's Department of Social Ethics, the spirit of which had emerged out of the Social Gospel movement. Throughout his college years, Allport was actively involved in volunteer social services (Hermanson, 1977).

Allport's career-long preoccupation with religion manifested itself in a series of professional publications, including his widely cited *The Individual and His Religion*. 
Less well known are the unpublished talks he gave to various religious audiences, including students at the Episcopal Theological School in Cambridge. A defender of religion in his professional writings, he became more frankly apologetic in the unpublished works, praising Christianity as more adequate than any other tradition and proposing that the social sciences be integrated into a larger religious framework (Hermanson, 1997).

When Allport was shocked to discover that religious involvement tends to go hand in hand with prejudice, he developed his famous distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic orientations as well as the earlier six-fold schema of religious maturity. The intrinsically religious—those genuinely committed to their faith—Allport hypothesized would tend not to be prejudiced, and they might even be healthier and less fearful of death as well. Thirty years later, the intrinsic-extrinsic distinction as well as Allport’s scales are still going strong, with evidence still accumulating that suggests to many that he was essentially right.

Allport was a social liberal who encouraged a symbolic and metaphorical interpretation of religious content—thought he offered few such interpretations himself. His scales, however—both the intrinsic and extrinsic ones and the Religious Scale on his Spranger-inspired Study of Values—were surprisingly lifted in a conservative direction. Unlike Hall, Coe, and others in the early period, his radical break from an orthodox religious past was short-lived, soon yielding to a traditional, church- and sacrament-centered form of piety. That his IE scales continue to be popular in spite of their long-neglected conceptual and psychometric shortcomings is a measure of how many today share in that religious outlook.

Personal religious views, I have tried to make apparent, play a major role in the setting of the agenda and goals for a psychology of religion and in establishing how religion will be conceptualized. But another way, psychologists of religion rarely if ever pursue their subject from a disinterested perspective. The farther goals that animate a particular contributor’s research or reflection are sometimes obvious, as they almost always were early in this century. In our day, however, an investigator’s or author’s personal views and ultimate goals are seldom explicitly stated. Rather, the scholarly ethos demands the studied appearance of scientific objectivity. Personal religious perspectives and goals nevertheless remain, silently working beneath the surface.

In 1954, when two colleagues approached me for ideas on a major panel on the psychology of religion at the next meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, I suggested putting together a group of prominent contributors and asking them three questions: (1) Why do you do what you do—that is, what are the ultimate goals of your work in this field? (2) What do you hope the psychology of religion will have become in 25 years? and (3) How would you change the psychology of religion if you could? My suggestion apparently struck a chord and the panel was duly constituted, with me cast in the role of respondent.

The next fall, the two-session-long panel discussion took place in front of a large, expectant audience. At long last, I thought to myself, I will hear my colleagues confess why they are in the field and what they would like to see it become. Somewhere along the way, however, my questions had become transformed into ones that were much less interesting. The crucial one—“Why do you do what you do, or what are the ultimate goals of your work?”—had utterly disappeared. The question “What do you hope the psychology of religion will have become in 25 years?” became the less personal “Over the next 25 years, where is the psychology of religion headed?” Only the last question remained more or less as I had proposed it: “How would you change the direction (of the field) in view of your own?” the third, new question they were asked was “Does (or can) the psychology of religion inform religious practice?”

Most of the participants responded to these questions extemporaneously and indirectly, and they tended to focus on general or technical issues, not the personal ones that I had had in mind. Even when I rephrased the question of why we individually do what we do, the discussion remained implacably impersonal.
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The responses of the four panelists, by the way, have been handily summed up by Michael Nielsen on his web page under the heading "Psychology of Religion's Future." The future they collectively envision, Michael points out, is not a "terribly optimistic" one. They all agree that changes are necessary if we are to see a happy outcome. Here is what they collectively recommend:

1) greater competence within psychology, and in particular, stronger adherence to scientific methods;

2) more knowledge of religion across various cultures;

3) an increased diversity of approaches, including clinical ones;

4) the positioning of data within a theoretical framework;

5) collective agreement to use in common the best existing scales;

6) improvement of the measures of spirituality;

7) additional funding for research, especially for longitudinal studies;

8) increased exposure of the field to other psychologists and in other venues.

What these come down to, by and large, is that we should continue doing what we are doing now, but just do it better — and then get more people to notice. Two of the recommendations do suggest, however, something of a departure from our usual mode of operating: gaining more knowledge of religion across various cultures, and increasing the diversity of our approaches within psychology.

