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BROAD DOMAIN #2: The Study of Virtues as Positive Social Science

Finally, brothers and sisters, whatever is true, whatever is noble, whatever is right, whatever is pure, whatever is lovely, whatever is admirable— if anything is excellent or praiseworthy— think about such things. (Phil 4:8)

The current president of the APA, Martin Seligman, observed recently that “while plumbing the depths of what is worst in life, psychology lost its connection to the positive side of life — the knowledge about what makes life most worth living, most fulfilling, most enjoyable and most productive” (1998, p. 2). Seligman has adopted a platform as APA President that should be welcomed by psychologists of religion and spirituality: positive social science. Proposing that the study of “personal strength” and “civic virtue” become psychology’s “Manhattan Project” for the 21st century, Seligman rightly asks how it is that we have come to view human strengths and virtues such as altruism, joy, courage, and honesty as derivative while human weakness and negative motivations such as selfishness, sadness, paranoia, and dishonesty as authentic.

Here again, the doors of opportunity are open for psychologists of religion to provide a needed service to the broader discipline. The disproportionate amount of space in this presentation allotted to this topic, far less than my discussion of the study of affect, is quite misleading if interpreted as an indication of its potential value to the psychology of religion, as well as what the psychology of religion can contribute to our understanding of people, rather, the brevity of my discussion is more accurately interpreted as a product of my own limited thinking on the subject. In fact, it can easily be argued that the study of virtue is perhaps where the study of religious and spiritual experience has the most to offer and that President Seligman’s propositions for future research are as germane to Division 35 as any other division of the APA.

Religion and spirituality is much more familiar with the language of virtue than is social science. Virtue is a contextualized concept and if psychology accepts Seligman’s challenge, it will only prolong its errors of the past if it chooses to decontextualize the study of virtue. By this I mean that people’s conceptualization and experience of what constitutes a virtue is developed within a larger belief structure or logic, a Wittgensteinian “grammar” (Roberts, 1987) if you will. In this case it so happens that the grammar for many people is at least implied and, in some case, explicitly defined by a religious or spiritual tradition. Roberts claims that the “grammar’s” structure is a function “of rules governing the use of a virtue name” (p. 193) within a given context. He goes on to say that “the rules for the virtue name are in their turn determined by the concept of the virtue in question — which is to say, what the
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virtue is like, what it includes and excludes, what it is connected with, and so forth. To say that Christian gratitude or Aristotelian pride or Romanian congruence each have a “grammar” is just to say that the concepts of these virtues differ in determinate ways which can be expressed in rule-like formulae specifying the connections and disconnections of these virtues with other virtues, beliefs, experiences, emotions, motives, actions, and so forth. To know the grammar of a virtue is to have a schematic notion of the kind of “life” lived by someone who possesses the virtue in question” (p. 193). To know how a religious person (or anyone else) practices virtue, one must understand his or her “grammar.” Though recognizing significant individual differences in grammar even among those committed to specific religious or spiritual traditions, the snippet fact remains that in the study of virtues, psychology will be hard-pressed to ignore the claims of religion and spirituality.

Virtually every religious and spiritual tradition has something to say about virtue. Again, however, I will draw upon Christianity for my discussion. For example, the medieval theologian Thomas Aquinas discussed four “Cardinal” virtues (in contrast to the “Intellectual” virtues that stress wisdom and the “Theological” virtues of Christian faith), prudence, justice, temperance, and fortitude. Baumeister and Exline (in press) briefly discuss each of these virtues in light of what they propose is central to all moral virtues: self-control. Two additional examples of virtues, each with a Christian grammar, are the ones I wish to discuss: stewardliness and humility (Roberts, 1997b).

Stewardliness. As a Christian virtue, stewardliness is the “fulfillment of the human need to nurture nature, but in its fullest expression it is a consciousness of doing this for God, to be allied to God, to identify with God by joining him in his projects” (p. 91). It is the personal characteristic associated with the biblical notion that humans are placed on earth as managers of God’s domestic affairs, much as the steward is employed to handle the internal affairs of a large household or estate. Often referred to as the “Cultural Mandate,” the Christian views his or her responsibility of nurturing God’s creation as a “calling.” Serious responsibilities...

accompany this lofty position as manager of God’s resources and there is an impressive literature, especially from the early days of evangelicalism during the 1880s to the 1930s, that emphasizes the close connection between stewardship and spirituality (see Smith, in press). Stewardliness as a virtue has implications for one’s attitude toward money, work, leisure, and consumerism. Emmons (in press) points out how many of our fundamental strivings can be imbued with spirituality to the point that even secular objects, such as work or money, can become sacred (Pargament, 1997b).

