CHAPTER 21

Religion in American Life

A Community Psychology Perspective

KENNETH I. PARGAMENT AND KENNETH I. MATON

Religion is woven tightly into the fabric of American life. In some ways, the essential "religiousness" of our culture is quite visible. The large number of congregations in any community, the key role of religious leaders and rituals during important transitions in life, the rapid expansion of ministry into television, and the prominence of religious traditions and holidays are clear signs of the salience of religion in the United States. Less visible, but perhaps more revealing, are some other indicators. For example, it is estimated that 94% of the American population believe in God; 88% believe God loves them; 81% believe we will be called before God on Judgment Day; 71% believe in life after death; more people have confidence in organized religion than in any other social institution; and religious figures such as Billy Graham, Mother Teresa, Pope John Paul II, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu are consistently named by Americans in their lists of most admired people (Gallup & Castelli, 1989).

What, if any, are the effects of religiousness in the United States? There is compelling evidence that religion is a potent force in society, shaping both individuals and institutions. Various dimensions of religiousness have been identified as significant predictors of a wide range of individual attributes and behaviors, such as racial prejudice, physical health and mortality, alcohol and drug abuse, nonmarital sexual activity, empowerment, mental health, psychosocial competence, and the outcomes of stressful experiences (e.g., Bergin, 1983; Hood, Spilka, Hunsberger, & Gorsuch, 1996; Koenig, 1994, 1997; Levin & Vanderpool, 1991; Maton & Wells, 1995; Pargament, 1997; Payne, Bergin, Bielema, & Jenkins, 1991; Schumaker, 1992). Religion has clear effects on social institutions as well. Benson and Williams (1982) demonstrated the strong relationship between the religious beliefs of members of the United States Congress and their voting behavior on eight significant issues. The 8.5 billion dollars in philanthropy provided by religious systems to other social institutions in 1985 was more than

KENNETH I. PARGAMENT • Department of Psychology, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402. KENNETH I. MATON • Department of Psychology, University of Maryland Baltimore County, Catonsville, Maryland 21250.

Handbook of Community Psychology, edited by Julian Rappaport and Edward Seidman. Kluwer Academic / Plenum Publishers, New York, 2000.

twice as great as that provided by corporations and foundations (Jacquet, 1986). These resources were used to support refugee aid, emergency aid, shelter for the poor, advocacy, social justice, human rights, educational, food, and nutritional programs.

Despite its significance for individuals and institutions, religion has been neglected by psychologists and other mental health professionals for the greater part of this century (see Larson, Pattison, Blazer, Omran, & Kaplan, 1986; Weaver, Samford, Kline, Lucas, Larson, & Koenig, 1998). In more recent years, however, there have been signs of renewed interest in the study of religion. Given its concern with the individual-in-context and systemic change, the field of community psychology has a particularly important stake in the study of religious life.

In this chapter, we will examine religion in American life from a community psychology perspective. Traditional psychological approaches to religion, we will suggest, have often been individualistic, overly-simplified and overly-biased, and non-collaborative. Rather than focus on religion as an individual expression, we will examine religious institutions as they impact both individuals and communities. Our goal is to highlight the exciting opportunities for community psychology to learn about, learn from, and work with religious systems.

A BRIEF REVIEW OF PSYCHOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO RELIGION

It comes as a surprise to many psychologists that religion was a central topic of concern and study for the founders of psychology. Theoretical and empirical studies of religious education, worship, conversion, emotion, and experience by William James, G. S. Hall, J. H. Leuba, and E. D. Starbuck were regularly published by the *American Journal of Psychology* and, later, by the *Psychological Bulletin* in the late-19th and early-20th centuries. However, as psychology moved away from its philosophical roots, and as behavioral and psychoanalytic approaches became more prominent, interest in the psychological study of religion dropped sharply. The lack of religious study may have been influenced by the fact that, throughout the century, psychologists have been less religious as a group than the general population of the United States. Thus, they tend to underestimate the significance of religious phenomena (Beit-Hallahmi, 1974; Sarason, 1993; Shafranske & Malony, 1990).

The last 20 years have witnessed more of a rapprochement between psychology and religion sparked by an interest in pastoral counseling by religious communities, an interest in working with religious systems by community mental health professionals, and a greater appreciation of the importance of spirituality in both religious and professional communities. Developments in cognitive, social, and lifespan psychology have also led researchers to take a closer look at religion. This resurgence of interest in the psychology of religion is marked by what is becoming a significant body of theory and research (see Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993; Hood et al., 1996; Wulff, 1997). Perhaps the most significant trend in this work is towards the conceptualization and measurement of religion as a multidimensional phenomenon, one which holds a variety of implications for the individual.

From a community psychology perspective, several issues of concern can be raised regarding the status of psychological approaches to religion. First, ever since James (1902) defined religion as "feelings, acts and experiences of individual men in their solitude" (p. 31), the psychological study of religion has been largely personological. A large portion of the research in the area has focused on identifying the different dispositional orientations of individuals to religion, and examining the implications of these orientations for various individual attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Donahue, 1985; Gorsuch, 1988). This has been a

significant and fruitful research tradition. However, it leaves unanswered important questions about how religion is expressed by groups, families, and institutions; how religion is shaped by different events and contexts; and how religion, in turn, contributes to the lives of individuals and to society. Developments in the sociology and anthropology of religion that could help answer these questions have not been integrated into the psychological literature. Commenting on the individualism of religious research, Barton (1971) noted that:

> Researchers have proceeded to take people out of their actual social contexts and to limit their analysis to individual variables ... this is like a biologist putting his experimental animals through a meat grinder and taking every hundredth cell to examine under a microscope; almost all information about anatomy and physiology, about structure and function gets lost (p. 847).