I would like to second both of these recommendations. First, I recommend that everyone aspiring to a genuinely adequate psychology of religion become well acquainted with at least two different religious traditions. Then, whenever one generalizes about religion, or prepares a new set of scales, one will have at least two traditions to test the outcome against. It has been common throughout this century for psychologists of religion to study Christian theology. What we really need, however, is a foundation in the history of religions, *Religionswissenschaft*, such as James Pratt had. Without such grounding, we are bound to remain a parochial discipline.

The second divergent recommendation — that we increase the variety of our approaches — also strikes me as important. In particular, I urge us to consider the resources that are available in the rapidly growing literature on qualitative methods. This literature is more sophisticated and more promising than many of us suspect. And as James himself believed, qualitative methods may be more appropriate and fruitful for the study of religion than the quantitative ones we have so far preferred. The first of these recommendations — becoming well acquainted with another religious tradition — is addressed to each of us individually; the second one — increasing the diversity of our approaches — is aimed more at the field as a whole. But required of each of us would be an openness to the methodological preferences of others. Ideally, we should all become methodological pluralists; but short of that, we should foster respect for a variety of approaches.

To develop the broader methodological perspective suggested here, I strongly recommend that we draw on the growing literature on critical psychology, an umbrella term for a movement that has brought together a variety of emerging perspectives. An application of these perspectives to the psychology of religion would go a long way, I believe, toward illuminating the problems we face, especially in the United States.

Critical psychologists challenge the modernist notion that psychology is an objective enterprise that, by means of scientific procedures, is systematically progressing in its understanding of human behavior. In the new histories that these critical psychologists are writing, they point out how profoundly the field has been shaped by social and political forces. Fundamental decisions, such as the adoption of measurement as a prerequisite for empirical research, were made, not chiefly on the basis of scholarly or scientific principles, but mainly in response to institutional demands and the competition for resources. Furthermore, mainstream
psychology continues to function, say the critical psychologists, to maintain the status quo — the status quo, first of all, in psychology, including the assumptions, rules, and traditions that keep the discipline organized as it is and thus its proponents successfully employed, and the status quo in the larger sense, that is, the assumptions and arrangements of society as a whole, including our assumptions about the autonomous individual, and the power arrangements between the sexes and among the various social levels (Fox and Prilleltensky, 1997).

Critics of social psychology are particularly germane, given that, as Gold and his collaborators note in their textbook (1996), social psychology is the field in which most of the leading empirical psychologists of religion were trained and the source of most of the field's methods and contemporary theories. As Mark Pancer (1997) points out in a recent analysis of the crisis in social psychology, this field started out deeply involved in the burning social and political issues of the early decades of this century. After World War II, however, there was a reaction against the applied orientation that had been growing in social psychology. The field was increasingly criticized as atheoretical and unscientific. Within a decade or two, an academic social psychology emerged that rejected the earlier humanistic and action-oriented approach and essentially limited itself to laboratory investigations that tested hypotheses that had no particular social relevance. The new social psychology in its laboratory settings became increasingly individualistic, a response, its critics say, to the American ideal of "self-contained individualism." It correspondingly neglected the broad effects of social forces within the immediate community and the larger society.

Critics of social psychology today point out that, overwhelmingly, social psychological research is carried out by researchers, and based on subjects who are white, middle-class Americans and thus reflects the interests and biases of that portion of the population. That social psychology remains far more concerned with the individual than with the way that persons relate to each other; that social psychological research outside the artificial confines of the laboratory continues to be relatively rare; and that research participants are still given little opportunity to express their own thoughts and feelings about what is going on.

Having uncritically grounded itself in this new social psychology, modern empirical psychology of religion shares in large measure these various shortcomings. It, too, is carried out by white, middle-class Americans and engages research participants who share the same characteristics, which in this field most often include a Christian background. Similarly, it is highly individualistic in orientation, assuming that religiosity is essentially a personal possession measurable by some self-rating scale and existing more or less in isolation from current social factors. This individualism is also notable in the recent shift in correlational studies from an interest in social attitudes to the more individual-centered dimensions of mental and physical health. Whereas empirical psychologists of religion do not mirror social psychology's strong disposition to limit research to laboratory settings, this is only because religion has so resisted laboratory study; the laboratory remains the ideal for them as well.