Within a Christian perspective, most notably from “the Protestant doctrine of vocation,” what is sacred is not the object or resource itself, but our responsibility to manage such resources as good stewards. “Since God is the one who calls people to work, the worker becomes a steward who serves God. Work ceases to be viewed only in itself and instead becomes an act of obedience and service to God” (Byken, 1995, p. 105).

Humility. The Christian grammar of humility is a disposition to perceive oneself as basically equal with any other human being, even if the other is conspicuously superior or inferior to oneself in looks, intelligence, skill, or social status (Roberts, 1997b, p. 91). Given the natural self-serving tendencies now empirically well established by social psychologists, the development of humility may be a painful process leading to what the Apostle Paul calls the death of the old self and the creation of a new self “alive to God in Christ Jesus” (Romans 6:11). Nowhere is this process better symbolized than in the sacrament of baptism (Jones, 1995). For Christians, baptism into Christ’s death and resurrection signifies a transition from an existence dominated by sin and death (the “old self”) to an existence marked by forgiveness and new life (the “new self”). Part of what is transformed then are not only patterns of sin and evil, but also patterns of self-deception. “Baptized believers, those who are learning in the context of God’s Kingdom to name the sin and evil that destroy and the forgiving love and friendship that edify, are enabled by God to envision and increasingly embody such a new life. In so doing, they testify not so much to their own abilities, virtues or strengths, as to the gracious forgiveness...
of God manifested in the crucified and risen Christ" (Jones, 1995, p. 167). This transformation process, centered around God's forgiveness, is a powerfully humbling experience.

Tangney (1991) provides empirical data that differentiates between "good," "bad," and "ugly" moral affect. Good moral affect tends to be other-oriented as in the case of empathic responsiveness that include both cognitive and affective capacities to share another's experience. Having done something "bad" to another tends to focus on specific and presumably controllable behaviors leading to a moral affect of guilt. Shame, on the other hand, is an "ugly" moral affect because the self becomes the focus of painful scrutiny and negative evaluation, leading to an experience that is global and devastating. Her research showed that "good" affect (other-oriented empathic responsiveness) was positively correlated with "bad" affect (promises to guilt) but negatively associated with "ugly" affect (promises to shame). The key seems to be the extent to which the person is oriented more to the needs or concerns of others versus a more self-oriented personal distress. To the extent that humility, as a Christian virtue, is confused with personal distress, it can cross over the line to shame and "good" moral affect can become "ugly."

Though not a direct test of Tangney's different types of moral affect, Bassett and his colleagues (Bassett, Hill, Pogel, Lee, Hughes, & Masi, 1990; Bassett, et al., 1993) found that, among Christians, two major criteria distinguish self-designated "righteous" from "sinful" expressions of emotion: 1) whether or not emotions lead to subsequent behavioral changes, and 2) whether the welfare of the person in primary focus is someone else or one's self. For our purposes, we can limit the discussion to the second criterion. Consistent across a number of studies was the finding that emotions judged to be "righteous" tend to focus on the welfare of other people rather than the self. For example, in one of the studies reported by Bassett et al. (1990), it was discovered that Christian college students experience the difference between "Godly sorrow" (or humility) and "guilt" (conceptualized more like Tangney's concept of "shame") much along the lines predicted by Narramore (1984). "People experiencing guilt feelings [shame] tend to be self-absorbed and concerned with what they have done wrong rather than being focused upon the person who was wronged. The results of guilt feelings are legalistic, conformity, rebellion, depression, or other maladaptive symptoms. In contrast, constructive sorrow [humility] is love motivated...and involves a sincere sense of regret, is not selfish, and will lead the wrongdoer to set things right out of respect for self and others" (p. 345).

**Conclusion**

I offer no special insight about the longevity of society's surging interest in spirituality and religion. It is likely, however, that the energy surrounding this interest will be around long enough for those of us who study religion and spirituality to have a listening ear. What we do with this opportunity during the next several years is crucial.