A second concern from a community psychology perspective is the simplified and inflexible view many people (including psychologists) have of religion. Religious issues are often approached with either an undifferentiated positive or an undifferentiated negative stance. For example, in a study of indiscriminate proreligiousness, over 35% of a mixed sample of students and church members stated that "I always live by my religious beliefs"; approximately two-thirds of the sample stated that "This church has programs to meet the needs of all the members" (Pargament, Brannick, Adamakos, Ensing, Kelemen, Warren, Falgout, Cook, & Myers, 1987).

When it comes to religion, psychologists are no less prone to bias. Anti-religiousness is clear in the writings of several prominent psychologists who criticize religion on various grounds (e.g., Albee, 1982; Ellis, 1960; Freud, 1949). What these criticisms share is an exclusive focus on a particular type of religious expression. Other forms of religious expression go unmentioned and undistinguished from those seemingly dysfunctional approaches. Pro-religiousness among psychologists poses problems as well. More religiously sympathetic psychologists have focused on the question "What kind of religion is healthy or good?" The form of this question suggests that there is one type of religion good for everyone. It does not allow for the possibility that different forms of religion may offer different advantages and disadvantages depending on each individual's life experiences, personal preferences, and social context. In short, the anti-religious and pro-religious biases of psychologists lead to an oversimplification of religion in which the diversity of forms and effects of religious expression are neglected.

Finally, a community psychology perspective points to the relationship between psychological and religious communities as a source of concern. Psychologist, clergy, and congregation most often meet around mental health issues. Referrals of clinical cases by clergy are sought by mental health professionals. Psychologists are often involved in training clergy and congregation leaders as counselors. Mental health educational programs are offered to churches and synagogues. Certainly, many church/synagogue members have been helped through this process. However, the process is one-sided. Studies indicate that clergy refer far more cases to mental health professionals than they receive from mental health professionals (e.g., Carson, 1976; Koenig, Bearon, Hover, & Travis, 1991; Meylink & Gorsuch, 1986). Thus, while religious communities are drawing upon the unique resources of mental health professionals, mental health professionals are dealing with religious systems as if they were quasi-mental health institutions (Rappaport, 1981). Apparently overlooked in this process is the fact that religious systems are, simply put, religious; that is, they have missions, structures, theologies, and resources that distinguish them from other settings, including mental health centers (Pargament, Falgout, Ensing, Reilly, Silverman, Van Haitsma, Olsen, & Warren, 1991). When viewed as unique, multifaceted, and resourceful systems that may, at times, share the

interests and concerns of psychologists, a broader set of opportunities for collaboration between psychological and religious communities emerges.

In recent years, community psychologists and others have begun to respond to these concerns. Community psychologists have applied their values, perspectives, and methods in an attempt to learn about, learn from, and work with religious systems (see Jason, 1997; Kloos, Horneffer, & Moore, 1995; Maton & Wells, 1995; Pargament, Maton, & Hess, 1992). While this work is yet in its infancy, a richer understanding of religion in American life is emerging.

RELIGION FROM A COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY PERSPECTIVE

Religion has been defined in a variety of ways. Common to these definitions, however, is a view of religion both as a social phenomenon, one involving a community of people who share a faith, and as an individual phenomenon, one involving a set of beliefs, practices, and feelings that place life experiences into a framework of Ultimate significance. Expressed individually or socially, religion has a dual character: It is involved in the construction and choice of pathways people take in their search for significance, and it is involved in the definition of significance itself (Pargament, 1992, 1997). What sets religion apart from other phenomena is the involvement of the sacred in this search for significance.

The religious institution is the primary system that bridges social and personal forms of religious phenomena. It is the gathering site for the fellowship of members. It provides opportunities for personal religious experiences. It is a central medium through which religious symbols, beliefs, rites, and traditions are transmitted to individuals. And it is a key channel through which religious ethics, values, and resources are transmitted to other institutions in society. In this sense, as Berger and Neuhaus (1977) note, religious institutions mediate between their members and a larger social matrix.

This chapter will focus on religious institution as the central phenomenon of interest, conceptualized at two levels of analysis. At the organizational level, local religious institutions, i.e., local churches, parishes, or congregations, will receive primary attention, as community psychologists have focused most of their attention on this level of analysis. Both the relationships of congregations to their members (inreach), as well as to individuals and organizations in the local community (outreach) will be examined. Much less work in community psychology has focused on other levels of analysis, such as the societal or cultural level, i.e., generalized cultural religious practices, beliefs, values, and norms. Reflecting the relative scarcity of community psychology work in this area, only a small portion of this chapter focuses on the societal level of analysis.

LEARNING ABOUT RELIGION

There are over 350,000 religious congregations in the United States, made up of approximately 148 million members and over 545,000 clergy, representing numerous denominations (Jacquet & Jones, 1991). These institutions vary in their functions, structure, values, goals, resources, members, leadership, traditions, activities, and context (Carroll, Dudley, & McKinney, 1986). They also vary dramatically in their impact on individuals and society. Consider the following examples: Only 8 of 29 ministers surveyed during the crisis over the admission of black students to Central High School in 1957 in Little Rock were active integrationists

(Campbell & Pettigrew, 1959). Over 100 million dollars was spent over a 15-year period by the church-based Campaign for Human Development to support over 2000 social justice programs (Evans, 1979). In 1978, several hundred members of the People's Temple in Jonestown were killed. Religious involvement has been associated with significantly lower rates of drug abuse and alcohol abuse (Benson, Wood, Johnson, Eklin, & Mills, 1983).

How do we make sense of this diversity in form and function of religious institutions? An ecological perspective provides a framework for understanding the varied intricate nature of religious life. From an ecological point of view, local religious institutions represent evolving organizational niches embedded in dynamic, changing environments. The nature of a specific religious institution is influenced by a multiplicity of factors, including member characteristics (e.g., SES, ethnicity), member needs, community locale (e.g., rural/suburban/urban; community composition and needs), the relationship to local community institutions and power structures, the cultural and religious tradition of both members and the larger denomination, and societal trends and forces. However, religious systems are not simply reactive. As they are being shaped by their broader milieu, they are also shaping it. Similarly, as they shape the lives of their members, they are, in turn, shaped by their members. Three key features help provide a framework for understanding the local ecology of religious systems and for distinguishing among religious institutions: theology, mission, and organization.