A similar critique could be made of the perspective of developmental psychology, which plays a significant role in various approaches making up the psychology of religion today. Like social psychology, modern developmental psychology is faulted by critical psychologists for its highly individualistic orientation. That is, the child is said to be conceived of as if it were an entity existing apart from its sociocultural environment, which is thought to surround and support the developmental process but not fundamentally construct it. In other words, development is represented as essentially occurring within the child, the result of inherited biological tendencies, and is attributed a direction and goal that is the same for all children. Development is thus a normal, universal process; differences in this process can only be conceived as regrettable deviation or inferiority. Critical psychologists reject this highly abstracted model, arguing that "development is not a self-evident, or self-enclosed entity, but requires agents, objects and values. It is always of something, to
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somewhere, as evaluated by someone" (Burman, 1997, p. 140).

Carried over into the psychology of religion, the reigning view of development has encouraged investigators to search for a universal developmental progression, usually conceived of as occurring in stages. Because this progression is assumed to be "guiding" by inherent cognitive dispositions that unfold — when they do — according to a natural logic, relatively little attention is given to how contextual factors shape whatever development process there might be. The two most prominent systems of religious developmental stages — those of James Fowler and of Fritz Oser — have both been criticized for being fundamentally determined by theological assumptions, and Fowler’s in particular for reflecting liberal and relativistic values. Implied in much of this criticism, it would seem, is the possibility of transcending such biases and establishing a more faithful or accurate account of the process of religious development.

The new critical psychologists would argue, however, that some fundamental set of assumptions — whether theological, philosophical, social, or political — is bound to guide all such research, just as they argue that social and political forces likewise construct the phenomena we are trying to understand. The only thing we can hope to do, therefore, is to become aware of these factors and, at least as they shape our own conduct, to decide what values and goals we ultimately want to affirm and pursue.

At the beginning of my talk today, I observed that the first psychologists of religion in America were deeply involved in the reform spirit of progressivism. As religious liberals if not religious radicals, they actively opposed the status quo and sought to foster a new, more humanistic understanding of religion. They cared deeply about religious values, and they dedicated their lives to promoting them.

The psychology of religion in the United States today, or at least the dominant, empirical side of it, is on a different track. As I have already suggested in my discussion of Allport and his scales, much of today’s research is prompted by comparatively more conservative religious views.

The main goal seems to be to defend, preserve, and promote these views — that is, to defend the status quo.

I would urge all of us to clarify and acknowledge our own agendas, whether they more resemble those of the early psychologists of religion, who opposed the status quo, or the present generation, which tends to support and defend it. I would also urge us to discuss the possibility of transcending these agendas to pursue the psychology of religion in a broader and more disinterested fashion.

It may be that the impulse to defend or promote some particular point of view is a virtual prerequisite for an interest in the psychology of religion. If that is the case, I would urge us to make that point of view the broadest and most defensible one possible. At the same time, we must realize that such advocacy, not our methods, is likely the source of the disdain our field has long suffered in the eyes of other psychologists.

This is not to say, however, that the methods we use are a matter of indifference. I think we should look carefully to the critical psychologists and join them in rethinking our work as psychologists of religion. We need to become more sensitive to the individualism and relativistic character of mainstream psychology and find ways to transcend this regrettable bias. We need, further, to contextualize the forms and functions of our own activities and professions, and to become more sensitive to the consequences and limitations of the views we put forward. Following the suggestions of the critical psychologists, we need to draw on a wider range of research participants, especially ones from religious traditions other than our own, and we should invite them to help us to shape our questions and to interpret the data that result. We should reopen ourselves to qualitative or naturalistic approaches, as a few are already doing, and follow a more inductive and discovery-oriented path.

Such actions will certainly not win us the respect of mainstream psychologists that Daniel Batson and many others yearn for, but I think we should look to ourselves to fulfill the mandate of the APA Division 36.
our success. What does count as success is, unfortunately, one of the fundamental, unsolved issues that has haunted this field from the beginning. It is an issue, I suppose, that cannot be solved once and for all or in a single way, but it is one we need to address in earnest if we want this field to have a future.
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Some Goals for Division 36
for 1998–1999

by
Siang-Yang Tan, Ph.D.
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As I assume my role as the new President of A.P.A., Division 36, for the 1998–1999 year, I would like to thank all of you for your support and help so far, and ask you to continue to support and serve Division 36 in the coming year.

The following are some goals I have set for us as a Division:

1. To increase membership in Division 36, and if possible, increase representation of Division 36 on the A.P.A. Council.

2. To increase the recognition of religion as a crucial factor in psychology as a discipline, and more specifically in human diversity, culture, mental health, prevention, psychopathology, and psychotherapy and counseling. The work of the Division 36 Task Force on Religious Issues in Graduate Education and Clinical Training chaired by Dr. Edward Shaffer will therefore be particularly important in this context.