I propose here that we begin to think of religion and spirituality not simply as objects or domains of study, as important as that may be, but also as common and important process variables that touch a large portion of human experience. To more forcefully engage such a constructive mode of interaction, it is required that we take the claims of religion and spirituality more seriously as potentially legitimate sources of knowledge. I have suggested that we consider research in two broad domains where religion and spirituality have much to say. Also, however, it is incumbent upon us psychologists of religion to demonstrate the utility of this approach. Otherwise the study of religion and spirituality will remain relatively self-contained and isolated, with little to offer the rest of the discipline.

*Editor's Note*: In the interest of space, demands on the Newsletter, references can be obtained from the editor. Send your request by e-mail (kreji@cord.edu), fax (218-259-1230), or surface mail (Mark Kreji, Associate Professor, Psychology Department, Concordia College, Moorhead, MN 56562). You will be sent a copy of the references via the way you sent your request unless you specify otherwise.
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It seems fitting that my address today will build upon and extend the work set forth in Religion and the Clinical Practice of Psychology. For that work, a collaboration of many gifted scholars, was never envisioned to be a conclusion to the dialogue concerning religion and clinical practice but rather was hoped would establish a contemporary foundation upon which future elaboration would venture. It is my intent in this brief address to contribute to that elaboration.

I intend to expand upon the following points initially set forth in the volume: (1) religion as a cultural fact and an important source of personal identity and meaning; (2) religion as a feature of diversity in mental health and clinical practice, and (3) a model for considering explicit and implicit integration within the clinical setting. In the first section I will briefly review the demographics of faith, religious affiliation, and practice and bring into focus what appears to be significant differences between psychologists and the general population which they serve. In considering religion as a variable in mental health and clinical practice, I will call for a radical consideration of diversity and examine the implications for both practice and training respective of such an appreciation of diversity. Lastly, I will propose a model that allows for a dynamic approach to religiosity within the clinical moment.

Religion as a Cultural Fact

An inspection of survey data consistently demonstrates that religion is an undeniable feature of American life. The majority of the population declares themselves, in some fashion, to be religious (Bauna, 1992; Clark, 1994; Gallup, 1994; Hastings & Hastings, 1994; Kosmin & Lachman, 1993; Princeton Religious Research Center, 1990; Spiritual America, 1994). About 9 in 10 Americans declare a belief in God and report that religion is either “Very Important” or “Fairly Important” in their lives. The National Survey of Religious Identification found that approximately 90% of Americans identify with a religion (cf. Kosmin and Lachman, 1993, p. 2) and, in addition, the Gallup Poll reports that most people place a great deal of confidence in religious institutions. Church or organized religion ranked second, only to the military, in ratings of confidence (Hastings & Hastings, 1994, p. 313). The influence of religion appears to extend beyond questions of ontology and personal moral behavior to include societal and political opinion. Religious similarity may better predict commonality and identification than traditionally held features of race, ethnicity, and class (Kosmin and Lachman, 1995). These data support the conclusion of the importance of religion and establish religion as a cultural fact.

Does religion hold the same degree of salience for psychologists? The simple answer appears to be “No” (see: Shafranske, 1996 for a summary of the survey literature.) In 1995 a sample of 253 psychologists possessing doctoral degrees in clinical or counseling psychology, were asked a series of questions taken from the most widely used national surveys of the general population. A number of significant differences emerged. For example, less than half reported that religion is either “Very Important” or “Fairly Important” in their lives as compared to the previously cited 88% of the general population. A further inspection of the data yields an interesting presentation of what may be salient differences and perhaps points of similarity between psychologists and the general population. We now turn to that more detailed examination.

Differences are found in beliefs, affiliation, and practice. The core or central tenant in Western religion may be posited to be the belief in a deity. Table 2 presents statements regarding belief in God. By collapsing the two affirmations of belief in God statements a clear difference is discovered. Eighty-two percent of the general population believe in God (with varying degrees of confidence) whereas only 42% of psychologists hold this perspective. The corollary is equally true. 27% percent of psychologists either reject the idea of God or “don’t know whether there is a God,” whereas only 7% of the general population endorse one of these positions. At first glance a conclusion might be drawn the psychologists are “God-less” and radically different from the general population. An interesting discrepancy in the data emerges however when the question is posed in a slightly different manner. Recall that 42% of the psychologists endorsed items when asked about a belief in a God yet when posed...
the alternative item: "Do you believe in God or a Universal Spirit?" 72% answer in the affirmative. What may account for this result? The answer may lie in the distinction between including a notion of the transcendent, such as "Universal Spirit," that is not tethered to the more traditional and institutionally-bound concept of "God." Similarly, rates within the general population increased as well to 94% to 99% depending on the year of the survey when the question is posed.