Theology

Religious systems throughout the world rest on a set of beliefs and values that prescribe a view of God or transcendent force in the Universe, a perspective on the nature of individuals and society, and a set of ideals regarding individual and social life. These beliefs and values offer a response to questions of ultimate meaning in life, such as how the world was created, why there is suffering in the world, the difference between good and evil, and what happens when we die. Of course the answers to these questions are very different among the religions of the world.

Even within western culture, there are marked differences in the theologies of religious institutions. Roberts (1990), for example, notes that theologies vary according to their source of doctrinal authority. He places theologies along a continuum ranging from Reversionism, in which the purity of original doctrines is stressed, to Orthodoxy, in which later historical revelations and interpretations are also authoritative, to Modernism, in which contemporary developments are accepted as authoritative and woven into the institution's theology. Theologies also differ in terms of the degree to which they focus on "this-worldly" or "other-worldly" concerns (Roozen, McKinney, & Carroll, 1984). This-worldy theologies emphasize the importance of establishing the Kingdom of God on *this* earth. Religious values and beliefs are expressed in concrete individual and social actions. Thus, there is no sharp distinction between the religious and the secular. Other-worldy theologies point to Heaven as the Kingdom of God. Here, emphasis is placed on the individual's relationship with God, and preparation for the world-to-come where the individual will receive his or her rewards or punishments for life experienced in this world.

Theologies may also be distinguished by the degree to which they challenge or comfort the individual and society (Berger, 1967; Glock, Ringer, & Babbie, 1967; Spilka & Bridges, 1991). Comforting theologies stress the soothing elements of faith as a means of bearing with the pain of life, and of keeping oneself and one's world together. Challenging theologies emphasize the transforming power of faith as bases for radical individual and social change.

Finally, theologies vary dramatically in their images of God and of the appropriate relationship between the individual and God. For example, grace-oriented theologies focus on God as a loving Deity, forgiving people for their sins, and embracing them in caring personal relationships. Sin-oriented theologies place greater emphasis on God as a stern powerful figure who punishes people for their transgressions.

Diverse contextual and personal forces shape religious world views. For example, Kelley (1977) has argued that rapid social change and the increasing complexities of modern life have led to the growth of religious institutions that adhere to strict religious thinking (reversionist) and provide a clear compelling sense of meaning in life. At the individual level, Benson and Spilka (1973) offer evidence that suggests that people with higher levels of self-esteem are more likely to adopt loving images of God.

Theologies also affect the response of the institution to the world and to its members. G. T. Marx (1967) notes that, historically, religion has served one of two diverse roles for blacks—either as an opiate or as a stimulus for radical social change. Surveying a group of black members of churches in the metropolitan United States, he found that the degree to which the members endorse a "this-worldly" versus "other-worldly" orientation was a crucial intervening variable. Members holding a this-worldy view were more likely to participate in social change efforts, while members holding an other-worldly view were more likely to "wait upon the Lord till (their) change comes."

Mission

As structures that mediate between the personal lives of the members and the larger social world, religious institutions develop both a public and a private character (Berger & Neuhaus, 1977). Underlying the stance the congregation takes both to the world and its members is a mission, a sense of purpose that guides the institution's actions and responses. There is, however, exceptional diversity in both the social and the personal missions of religious institutions.

Roozen et al. (1984), surveying over 400 leaders of Protestant, Jewish, Catholic, and nondenominational congregations, identified four types of public mission: (1) an activist orientation in which the congregation stresses social justice, a critical attitude about existing social structures, and systemic change; (2) a civic orientation in which the congregation supports existing social structures, seeks civil harmony, and avoids confrontation and conflict; (3) an evangelistic orientation in which non-members are encouraged to become new believers; and (4) a sanctuary orientation in which members are encouraged to withdraw from the stresses of society into the haven of the congregation. Maton and Pargament (1987) suggest two additional social orientations: (1) a social service orientation that focuses on assisting individuals inadequately served by the social system and (2) an avoidance orientation in which self-sufficient communities are established as a means of prohibiting contacts with the outside world.

Equally diverse are the personal missions of religious institutions. Strommen, Brekke, Underwager, and Johnson (1972) studied 316 congregations from the three major Lutheran bodies in the United States. They distinguished between two major orientations of the congregation to its members: a spiritual orientation that encourages the development of a transcendent meaning in life, a personal caring relationship with God, and a faith of emotional certainty, and a law orientation that stresses the importance of living by religiously based rules and traditions. Two further personal mission orientations may be distinguished: a growth

orientation that challenges the individual to evaluate himself or herself critically and make personal improvements, and a maintenance orientation that supports the individual emotionally in his or her efforts to cope with the world (Pargament et al., 1991).

It is important to note that any given congregation may have multiple overlapping social and/or personal missions. For example, Roozen et al. (1984) report an association between activist and civic orientations, and between evangelical and sanctuary orientations. However, they also found that most congregations could be identified in terms of one or two dominant mission orientations.

Like the theology of an institution, missions are embedded in the context of a larger social milieu and the membership of the congregation. For example, as many urban congregations have moved to the suburbs, a number of the remaining religious institutions have shifted towards a more maintenance-oriented personal mission in response to the pressing needs of an increasingly impoverished membership (Maton & Pargament, 1987). In addition, many remaining mainline inner-city congregations have changed towards a more social activist or social-service public mission in response to deteriorating social conditions, such as homelessness (Cohen, Mobray, Gillette, & Thompson, 1991).