4. To collaborate more with other A.P.A. Divisions (e.g., in joint programming for the 1999 A.P.A. Convention) in order to have greater impact on the psychological community at large with regard to religion and psychology.

5. To encourage greater coverage of religion and the psychology of religion in psychology textbooks, as well as A.P.A. publication of books on topics relating religion to psychology, and more specifically, to psychotherapy and counseling.

With your continued support and participation, I look forward to a good year of progress together in advancing the goals of our Division!
February 20-22, 1998 Session

The most important Council event for our division occurred outside of its chambers during 1998. Through the strong support of its members, the division received 2,479 apportionment votes which were sufficient to receive an additional seat on Council. I am pleased to announce that Stanton L. Jones, Ph.D., has been elected and will be joining me in representing the division's interests on Council. The attaining of an additional representative, i.e., vote, elevates the status of the division and puts us in better bargaining position to influence the direction of the Association and to promote coalitions supporting positions of the division.

The February meeting was jointly chaired by Drs. Norman Abeles and Martin Seligman. This was the inaugural meeting in which the calendar year was used as the transition point for this responsibility. Each was gracious in offering and accepting this, at times, demanding responsibility. As I reflect on the content and tone of the meeting, the issue that first comes into focus is the need for fiscal conservatism. Such a stance poses challenges for a polity such as APA in which multiple, diverse constituencies are represented, each seeking recognition and funding for a multiverse of projects. Dr. Fowler, CEO of the organization, characterized that we are heading into "perilous financial times" and predicted future deficits in the budget. This will be the case, in my view, should the appetite for new projects and expansion of the functions of APA be allowed to escalate. I do not wish to be an alarmist, my assessment is that the management team is highly competent and adept at structuring financial plans to ensure the livelihood and solvency of the association. For example, the development of the APA buildings, from my view, was an important step in attaining long term financial security and a wise investment; leasing of space in the new building is ahead of projection and provides an impressive facility for the Association and in time a revenue generating capacity. I am meaning to convey, however, an important current that runs through every decision: there are many initiatives worthy of support and yet restraint is required in providing funding directly by APA.

What was of additional importance was Dr. Fowler's report of membership trends. APA is made up of 87,000 members, fellows and associates, 62,500 student affiliates, 3,500 affiliates, and 2,000 high school teacher affiliates. The robust number of student affiliates speaks to the vitality of the field and simultaneously poses challenges, e.g., opportunities for career development and recruitment into full participation in APA as members. Dr. Fowler highlighted the "customer service center" model of the central office in which member relations are addressed and services and products obtained. The goal is that a query will be routed immediately to the appropriate office and a response provided; this proactive approach is aimed to prevent what, at times in the past, and in other organizations can be the frustrating experience of the seemingly endless referral loop in which a simple request or question is not addressed or answered. He reported the on-going success of the Traveling Psychology Exhibit which now has a home in Arizona and has been visited by over 350,000 persons. Council heard an invited presentation by Dr. Richard McCarty, Director of the Science Directorate. He described the campaign to launch the Decade of Behavior (2000-2010) which aims in part to initiate and pass federal legislation to obtain such a national designation. In this context he mentioned the past designation of the Decade of the Brain and cited an interesting comment from the Director of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Science: "The beginning of the next century will belong to the behavioral sciences." This upbeat tone was tempered by a chilling remark that professional psychology was not represented at a high level scientific meeting in which our discipline was clearly relevant. As a division, we might consider projects or initiatives that bring the psychology of religion into the discussion of human behavior. Dr. Seligman noted the Sir John Templeton's support of a symposium on optimism and hope that in my view opens the door for the contributions from our membership.

The actual legislative activity of Council was mostly pedestrian at this meeting, e.g., language designating which Council members complete the CEO evaluation.
was clarified, in this instance the current members of Council. One important action concerns the format of Monitor coverage of presidential candidates. It was passed that each APA Board or committee that reports to the Board or Council would develop questions at their Fall meetings which would be sent to the Election Committee for review. That committee would then select 6 questions to be posed to the candidates. Over a number of issues the candidates' 300 word opening statements, biographies, and 100 word responses to the six questions would be presented. It was hoped that this will provide for a more informed and involved electorate. On a related note, a one year hiatus between presidential terms was approved.