In fact 75% of the psychologists report a belief in some form of transcendence. An inspection of endorsements of statements of personal ideology (Table 3) not only finds a widely held belief in the transcendent but may also provide a glimpse at the nexus point of similarity and difference between psychologists and the general population. From one vantage, both groups appear to be more similar than not in their beliefs in a transcendent dimension; the conceptualization of this dimension appears to vary significantly and appears to be the location of the difference. This may account as well for the finding that although 51% of psychologists report religion to be very important, 73% indicate that spirituality is either "fairly important" or "very important" (See Table 1). In this discussion I do not intend to convey that these differences in belief are insignificant or are simple matters of semantics but rather to better identify the source of the divergence. Further, as we may speculate about the sensitivity and receptivity that psychologists bring to clients who hold explicitly religious perspectives, I believe that it is a significant finding that psychologists appear as a group to be appreciative of the transcendent dimension while at the same time acknowledging that their own personal spirituality tends to be less oriented within institutional religion. This is a far different situation should we find that psychologists eschew religiosity and spirituality itself.

The 1995 national survey found that 21.3% reported regular participation with some involvement and 16.1% with active participation and a high level of involvement in organized religion. Of note is that almost one-third reported no religious affiliation and within that group 12.8% reported either a somewhat negative reaction or disdain of religion.

In addition to affiliation, participation in religious practice is an important index of religiosity. Gallup polls have found it useful to ask, "Did you, yourself, attend church or synagogue in the last seven days?" as one measure of religious practice. Forty percent of Americans and 28% of the psychologists answer affirmatively. The drop-off rate in attendance as compared with reported affiliation has been widely reported; it has been found that "more Americans claim to belong to a church than regularly attend one" (Kosmin and Lachman, 1993, p. 5). Prayer is also seen as an aspect of practice within the majority of both religious and spiritual traditions and may be a better indicator of spiritual participation. Table 7 presents the rates of prayer. Sixty-eight percent of Americans and 43% of psychologists pray at least once a week; among, perhaps the most devout, the difference between the groups in those who pray several times a day narrows to 26% to 19% respectively.

The preponderance of the empirical literature consistently supports the view of Americans as a religiously committed people. In addition to the impact of organized religion on beliefs, affiliation, and practice, recent studies have found religion to be a potent force in not only the formation of personal values and behavior but also political action and social policy. The growing survey literature suggests that psychologists as a group are less religious as measured by beliefs, affiliation, and practice. The data suggest as well that this does not necessarily imply that psychologists are anti-religious. On the contrary it seems more likely that psychologists are more like their religious counterparts in their appreciation of the transcendent dimension, although their characterizations and beliefs concerning transcendence are markedly different.

To place emphasis on the points of similarity offers the view that consideration of
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ontological issues as matters of human importance may not be as foreign to psychologists as at times assumed. Survey data indicate that psychologists who are non-believers and consider religious beliefs to be illusions nevertheless appreciate the value such beliefs offer to many. Interestingly, psychologists perceive religion as remaining the same or increasing its influence to a greater extent than does the general population.

Consideration of the value of religious beliefs, affiliations, and practices leads to a discussion of diversity, for group data and population trends do not prepare clinicians to understand the unique religious experiences of the clients who sit before them. To say that Americans are religious does little justice to the import and uniqueness of individual faith and religious practice. We turn now from a global reading of religiosity in America to a discussion of the importance of considering religion a variable in the mental health of an individual.

Religion as a Feature of Diversity in Mental Health and Clinical Practice

The American Psychological Association mandates within its professional standards consideration of dimensions of human differences or diversity, including religion, in providing professional consultation (cf. 1992, p. 1601, Standard 1.08 Human Differences). This standard acknowledges that each individual is influenced by immutable features of gender and race and the totality of the culture in which the person lives. Religion contributes as well to the rich backdrop of influences which give shape to human expression. How might we approach this mandated consideration of religion as a feature of diversity?