Organization

The theology and mission of religious institutions come to life through the organization of the congregation, and the organizations of religious institutions vary as dramatically as their theologies and missions. For example, religious institutions differ according to their degree of complexity and bureaucracy, with many institutions adopting complex hierarchical structures, while others develop more simplified communal organizations (Roberts, 1990). Religious institutions also evolve distinct processes for decision-making, communication, and generating and managing their resources. These processes are expressed through congregational climates diverse in their stability, flexibility, sense of community, social concern, emotional expressiveness, involvement in personal problems, and tolerance of individual differences (Pargament, Silverman, Johnson, Echemendia, & Snyder, 1983). Religious institutions also differ in their activities and practices. Some congregations emphasize regular religious practices (e.g., prayer, Bible study, services), and place special significance on life-transition rituals, such as baptisms, weddings, and funerals. Others place more of their energy into specialized helping approaches, such as pastoral counseling to members, group-based family-life enrichment programs, or self-help groups. And others emphasize activities that reach out to the larger community (Maton & Pargament, 1987). Finally, religious institutions may be distinguished in terms of their degree of embeddedness or active involvement in the diverse spheres of societal and individual life (Troeltsch, 1964).

The organization of the religious institution is shaped not only by its theology and mission, but also by its members and broader social context. In this vein, Pargament et al. (1983) found that congregations of different race, size, and denomination had distinctive climates. For instance, consistent with descriptions of the black church as a source of support and identity, small black Protestant congregations were characterized by a higher sense of community, stability, and social concern than white churches.

The organization of the religious institution can, in turn, shape its members and milieu. For example, Maton and Rappaport (1984) propose a number of relationships between religious organizational activities and behavioral change. They note that ongoing prayer groups, supportive relationships with fellow members, congregational norms focused on

personal development, and high levels of commitment and involvement in the institution can help individuals deal with stressful life events, develop specific problem-solving skills, and enhance their psychological well-being.

The constructs of theology, mission, and organization provide a framework for understanding the religious institution as a complex multidimensional system, which can take many forms, and which is embedded in an individual–systems ecology. Clearly, however, these constructs are not independent of each other. Rather, the theology, mission, and organization of a religious institution are woven into richly intricate patterns. These patterns guide the institution along distinctive pathways that have significant and diverse implications for the member and for society.

Pathways of Religious Influence

Maton and Pargament (1987) describe and illustrate several pathways religious institutions take to influence society (outreach) and influence their members (inreach). They stress that it is important to avoid the temptation of evaluating these outreach and inreach pathways simplistically, that is, as either "all good" or "all bad." Rather, each of the pathways may be associated with psychosocial advantages and disadvantages. Finally, they note that, while these pathways reflect the dominant orientation of an institution, any institution may involve itself in more than one pathway. Using the constructs of theology, mission, organization, and psychosocial advantage and disadvantage as an organizing framework, several pathways of religious outreach and inreach can be articulated.

Social Outreach

The pathways of social outreach are described in Table 1. Rooted in a challenging, this-worldly theology of modernism, a number of religious institutions follow a *social action* pathway. This world view stresses the *corporate* (i.e., group-based or social-based) nature of sin. As a remedy, social action institutions adopt the mission of fundamental social systemic change. Towards this end, these institutions embed themselves deeply in social affairs through highly organized activities, including social protest, civil disobedience, community organization, political involvement, and participation in social policy formation. Social action institutions have the potential to reduce inequity and discrimination in other societal institutions, as well as to enhance the psychological well-being of involved individuals. Boyte (1984), for example, describes the beneficial political and psychological impact of (COPS), a parish-supported community-action organization for lower-income Mexican-Americans. Social action institutions may also encourage conflict and, in some cases, aggression to achieve social change (Gutierrez, 1973).

Other religious institutions follow a *social service* pathway. As seen in Table 1, these institutions also identify social problems in this world. However, they are more heavily influenced by a grace theology, and seek to improve the social system through work with underserved individuals, rather than through fundamental systemic change. Social service institutions involve themselves in a wide range of social support programs, including help for the elderly, homeless, poor, and deinstitutionalized; mentoring at-risk youth; social-skills training; and preparation for, and assistance through, life transitions (e.g., birth, marriage, parenting, divorce, retirement, death) (see Haugk, 1976; Pargament, 1982, for review). While rarely evaluated formally, descriptions of these programs suggest that they can contribute in a

Table 1. Social Outreach Pathways of Religious Institutions

Pathway	Theology	Mission	Organization	Advantages/ disadvantages
Social action	Challenge; this-world; modernism	Fundamental systemic change	Deeply embedded; social and political change	Institutional change/ conflict
Social service	This world; grace	Improve social system	Deeply embedded; social support programs	Social support/first-order change
Social conversion	Challenge; other-world; sin; revisionism	Evangelism	Moderately embedded; social control; evangelical	Member support/ intolerance; first-order change
Social conservatism	Comfort; this-world; orthodox	Support social system	Narrowly embedded; bureaucratic; traditional practices	Institutional protection/ maintenance of inequality
Social sanctuary	Comfort; other-world; grace	Protection from social system	Narrowly embedded; communal; pietistic and support activities	Member support/ maintenance of inequality
Social avoidance	Sin; reversion	Avoid social system	Narrowly embedded; social control; special practices	Alternative institution; member support/ dysfunctional member practices

significant way to the psychological, social, and material resources of many people facing serious problems. However, by responding to the individual needs of people experiencing social difficulties, social service institutions, like their mental health counterparts, have been criticized for "salving" rather than "solving" basic systemic problems (Berton, 1965).