The CRSPPP recommendation to recognize specialties and proficiency in professional psychology set off a heated debate, and behind the scenes politics and negotiation. Following approval of Psychoanalytic Psychology and Geropsychology as specialties, the committee's motion to recognize School Psychology set off a firestorm; the issue seeming to me that the constituencies representing clinical and counseling psychologies did not wish another extant professional group to be recognized prior to all three. The draft minutes reflect the approved substitute motion: The Council of Representatives formally confirms the continued recognition of School Psychology as a specialty in professional psychology. Council also approves the archival description of the specialty of school psychology and, at the request of the petitioners, will not make the archival description of a specialty a formal policy statement of APA until August 1998. This will allow clinical and counseling to complete the review process by CRSPPP. This debate was intense and brought a number to speak out.

Council voted to allocate $20,800 from its 1988 contingency fund to support two meetings in 1998 of the Working Group on Review of the Sponsor Approval System (related to the burgeoning number of CE sponsors and the requisite issue of quality control). Other budget allocations included: $4,500 to appoint 6 persons to attend collaborative meetings with the U.S. Department of Education School to Work Opportunities Office; $6,000 to support a two-day meeting of the Task Force on Specialty and Proficiency Titles to be held concurrently with CRSPPP.

$10,000 to support two meetings of the Test User Qualifications Task Force in 1998; $4000 for three APA members who are content experts to attend the meetings of and to work with Committee on Women in Psychology (CWIP) in evaluating issues associated with the recruitment, retention, and progress of women throughout their careers in academia; $4000 for three APA members who are content experts to attend two meetings Committee on Disability Issues in Psychology; $8000 to support the development and dissemination of the National Conversation on Psychology and Racism. $10,000 CEMIRAT$ Implementation Fund, $4000 for three APA members who are content experts to attend CEMA meetings and to assist in the monitoring of the APA 5-Year Plan on Ethnic Minority Recruitment, Retention, and Training in Psychology; $2000 increase in APA general awards budget (and the establishment of an APA International Humanitarian Award). The 1998 Final Budget was approved with a bottom line deficit of $772,500 (including the building subsidy of $1,000,000 for 1998) to govern operations through 1998 and fund the next $1,000,000 of the Public Education Campaign out of 1997 operations. Reviewing the "bock" detailing the financial affairs of APA, including an annual budget over $75,000,000, one gets a powerful sense of the enormity of APA as a complex national organization.

"Guidelines for Psychological Evaluations in Civil Protection Matters" and the designation of 2000-2010 as the Decade of Behavior were approved. Rhea Faber, Executive Editor of the Monitor, presented a preliminary proposal to change the format from a newspaper to a magazine format. This was based on focus group input and an abbreviated prototype was distributed. This led to number of comments from the floor expressing personal preferences. The heart of the matter goes to addressing the reading needs of the Association and financial considerations. The issues are complex and include: member taste, representation of the Association, parameters within the printing industry, postal delivery, generation of advertising revenue, and the trade off between a potentially-
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more attractive and readable Monitor and the likely decrease in actual literary content. Let me be clear that this is not a proposal for another Psychology Today as a trade publication but rather is a consideration of the best format for the Monitor that would ensure satisfaction of the membership. The most daunting feature is the increased costs of production which were projected to be over $100,000 per issue ($70,200 per issue/present format: $174,000 per issue/magazine format). Further research will be conducted, particularly concerning the support by the advertising community.

Finally, I would recommend an excellent resource to anyone working with or having an interest in older adults (we all will at some point in our own personal epigenesises). APA, under the presidential leadership of Dr. Norman Abeles, has produced a 40 page booklet, entitled "What Practitioners Should Know About Working With Older Adults," that presents a wealth of information in a highly attractive format. To add a personal, editorial statement, it is an example of the kind of activity or product that truly marshals the finest resources of our association to the betterment of humankind. Copies may be obtained by calling Special Projects Assistant, in the APA Executive Office at (202) 336-6000.

August 13, 16 Session

As Council convened a clear concern permeated all discourse—fiscal responsibility. Prior to the August meetings, Ray Fowler, Ph.D., CEO, provided an update that showed that APA would likely face a deficit in the 1999 budget of approximately $5,285,200 should Council not adopt the Finance Committee's proposed package of budget improvements. In his opening statement to Council, Dr. Fowler asserted that we are not in a budget crisis, however, without immediate action and financial restraint a crisis would ensue. The underlying financial realities reflect two economic conditions: steady state membership growth and rising expenses, minimally related to inflation. Dr. Fowler recommended a number of improvements to the budget which resulted in a proposed savings of $2,115,000. Among the improvements recommended by the Finance Committee, Board of Directors, and CEO/CFO are postponement of staff hires, reduction in convention expenses, 90-day hiring freeze, reduction in staff training, and change in the structure of the Consolidated Meetings and the Division Leadership Conference. The Public Education Campaign was incorporated into the budget; in this regard, the special assessment for clinicians was raised by $20; also, the convention registration fee will be raised by $30. Council approved a preliminary budget which includes a $351,000 deficit. Council did not entertain a motion to raise association dues and clearly supported a number of cost cutting measures.