In my view there are two interrelated approaches: the nomothetic and the idiographic. The nomothetic seeks to understand individual diversity based on group characteristics in religious affiliation. Through an inspection of beliefs, practices, moral principles, and traditions an overview of the potentially potent influence of affiliation to a religious denomination can be assessed. However, as Lovinger (1984, 1990, 1996) has pointed out, there are limits to the application of the assumptions derived from such a study due to the wide variability across individual congregations within a given denomination. Further, individual congregations are themselves informed by class, race, ethnicity and other features of cultural diversity. What can be yielded from a simple assessment of an individual’s religious affiliation are nodal points for consideration. For example, knowledge of a religion’s stance to institutional authority in personal decision-making may attune a clinician to aspects of authority that may unwittingly shape the course of the treatment relationship or understanding a given religion’s position on sexual orientation may provide a context to understand and to locate the psychological setting of an individual’s conflicts. Diagnostically, understanding a person’s religious background may be important in determining aspects of an individual’s behavior and beliefs which are congruent within their religious tradition and therefore normative versus behaviors and beliefs that are incongruous and suggest social deviancy which may in fact be symptoms of a psychiatric disorder.

The idiographic approach considers religious influence to be expressed uniquely in the life of a given individual. This approach while appreciating trends of influence that are elucidated in formal empirical examinations of group religiosity and the stereotypes that such investigations generate nevertheless seek to initiate an individual study of religious and spiritual influence. This approach to diversity challenges a conceptualization of sensitivity to diversity that relies solely upon broad, sweeping generalizations and stereotypes based solely on features of affiliation (even should those be derived from findings obtained through valid scientific procedure). What I am suggesting is a radical consideration of diversity which focuses entirely on the individual. The adjective “radical” is employed to place emphasis on two fundamental meanings: the first is related to radical as “essential,” the second concerns a stance that is “revolutionary.”

In my view it is essential that religious diversity be considered in clinical work. It bears the qualifier of essential as all good
clinical consultation involves a thorough, on-going, and essential appraisal of psychological functioning as related to affect, cognition, and behavior. This consideration must also be revolutionary in that it takes seriously the diversity of religiosity and spirituality in the present life of the client. Allow me to digress. Its revolutionary character derives from two features. The first concerns truly taking seriously the impact of religious experience on health and the influence of deeply held conscious and unconscious beliefs and representations, values, and experiences on psychological functioning. The second aspect is the demonstration of the impact that one's faith and religious background has to the client. Let me caution that I am not proposing that for every client and in every situation religious influence is the quintessential determinant of behaviors, moods, and cognitions. I am asserting simply that it is the responsibility of the clinician to consider the potential contribution of religiosity and spirituality.

The consideration of the diversity of religious experience is supported by knowledge developed within the psychology of religion. Theories and empirical research assist clinicians in developing approaches to understanding the influence of religiosity. For example, constructs such as extrinsic, intrinsic, and quest allow for considering how an individual holds beliefs and affiliations and determines particular views of the world. Psychoanalytic theory posits the role of unconscious God-representations constructed dynamically and serving a host of functions in the psychic equilibrium. Further, theory and research on the role of religion in coping demonstrates the importance of attributions and affiliations in responding to personal crises and traumatic events through the conservation or transformation of significance (Pargament, 1997).

A serious consideration of religion in the life of an individual may provide a glimpse into the origins and organization of deep psychological structures or "unconscious, invariant, organizing principles" (cf. Atwood & Stolorow, 1984) that give shape to conscious attributions, affects, and behavior. For religion, as I wrote in the introduction to Religion and the Clinical Practice of Psychology, is:

"one of the 'webs of significance' that culture provides and that the human community constructs. It informs the creation of a sense of personal identity and provides a 'sacred canopy' under which spheres of relevancy are created that orient human values and ultimately determine behavior". A variance of religious commitment and expression exists between individuals and within individuals. At certain points in life, religion may be silent, almost imperceptible thread of influence and coherence in a person's life. At other points, religion may appear as a clear and potent source of influence, support, or conflict. Religion, in its intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions, shapes the commitments and affiliations through which an individual lives. Religion's influence may wax and wane both within the individual and within the culture. The intensity of religious influence is a complex ever changing dynamic (Shaffer, 1995, p. 2).

I take seriously the call to consider religiousness as a feature of diversity — to assess its influence in supporting, eroding, or re-establishing mental health. In my view we are at a critical juncture whether this professional mandate will be paid lip service or critically implemented within clinical practice and training. This division, perhaps, bears the responsibility for initiating and developing resources to assist clinicians in better addressing religiousness as a feature of diversity. This will be accomplished through research programs investigating, from a non-orthodox perspective, the influence of religious affiliation, beliefs and practice on mental health as well as refining assessment procedures for use in individual consultation.