Social conversion institutions also recognize problems in society. However, this pathway rests on a theology that views societal problems as a manifestation of individual sin; the solution lies in a focus on the other-worldly and a reversion to fundamental religious beliefs and practices. Thus, the mission of this institution is social change through evangelism. Social conversion institutions are often characterized by high levels of commitment among members, strict social controls, religious activities that stress the individual's personal relationship with God, and a variety of evangelism programs (e.g., hospital visits, religious literature, personal witnessing, religious media events). The social conversion pathway may offer a source of meaning, community, and structure to its members (McGaw, 1979). However, it may also be tied to a lack of tolerance for differences in beliefs and lifestyles. Furthermore, questions may be raised about the efficacy of individual religious development as the basis for social change.

Many religious institutions attempt to support and maintain existing social systems rather than radically change or reform them. This mission is a central element of the *social conservatism* pathway (see Table 1). Underlying this pathway is a more orthodox theology, which focuses on comfort rather than challenge in this world. Social conservatism institutions tend to adopt more complex, stable, bureaucratic structures, an emphasis on regular religious practices and traditions, and a relatively narrow scope limited to support for traditional institutions in society. While this support may play a key role in the protection of benevolent institutions, it may also perpetuate inequitable social conditions (e.g., Campbell & Pettigrew, 1959).

Other religious institutions view society more apprehensively, and try to protect their

members from this world. Consistent with this mission, *social sanctuary* institutions stress spiritual comfort, an other-worldly view, and a grace orientation in their theology. The congregation also provides members with a supportive milieu through a more communal organization, a sense of community among the members, and religious activities that encourage a close relationship with God. In this pathway, members leave the "problems of the world" at the doorstep when they enter the congregation. As Kennell (1985) noted in a participant-observation study of an inner-city congregation, the social haven institution offers many members valuable support often missing in their environment. However, other theorists have suggested that this support occurs at the cost of more active social involvement (Block & Stark, 1965). In this sense, the social sanctuary congregation may also protect existing social institutions.

Yet another response to the view of evil in society is to actively avoid it. Table 1 indicates that the *social avoidance* pathway is based on a sin-oriented, reversionist theology. Members are challenged to avoid contact with existing social institutions. Alternative social structures are developed, often in isolation from the larger society. The organization of the social avoidance institution is typically characterized by charismatic leadership, high levels of control over members' behaviors, social solidarity, and special teachings and practices (Wilson, 1959). Social avoidance institutions tend to attract those who are less powerful and more alienated in society. While these institutions can generate potentially valuable alternative social structures, they can also encourage a loss of personal initiative and, at times, dysfunctional practices and norms (e.g., "Heaven's Gate").

Personal Inreach

Religious institutions also reach in to their members in a variety of ways. These pathways of personal inreach are presented in Table 2. Many congregations attempt to provide members with *personal structure* in their lives. Institutions that follow this pathway identify a law orientation as their key mission. Based on a sin-oriented, reversionist/orthodox theology, they offer their members a clear set of religiously based rules for living that define appropriate and inappropriate behaviors. The organization of these institutions stresses social control over members' actions, religious rituals and traditions, and a high degree of embeddedness in members' lives. Empirical evidence suggests that this type of system may provide members with a source of control over their impulses, a haven from a maladaptive subculture, and a system of personal and social support (Pargament, Echemendia, Johnson, Myers, Cook, Brannick, & McGath, 1987; Hood et al., 1996). However, there is also some evidence to indicate that more restrictive religious perspectives are tied to lower levels of personal competence and higher levels of interpersonal intolerance and prejudice (Benson & Spilka, 1973; Batson et al., 1993).

Other people turn to religious institutions for more limited purposes. As Table 2 shows, the institution may serve as a *personal defense* against feelings of weakness, anxiety, or loneliness, or as a *personal stress buffer* during crises or major life transitions. A number of studies have shown that people are more likely to become involved in religion during periods of stress, change, or personal distress (e.g., Lindenthal, Myers, Pepper, & Stein, 1970; Pargament, 1997; Pargament & Hahn, 1986). Maintenance of the individual in the world is the key personal mission of these institutions. Consistent with this mission is the comforting theology of the congregation, an active supportive clergy, and the use of religious rituals and congregation-based helping activities. However, since the scope of the institution in members' lives is narrow, these congregations often have difficulty generating sufficient resources to

TABLE 2. Personal Inreach Pathways of Religious Institutions

Pathway	Theology	Mission	Organization	Advantages/ disadvantages
Personal structure	Sin; reversionism; orthodox	Law	Deeply embedded; social control; traditional practices	Restraint; support/ intolerance; lower problem-solving skills
Personal defense/ stress buffer	Comfort	Maintenance	Narrowly embedded; active clergy; specialized helping; unstable	Support/dysfunctional beliefs and practices
Personal quest	Challenge; this-world; modernism	Growth	Deeply embedded; communal; autonomy	Competence; tolerance/ anxiety
Personal empowerment	Grace; comfort/ challenge	Spiritual/growth; maintenance	Deeply embedded; communal; pietistic activities	Interpersonal skills, well-being/instability
Personal identity	Orthodoxy; comfort	Maintenance; law	Moderately embedded; bureaucratic; traditional practices	Support/intolerance
Personal marginality	Varied	Varied	Varied	Competence/stress

maintain themselves. Personal defense and stress buffer institutions can provide their members with much needed support. Involvement in some religious groups has been found to moderate or deter the effects of negative life events (Ellison, 1993; Krause & Van Tran, 1989; Maton, 1989a, 1989b; Siegel & Kuykendall, 1990; Williams, Larson, Buckler, Heckman, & Pyle, 1989). For example, Maton found that both high levels of individual spiritual support (Maton, 1989a) and, at the organizational level of analysis, highly supportive congregations (Maton, 1989b) were related positively and in a stress-buffering fashion to individual well-being; apparently they protected individuals from the deleterious effects of varied and serious life stressors. Some institutionally related practices and beliefs, however, may interfere with the development of personal skills and the successful resolution of crises (e.g., Horton, Wilkins, & Wright, 1988; Pargament, Ensing, Falgout, Olsen, Reilly, Van Haitsma, & Warren, 1990).