It is necessary to put the budget in the context of the overall fiscal health of the association. A review of the fiscal history of APA suggests that under the leadership of Dr. Fowler, Jack McKay, CEO, the Boards of Directors, and Council, the association has made significant progress in its recent history. Dr. Fowler has shepherded APA from a position of deficit and negative equity to increased net worth. The development of the APA buildings has not only provided a highly professional environment and enhanced the public image but also appear to have increased the book worth of the association and in the near future will produce a net revenue stream of over $1,000,000 annually. The Communications Department (APA publications), under the leadership of Gary VandenBos, Ph.D., generates an income of upwards of $8,000,000-9,000,000 annually and has expanded its book publishing to an impressive 52 books per year. Look in the future for trade books to complement its catalog of professional journals and books. APA staff costs and membership stability compare favorably to those of other professional organizations. Dr. Fowler reported that APA staff costs approximate 36% of the budget (compared to 50% in like organizations) and higher membership renewal rates than those of other associations. APA will continue to face financial challenges in the near future, with steady state membership it will be difficult to increase revenue and to offset inevitable increases in expenses. With a budget approaching $80,000,000 it is easy to see the demand caused by ordinary inflation, e.g., 2% COLA results in well over an
additional $1,500,000 in the budget just to maintain the level of service whereas an increase in membership dues by $10 generates about $600,000. It is clear that finances will dominate the future attention of Council. In the face of potential increases in membership fees, it is important for the division to employ financial restraint to attempt to forestall raising division membership dues which might prompt decline in membership and to provide high quality services to maintain membership support.

Among other business, I supported the adoption of a policy position, introduced and sponsored by E. Mark Stem, Ed.D., of APA Division 32, to reestablish reasonable sentencing boundaries for first-time drug offenses. I cosponsored the motion in light of issues of human welfare and empirical data suggesting the inequity in the application of the sentencing procedures in respect to race and the lack of emphasis on rehabilitation. Late in the Council meeting a motion was introduced which essentially mandated APA staff to annually collect and disseminate information on the number of women, ethnic minorities, gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and individuals with disabilities serving on Council and boards and committees and to produce a report every 5 years (synopsis of the motion). I rose to suggest to Council that all aspects of diversity, that had been identified in the APA ethical standards, be included, i.e., religion. Following a brief verbal skirmish, my proposed amendment was soundly defeated. I share this incident in light of the fact that I publicly raised the issue and to illustrate what I believe, depicts a more pervasive sentiment within the association — a marginalizing the issue of religion as a variable. Although politically this was a somewhat awkward moment, I believe that it provided an opportunity to test the waters of opinion and to assert into the public dialogue a reminder that all areas of diversity should be considered by our association. I was not surprised by the reaction nor the vote, however, I hope it served for some as a momentary reminder of religion, broadly defined, as a feature of diversity. To close on an upbeat note: I was pleased to see division members P. Scott Richards and Allen E. Bergin’s 1997 book, A Spiritual Strategy for Counseling and Psychotherapy, mentioned in APA’s annual report. Finally, I look forward to Stan Jones serving with me on Council during this coming year. Should you wish a complete text of Council minutes please contact me at eshafran@pepperdine.edu or (949) 223-2521; the February minutes and annual report is published in the American Psychologist, August, 1998, 5(8).

---

**1999 APA Convention**

**Call for Proposals**

APA Division 36 encourages submissions in all areas relevant to religious issues, psychology of religion, psychotherapy and religion, and other areas of psychology related to religion.

*Submit proposals to:*

Robert A. Emmons, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
One Shields Ave
University of California
Davis, CA 95616-8686
Minutes of the Annual Business Meeting

Division 36 (Psychology of Religion) of the American Psychological Association

Sunday
August 16, 1998
San Francisco, California

President David Wulff opened Division 36's annual business meeting at 2:05 p.m. and offered the following comments:

A. He announced that this year's Division 36 outgoing and incoming executive committee meetings were being combined into one meeting, to be held the day after the present business meeting. The executive committee therefore did not yet have anything to report.