There are implications as well for clinical training in taking this mandate seriously. The immediate implication is establishing training programs that offer clinicians and students opportunities to examine their own personal religious and spiritual orientations. This is important in light of the intersubjective nature of the therapeutic enterprise in which both participants bring their values, beliefs, and attitudes into the
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clinical setting and which mutually influence the nature and course of treatment. This is in keeping with the acknowledgment that psychological intervention and treatment are not value neutral but rather implicitly contain a worldview; a prescribed set of values and code for behavior (see Bergin, Payne, and Richards, 1990; London, 1965; Remick, 1993). In addition, such training should serve as an introduction to the assessment of the role of religiosity as a variable in mental health and as a potential resource. Secondly, clinical training might be expanded to include a critical examination of the values and beliefs inherent in psychological theory and treatment, the psychology of religion, comparative religion, and a provision for clinical supervision respective of religious and spiritual issues. The first recommendation in my opinion is the minimum requirement to prepare clinicians to fulfill the spirit of the APA Ethical Principles (APA, 1992) and the second allows for a more complete foundation for the development of competence respective of religion as a feature of diversity and a resource for mental health. Inclusion of this material will remediate what appears to be inadequate training respective of dealing with religious issues in clinical practice. Surveys have consistently found that 90% of respondents report that religious issues were either rarely or never discussed in their graduate programs and clinical training. This is striking when one considers that 51% of psychologists sampled reported that religious or spiritual issues are involved in treatment at least sometimes and over one-fifth reported that they are “often” or “a great deal of the time” involved. The significance of these findings is further reinforced in light of the report that over 50% of the psychologists sampled in 1995 report training respective of dealing with religious issues to be soundly inadequate rating adequacy as a 1 or 2 on a 9-point Likert scale. These data support the conceptual and ethical requirement to address religiosity as an aspect of diversity and to the training community and to Division 36 to develop programs of training and resources to ensure that psychologists are prepared to meet the practice standards of the profession.

Editor’s Note: The final part of Staflinowski’s address can be found in the Psychology of Religion Summer 1999 Newsletter. In the interest of space demands on the Newsletter, tables can be obtained from the editor. Send your request by e-mail (krejci@cord.edu), fax (218-299-6380), or surface mail (Mark Krejci, Associate Professor, Psychology Department, Concordia College, Moorhead, MN. 56562). You will be sent a copy of the tables via the way you sent your request unless you specify otherwise.
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Peter C. Hill has his doctorate in Social Psychology from the University of Houston (1979), and is Professor and Chair in the Department of Psychology, Grove City (PA) College. He has served Division 36 as Chair of the Continuing Education Committee (1989–93); Newsletter Editor (1993–97); and is currently Chair of the Awards Committee. He is a Fellow of the APA (Div. 36) and is Editor of the Journal of Psychology and Christianity. He has over 50 published articles and conference presentations related to the psychology of religion. He is co-editor (with Ralph Hood) of Measures of Religiosity (due our Spring, 1999); and (with David Benner) Baker Encyclopedia of Psychology and Counseling, 2nd ed. (1999). He was the 1998 recipient of the Father Bier Award presented by Division 36.

With the upsurge of interest in spirituality and religion, this is an exciting but crucial time in the history of Division 36. If elected, I will do my best to continue the Division 36 tradition of reminding our profession and society as a whole of the significance of the spiritual dimension in psychological makeup.

George S. Howard

George S. Howard is a professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of Notre Dame where he has served as Director of Graduate Studies and twice served as chairman of the department. His research has focused upon theoretical, methodological, and philosophical problems in applied areas of psychological research such as counseling, clinical, educational, industrial/organizational, and ecological psychology. A fellow of six divisions of the American Psychological Association, he has served as president of both the Division of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology and the Division of Humanistic Psychology of APA. He is the author of eight books, and over one hundred and fifty book chapters and articles in professional journals. His current interest lies in the role that various worldviews (e.g., religious, economic, political) play in creating virtuous lives and supportive communities.
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This year I am serving as APA Program Chair for Division 35. We received an increase of about 20% in proposals over the previous year, a trend that I would like to see continue. One of my goals as chair was to increase divisional co-sponsorship and co-listing of proposals with cross-divisional emphases. We were able to co-sponsor two symposia with other divisions, which, in effect provided us with two additional program hours. We are also co-listing a number of sessions with other divisions and we have scheduled a joint social hour with Division 8. As a member of Division 35, I would like to see greater dialogue and collaboration with divisions where historically there has not been much interaction, but potentially could be because of shared interests.