Other religious institutions direct themselves towards the personal growth and development of their members. Institutions involved in the *personal quest* pathway espouse challenging, this-worldy, modernistic theologies that emphasize personal freedom and responsibility for human development. Communal-type organizations are developed that encourage individual autonomy, variety in religious expression, and personal search and change. Evidence indicates that members of this kind of institution have a greater sense of efficacy in life, are more willing to examine themselves critically, and are more tolerant and trusting of others (Pargament, Tyler, & Steele, 1979a). However, the lack of a simple definitive structure in the personal quest pathway may also result in higher levels of anxiety and insecurity among the members (Batson et al., 1993).

At the core of many religious institutions is the individual's personal relationship with God. The primary mission of the *personal empowerment* institution is spiritual—the develop-

ment of an intimate relationship of members with a personal God (see Table 2). Underlying this pathway is a theology of a loving, caring, and powerful (i.e., impactful) Deity, actively influencing and transforming individuals and social environments—providing comfort and aid during times of personal need and providing challenge, in order to enable people to improve themselves and influence their social environments. Through its primary spiritual mission, the personal empowerment institution naturally incorporates missions focused on personal growth and maintenance as well. Specifically, this institution stresses activities that enhance the individual's relationship with God, such as prayer, fellowship groups, and Bible study, as well as being a communal supportive organization highly integrated in members' lives. In a number of studies, reports of a loving relationship with God have been associated with measures of mental health (Benson & Spilka, 1973; Batson et al., 1993). Maton and Rappaport, in their work with an empowering non-denominational fellowship, demonstrated the significant impact of this institution on the interpersonal skills and personal well-being of the members (Maton & Rappaport, 1984; Maton & Salem, 1995; Rappaport & Simkins, 1991). Yet, maintaining an empowerment pathway over time may be difficult, as it involves a continual balancing of challenging and comforting beliefs, and of spiritual and personal missions. Ultimately, the attempt to achieve and maintain this balance may prove draining and stressful, and/or may lead to an instability for individuals and congregations as one or the other form of belief or mission becomes predominant at a given point in time.

Religious institutions offer many people a source of identity in life. Congregations following a *personal identity* pathway provide a set of rituals, traditions, beliefs, images, and symbols that help their members define how they are both alike and different from others. They also adopt organizational structures that give members opportunities to define themselves and others in terms of particular roles. The theology of personal identity institutions is often orthodox, directed towards the mission of sustaining members in the world through adherence to religious traditions and laws. This pathway can play a significant role in the development and maintenance of the individual's sense of self and relation to the world, a function particularly crucial for minority and other marginal social groups (Herman, 1977). However, as Glock and Stark (1996) found in their study of anti-Semitism, intolerance and prejudice result when identity is based upon the *superiority* of particular teachings.

Finally, it is important to note that religious systems of all kinds can be reacted against as well as identified with. In this sense, any religious system may offer members the possibility of *personal marginality*. Marginality within religious systems may generate stress among members. Pargament, Tyler, and Steele (1979b) report that peripheral congregation status was associated with lower satisfaction than central status. However, marginality may also stimulate personal development (Rubin, 1982). Thus, Pargament and colleagues have also found marginal status to be associated with higher levels of personal competence, particularly within more restrictive religious institutions (Pargament, Johnson, Echemendia, & Silverman, 1985; Pargament et al., 1979b).

LEARNING FROM RELIGION

Religion has developed unique approaches to meeting people's needs and addressing social problems. Community psychology, in its attempt to prevent and alleviate individual and social problems, may benefit considerably from a careful examination of the strengths and

weaknesses of the varied approaches adopted by religion. In this section, some of the dominant themes concerning religion and religious influence in American life, with direct relevance for community psychology, are reviewed. The implications of these themes for future research and action by community psychologists are discussed in the concluding section of this chapter.

Meeting Primary Human Needs for Meaning and Understanding

Central to diverse religious theologies is the provision of a world view that provides explanations and, in most cases, "ultimately hopeful" perspectives on life purpose and events, death, and history. The widespread presence of these themes across all religious world views points to a deep "need" in humans to find and create meaning, both in terms of universal issues and day-to-day events (Hood et al., 1996; Sarason, 1993). Empirical evidence suggests that in religious settings where theology, mission, and organization combine to uphold and/or challenge individuals, the influence of religion can be health promotive, stress buffering, and empowering (e.g., Maton & Pargament, 1987; Hood et al., 1996). The large number of Americans who continue to ascribe to a religious world view, in the context of a materialist and pragmatist dominant culture, underscores individuals' needs for understanding and meaning, and the capacity of religious systems to respond to these needs.

One important aspect of a religious world view is the extent and the conditions under which it influences individuals' psychological locus of control. The actual impact of religious world views on locus of control appears quite varied in nature. For instance, some theologies emphasize that God is in control of all events, and that ultimately all life stresses or situations will "work toward the good." The emphasis that God is in exclusive control of all situations, however, may lead to a passive approach to coping with personal life events and social injustices. On the other hand, the emphasis that God and the individual are partners working together, emphasized by some theologies, may enhance a sense of personal efficacy and efforts at social change (Hathaway & Pargament, 1990; McIntosh & Spilka, 1990; Pargament, Grevengoed, Kennell, Newman, Hathaway, & Jones, 1988; Schaefer & Gorsuch, 1991). Furthermore, the sense of control by a benevolent God may be particularly helpful in uncontrollable situations or crises where there are real limits to what an individual (Bickel, Sheers, Estadt, Powell, & Pargament, 1998; Jenkins & Pargament, 1988) or social group can accomplish. Thus, "letting go" of anxiety and personal control, and placing faith in God's ability to deal with uncontrollable personal or social events (Baugh, 1988; Cole & Pargament, 1999; Maton & Rappaport, 1984), may be a useful complement to psychology's traditional focus on enhancing personal control over events that are controllable. In short, some elements of external control, when integrated appropriately with an internal locus of control, may serve important functions, both on the individual and societal level (Pargament, Sullivan, Tyler, & Steele, 1982).