B. Election results for the division were as follows:
   - President-Elect: Robert Loving
   - Treasurer: Donna Goetz
   - 2nd Council Representative: Stanton Jones
   - Member-at-Large: Crystal Park

C. The results of a survey distributed among the division's membership were discussed. Highlights of the findings were as follows:
   1. 61 percent reported their primary area of training as clinical.
   2. Of the seven areas of interest respondents could check off, the one receiving the lowest percentage — 47 percent — was "the origins and dynamics of religious concepts and practices" which of the seven comes closest to characterizing classical psychology of religion. David Wulff found this particularly notable, given that the members of our division voted several years ago to change its name from "Psychologists Interested in Religious Issues" to "Psychology of Religion."
   3. When asked, Are you interested in becoming more active in Division 36? 50 percent of the members responded, "Uncertain." David reflected that this presents our division with the challenge of how to create a more active membership for our division.
   4. 36 percent of the members described themselves as "very strongly religious," while 46 percent rated themselves as "very strongly spiritual." The possible implications of this apparently shifting ethos among the members was briefly discussed.
   5. When asked how likely members were to attend APA conventions in the near future, 14 percent said "never," and 36 percent reported "seldom." Mary Reeder interpreted this as quite possibly an economic issue for members, who find it prohibitively expensive to attend these conventions.
   6. With approximately 1700 members in the division, only 137 members responded to this survey. Both the low response rate and cautions for generalizing the results of this survey were discussed.

D. David expressed continued interest in having our division establish both a website and a directory for our members.

Treasurer's Report

Treasurer Beverly (Mary) McCallister announced that she will end her second term as treasurer of this meeting. She offered the following recommendations:

1. that the budget for council representative be increased from $500 to $1500 because there are now two council representatives, and their travel needs have also increased

2. that we need a better list for those members of our division who are not members of APA, in order to obtain dues revenue

3. that the division's budget add a line item for caucuses, with an annual budget of $250, and that the President's discretionary fund be correspondingly
revised from $750 to $500 (this discretionary fund is used to cover the cost of caucuses in the past)

Overall, Macy reported that our division has kept within its overall budget for this year. The treasurer’s report was approved by the members present with a unanimous vote.

APA Council Representative’s Report:

Council representative Ed Shafranske thanked his predecessor, Mary Reuder, for her briefing. Ed gave the following report:

1. Due to this year’s strong apportionment votes (Division 36 received 2479 votes), our division won a second seat on the APA Council of Representatives.

2. APA CEO Ray Fowler reported that APA is heading into “perilous financial times,” although it is not in crisis at this time.

3. APA has achieved a steady state of membership (95 percent renewal rate)

4. From 1980, there has been a straight line decline in subscriptions. This is fortunate, given that 51 percent of APA’s income comes from its communications department.

5. APA’s annual budget is approximately $80,000,000 (with every $10 of dues producing approx. $600,000 of income for APA).

6. Staff cost in APA central office is 36 percent of APA’s revenue (which is favorable in light of the 50 percent rate of most other organizations).

7. APA’s buildings have maintained an excellent occupancy rate of 95-98 percent. It is predicted that these buildings will generate a revenue stream of $1,000,000 annually, beginning in year 2001.

8. Ed supported Division 2’s contention that there ought to be more reasonable boundaries set on minimum sentencing laws for drug-related crimes, so that these incarcerated persons can have earlier access to psychological treatment. This referendum was upheld by vote of the APA Council of Representatives.

9. An amendment to the APA bylaws was proposed, which would require inclusion of all areas of diversity (including religion) when reporting nominations to APA office. Ed reported that, unfortunately, this motion was resoundingly defeated.

Membership Report:

Membership chair Ralph Piedmont reported in absentia that he has accomplished his goal of creating a single, integrated membership database containing the 1,738 members of the division. He stated that the database is in Microsoft Access 97 format, and that he would be happy to provide a copy of this information to anyone interested. He also reported that the greatest source of new members to our division continues to come from the direct mailing from APA headquarters. Of the approximate 400 persons who indicated interest in Division 36 through the APA mailing this year, 80 of those subsequently became members in our division.

New Business:

Mary Reuder stated that the detailed criteria for Fellows of our division had been lost; Mary found them recently and asked David Wulff to send them to APA central office.

(Continued on page 180)
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Awards and Certificates of Appreciation:

The following award was given:

Distinguished Service Award
Vytautas Bieliaskas

The following certificates of appreciation were given:

David Wulff (President)
Beverly McCullister (Treasurer)
Joseph Erikson (Program Chair)

David Wulff handed the Presidential gavel to Siang-Yang Tao as the new President of Division 36.

The meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by

Nancy S. Thurston
Secretary, Division 36

International Council of Psychologists
57th Annual Convention
August 15–19, 1999
Salem, Massachusetts

ICP's 1999 convention will be held at the Sheraton Ferrocroft Resort near Salem, MA, immediately preceding APA's convention in Boston. The convention site is just 17 miles north of Boston in a beautiful, historic, and cultural area. The conference committee has planned a whale watch and organized tours of Salem and Marblehead, Lexington and Concord, and Rockport and Gloucester in conjunction with the conference sessions.

To propose a paper, symposium, workshop, or other type of session, contact the Program Chair: Frank Parley, 213 Ritter Annex, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122, USA. Deadline for receipt of proposals is February 25, 1999.

For convention registration and tour information, contact: Joan C. Chistler, Dept. of Psychology, Connecticut College, New London, CT 06320 USA. E-mail: jchistler@conncoll.edu. Registration fees include opening reception, coffee breaks, two lunches, a traditional New England Clambake, and a souvenir bag.
Call for Nominations

Please submit nominations for the following awards for the year 2009 (selected in 1999) to Peter G. Hill, Div. 36 Awards Chair, Dept. of Psychology, Grove City College, Grove City, PA 16127. William C. Bier Award, William James Award, Distinguished Service Award, Margaret Gorman Early Career Award, and Virginia Sexton Mentoring Award. Below are descriptions for each award.

■ William C. Bier Award
This award is offered annually to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution through publication and professional activity to the dissemination of findings on religious and allied issues or who has made a notable contribution to the integration of these findings with those of other disciplines, notably philosophy, sociology, and anthropology.
- The recipient is presented with a plaque at the Division's annual meeting.
- **Deadline for nominations:** January 15

■ William James Award
This award is offered every three years to an individual who has made an outstanding contribution through publication and professional activity to basic research and theory in the psychology of religion and related areas.
- The recipient is presented with a plaque at the Division's annual meeting.
- **Deadline for nominations:** January 15

■ Distinguished Service Award
This award is offered to individuals who have made an outstanding contribution to Division 36 through service and leadership.
- Recipients are presented with a plaque at the Division's annual meeting.
- **Deadline for nominations:** January 15

■ Margaret Gorman Early Career Award
This award is offered to an individual whose innovative research in the psychology of religion is marked by scholarly excellence and has implications for theory, practice, or further research. The recipient of the award must have completed the master's or doctoral degree within five years of the submission deadline and must be the sole or first author of the paper. Entries must either come from or be sponsored by a member, associate or affiliate of Division 36. Both unpublished and published papers are eligible.
- The winner will be presented with $100.00 and a plaque at the Division's annual meeting and will be invited to present his or her research as part of the Division 36 program at the next APA convention.
- **Deadline for nominations:** January 15

■ Virginia Sexton Mentoring Award
This award is offered to individuals who have contributed to the psychology of religion by mentoring individuals who themselves have become active in the field.
- Recipients are presented with a plaque at the Division's annual meeting.
- **Deadline for nominations:** January 15

■ Research Seed Grant
This grant is awarded to provide recognition and assistance to scholars in the psychology of religion who are in the early stages of their careers. Applicants should be engaged in graduate study or have completed the doctoral degree or terminal master's degree within the past five years. The proposed research should address a significant issue in the psychology of religion, show sophistication in research methods and design, and promise to make a contribution to theory, further research, or practice. Proposals must be no longer than 10 double-spaced typed pages and should indicate the purpose of the proposed study and its significance for the psychology of religion. They should also describe the research design and indicate how the grant, if awarded, will be used.
- Awards up to $250 will be granted and winning proposals will be described in the Division 36 Newsletter.
- **Deadlines for application:** September 15 and January 15
In this issue of the Fall Newsletter, Division 36 President, Sian-Yang Tan, Ph.D., stated that one of his goals is to increase Division 36 membership and increase representation of Division 36 on the APA Council.

Each Division 36 member has the opportunity to recruit new members by extending an invitation to colleagues who have an interest in the Psychology of Religion to join Division 36. To assist you in recruiting new members, the Winter issue of the Psychology of Religion Newsletter (coming to you in late January or early February) will contain a Division 36 Application Form that you will be able to photocopy and distribute.

If you know of someone who wants to join right away, contact membership chair Ralph Piedmont, Ph.D., for information.

I also want to take this opportunity to solicit feedback from the membership concerning the Newsletter. Many of you have given me helpful suggestions and I want to seek input from the entire Division 36 membership. What would you like to see in the Newsletter? Perhaps you want more of something already done or you have a new idea. While our space is limited, I am always open to new ideas. Please e-mail or send me your ideas (you can find information on how to contact me in the Executive Committee Roster found earlier in this edition of the Newsletter).