The psychology of religion has been making gains in the more applied areas of clinical and counseling psychology, but there is much work still to be done in the more experimental areas of psychology where spiritual and religious influences on behavior are substantial but go unnoticed. For example, I have been working hard to increase the visibility of the psychology of religion in personality and social psychology. A couple of years ago I organized a symposium at the Society for Experimental Social Psychology annual meeting on religion and social behavior. I am currently editing a special issue of the Journal of Personality, to appear later this year, entitled “Religion in Personality Psychology.” I find it remarkable that three recent, presumably comprehensive handbooks in personality and social psychology (Gilbert, Fiske, & Lindzey, 1997; Hogan, Johnson, & Briggs, 1997; Pervin, 1999) failed to include religion as a topic of inquiry. Out of a total of over 3,000 pages in these three presumably comprehensive handbooks, less than one page discusses religious influences on personality and social behavior! We must do a better job in communicating to our colleagues that religion and spirituality are valid and essential areas for scientific inquiry, and that no understanding of human behavior can be complete without considering this most significant realm of human experience.

Beverly J. (Macy) McCallister

Having served as the division’s treasurer for the last six years and currently as interim member-at-large this year, I would hope to provide as member-at-large some continuity with the division’s recent past. My ongoing concern is that the division continue to promote the psychological study of religion by interesting greater numbers of psychologists in the division, by sponsoring research, and by furthering the formal clarification of all aspects of the division’s activities which was started to enhance its operation.
For the Office of Council Representative

Maureen P. Hester

I have been a member of APA since 1975 and am associated in particular with the divisions of Teaching, History, and Psychology of Religion. I have served as Treasurer of Division 2 and President of the Council on Teaching Undergraduate Psychology. My passion for the psychology of religion impelled me several years ago to organize an APA symposium on the teaching of the psychology of religion and, during a recent sabbatical leave, to conduct a national survey of psychology of religion courses, the results of which I hope to publish soon. An interview of mine with Ray Paloutzian, on the current status of the psychology of religion, recently appeared in Teaching of Psychology. As someone who is sensitive to the tensions between psychology and religion and who is accustomed to speaking to "outsiders" from a liberal religious perspective, I would enjoy the opportunity to represent Division 36 on the APA Council.

Mary E. Reuder

Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania, M.A., Brown University, B.A., College of St. Catherine. Professor Emerita and past Chair, Psychology Department, Queens College of CUNY. Fellow, APA Divisions 1, 2, 35, 36, 52; Member Divisions 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 15, 24, 26, 32. Charter Member Phi Rho Iota, (Division 36), President 1987-88; Council Representative (1979-81, 1991-97). Executive Committee, Fellows Committee, Elections Committee. In Division 1, served as President (1987-88), Executive Committee, Fellows Committee (Chair), By-laws Committee and Elections Committee. Fellow, New York Academy of Science and AAAPP, Member, national Board of Directors of Sigma Xi (1972-75, 1977) Recipient, 1988 Williams James Award, Academic Division, New York State Psychological Association. Research interests: human motivation, personality, research design.

Now that APA as a whole has finally become aware that religion is an important variable in human behavior, it is important that the voice of Division 36 be heard in Council from both the perspective of a scientific as well as a practice division. Hopefully, I could contribute to such impact.
Self Psychology and Religion: 
Clinical Specialization and Applications

A two-year, part-time, advanced certificate program at:

The Center for Religion and Psychotherapy of Chicago

Based on the Center's integrative approach to psychotherapy and religion, this program is for secular clinicians as well as pastoral counselors who wish to develop a solid foundation in psychoanalytic self psychology, and who wish to integrate this foundation with religious and spiritual concerns.

The curriculum is structured around three interrelated components:

Clinical Theory & Case Studies    Psychoanalysis & Religion Series

Integrative Case Conference

For information contact the Co-Directors of Education:
Cathy Burris Schnur, M.Div., R.N. and Marie McCarthy, Ph.D., LCPC

Crapchicago@aol.com  312.263.4368 x.9088
30 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1920, Chicago, IL  60602