Meeting Primary Needs for Community and Belonging

In addition to providing meaning, religion as a social institution appears to provide a sense of community and belonging to millions of Americans. Religion contains distinctive assets in building interpersonal community. One asset is the potential for a holistic approach

to the person—spiritual, psychological, interpersonal, and economic needs can all be legitimately addressed in religious settings (Anderson, Maton, & Ensor, 1991). A second distinctive asset is a rich heritage of tradition and symbols that facilitate the sense of continuity and shared history integral to community. A third distinctive asset is the voluntary, self-selected nature of religious involvement. Individuals apparently choose to join religious settings peopled by others who not only share religious backgrounds and beliefs, but who also share the same cultural, economic, and social statuses as themselves (Roberts, 1990).

In contemporary society, religious settings face many challenges in attempting to foster a sense of community (Roberts, 1991). The impersonalization and mobility of American communities, together with a prevailing materialistic and individualistic culture, may diminish cohesiveness within congregations. The fact that many of the traditional functions of religion have been taken over by other social institutions reduces the intrinsic capability of religion to establish viable community (c.f., Berger, 1967). Finally, the large size and traditional centralized organizational structure of many congregations also represent obstacles to community.

One apparently effective organizational response to these problems has been to base ongoing activities in small, decentralized units within the church. Ongoing small group prayer, bible study, and mission groups are increasingly frequent means of enhancing intimate sharing and interpersonal commitment among members of diverse congregations (Maton & Rappaport, 1984; McGaw, 1979; Wuthnow, 1994). Small group involvement likely contributes to an integrated, strengths view of participants, and provides the opportunity for balanced individual involvement in providing and giving (c.f., Maton, 1987). Finally, sustained small group involvement creates a more localized forum for involvement and control over decision-making, another factor apparently important for community (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

A second organizational feature of many religious settings that likely facilitates belonging is the creation of participatory role opportunities for members. For instance, in an intensive study of a small Pentecostal congregation (less than 100 members) for disenfranchised, inner-city blacks, Williams (1974) found the presence of a large number of role positions: pastor, pastor's aide, choir president and members, church secretary, deacon board chairman and deacons, trustee board chairman and trustees, Sunday school superintendent and teachers, financial captains, local community "missionaries," and so on. Religious settings that effectively involve individuals in roles perceived as important likely contribute to both a sense of meaning and community among members (Maton, 1988).

A central task for religion in building community is to find a viable balance between individual "agency" (self-assertion) and "communion" (participation as part of a larger whole) (Bakan, 1966). Religion faces special dangers in this regard, as the special powers traditionally ascribed to religious leaders, and the fear of ostracism or sin, may promote a maladaptive suspension of individual judgment. Tragedies such as Jonestown and Heaven's Gate illustrate some of the conditions under which "agency" can be lost and "communion" can become destructive. Furthermore, the dangers of particularism are also paramount, especially when group boundaries become so firm that those who are different become labeled as "evil" or "ungodly," and negative consequences such as prejudice, discrimination, or violence may follow. On the other hand, in some settings the proper combination of individuality and community can prove extremely empowering, especially with leaders fully committed to the development of both individuals and community (e.g., Maton & Rappaport, 1984). Interestingly, in this regard some theoreticians have asserted that only religious settings are potentially capable of fully integrating individual freedom with lasting community, for instance, in the context of individuals fully committed to a community of fellow believers whose fundamental tenet is respect for each individual's unique search for meaning (Becker, 1968).

Beyond Narrow Individualism: Toward the Public Good

The classic structural-functional view of religion (Radcliffe-Brown, 1939) asserted that, as a social institution, religion exists not to meet the needs of individuals, but rather the needs or requirements of society as a whole. The shared values, beliefs, and norms of religion as an institution are viewed in this perspective as central to societal stability and social integration. Concern for others and prohibitions against greed and oppression are examples of contributions of religion viewed as necessary for the orderly development and maintenance of society.

Many of the original "religious" norms and values of Judaic-Christian religion are today interwoven into the civic culture of American society. However, while they are often pronounced, it appears that they are not always acted upon (Lasch, 1979). The narrow individualism of individual, family, and corporate life in America increasingly underscores the need for limits on individualism, and the need for a revival of institutions that generate more of a balance between individual needs and concern for the public good (Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler, & Tipton, 1985; Sarason, 1986).

In contemporary society, religion continues to place limits on narrow individualism in a variety of ways. One way is through religious teachings on the importance of serving God and serving one's "neighbor." Thus, Judaism emphasizes the importance of *mitzvot*, or obligational commandments from God, including those focused on helping others in need. Different branches of Christianity focus on different applications of personal and/or social ethics (e.g., Carney, 1978; Hallie, 1979; Niebuhr, 1963), prayerful seeking of God's will rather than one's own desires, and on being a "servant" in one's everyday life. The latter term, "servant," emphasizes that the committed religious individual should focus on meeting the needs of others, especially those in greatest need, even at possible cost to oneself.

A related means by which religion can contribute to the public good is by generating overall conceptions, that is, "visions," of societal arrangements and practices consistent with the public good. The Judaic-Christian tradition, for instance in the Bible, offers visions of society in which sharing of material wealth, helping one's neighbor, and concern for the common good served to mediate between the individual and the collective. Modern social action congregations, such as the well-known Church of the Savior in Washington, D.C., articulate visions of a congregation knit together in a shared social justice ministry to the inner city and larger society. Martin Luther King shared a vision of a country in which "all God's children" were holding hands, together singing "free at last, free at last." New theologies, such as "liberation theology," have emerged to mobilize both the church and citizenry in Central America with visions of a new social order. Of course, the vision of the "public good" and the "good society" articulated by some popular leaders or theologians may represent values and class interests that contribute more to the maintenance of current social arrangements than to true social justice.

Special Access to the Marginal, Disenfranchised, and Minority Groups

One of the unique aspects of religion as a social institution is its special access to the poor and minorities. For instance, the church has historically stood at the center of community life and power in the black community, and apparently continues to be a significant influence today (Frazier, 1964; Hrabowski, Maton, & Greif, 1998; Maton, Hrabowski, & Greif, 1998; Maton, Teti, Corns, Vieira-Baker, Lavine, Gouze, & Keating, 1996; Moore, 1991). For many among the rapidly expanding Hispanic population in our country, Catholicism remains a way

of life. When psychological needs arise, pastoral counseling and non-church-based religious healers of various kinds retain a central role for many minority and immigrant populations (e.g., Garrison, 1977; Wimberly, 1979). Finally, a significant amount of the services and social action for the disenfranchised comes directly from minority and mainline contributions of money and volunteer services. A community psychology interested in understanding and influencing the community dynamics, health care delivery, and individual needs of the disenfranchised in America needs to take seriously the central role of minority religion and institutional religion in America.

The special access and importance of religion for the disenfranchised appears to follow directly from the previous themes emphasized above: meeting needs for meaning, meeting needs for community, and extending beyond narrow individualism towards the public good. Thus, religion apparently helps those who are most negatively affected by uncontrollable external events and societal circumstances to develop a world view that provides meaning and understanding, as well as a source of optimism and hope for the future. Religious congregations can provide the disenfranchised with the interpersonal community, belonging, and meaningful roles most likely to be lacking in nonempowering social institutions (Kennell, 1985). Finally, for both the minority and mainline congregations, religious imagery and ethics provide a vision and a calling that allow people to reach beyond themselves to seek a greater public good, even in the midst of extremely stressful personal or community circumstances.

Of course, the role of religion in minority communities has the potential for negative as well as positive impacts. Specifically, it has been asserted that "otherworldly" religion is an "opiate" that diminishes social action efforts (G. T. Marx, 1967). In addition, it can be argued that social service outreach efforts distract attention and energy from the real preventive and systemic changes that would represent truly transforming and empowering change for disenfranchised minority communities.

WORKING WITH RELIGION AS A SYSTEM

The previous discussion has hinted of the potential benefits of collaborative work between community psychology and religion. Religious systems address many of the same individual and community concerns that community psychology addresses; these systems also have unique approaches, resources, and access that psychology lacks (Anderson, Maton, & Ensor, 1991). Both psychological and religious communities, then, appear to have much to gain from working together.

Unfortunately, as noted earlier, when psychologists have worked with the religious sector, the interactions have typically been one-sided. Ideally, collaboration with religion should be based on a "resource exchange" model (Kelly, 1986; Kloos, Horneffer, & Moore, 1995; Meylink & Gorsuch, 1986; Tyler, Pargament, & Gatz, 1983), encompassing a full recognition of, and respect for, the unique resources and limitations of religion and psychology.

Religious settings have not often been the focus of community psychology intervention efforts (e.g., Weaver et al., 1998). The existing examples, however, do portray a range of content areas and role relationships as a basis for collaborative efforts with religion, and illustrate the potential value in this work. Several that highlight the unique resources and dilemmas in working with religion will be presented below. Most of these interventions focus on efforts to enhance congregational inreach to its members. To date there are only a few published accounts of collaboration to influence congregational outreach to the community, or

to launch efforts to influence cultural practices or basic social institutions in America (e.g., Eng & Hatch, 1991; Cohen et al., 1991; Maton & Seibert, 1991; Shifrin, 1991).

Peer Counseling: The Stephen Series

The Stephen Series is a system of one-to-one helping interactions with congregational members in need carried out by trained lay congregational helpers. The program was developed by Kenneth Haugk, an ordained minister and clinical psychologist (Haugk, 1985). The congregational members receiving help are often identified and referred by the minister; the Series estimates that after contact and encouragement by the minister, over 90% of members agree to accept help from the trained helpers. Those receiving help may be individuals undergoing specific life transitions or stresses, such as divorce, bereavement, and unemployment; or those suffering from physical or emotional problems. To date, over 30,000 congregational helpers have been trained, encompassing over 1100 congregations and over 40 denominations. While empirical evaluation research of the program has not been carried out, it is a program with a strong potential for widespread preventive and promotive influence.

Basic to the Stephen Series program are a series of training and supervision experiences. Initially, leaders from local congregations, often including the minister, receive two weeks of training provided by Stephen Series personnel. Those receiving the initial training then provide 50 hours of training to volunteer lay "Stephen ministers" in their congregation. The lay helpers are then ready to provide assistance to fellow members; however, they continue to receive supervision, education, and support bi-monthly.

The Christian concept of "the priesthood of all believers" serves as the underlying principle guiding the program (1 Peter 2:5–9). Concepts of Christian caring, along with psychological theory and methods, are presented in the training of the helpers. Included as training topics are listening skills, dealing with feelings, crisis intervention, assertiveness, the use of community resources, confidentiality, termination, the use of prayer in ministry, helping people with spiritual concerns, and other aspects of Christian caring.

The successful development of the Stephen Series by a psychologist-minister demonstrates the value of working with change agents who span the worlds of psychology and religion. Clearly, problems of legitimacy and of accurate knowledge of religious systems are likely to be greatly reduced in such efforts. Furthermore, it suggests that community psychologists have the potential to start in motion innovative change efforts in their own religious settings, which can then be disseminated to other settings.

Social Ecological Consultation: Multisite Drug Abuse Prevention Program

Roberts and Thorsheim (1987) used a social ecological consultation approach as part of a four-year drug abuse prevention field research project funded by the National Institute of Drug Abuse. The project focused on Lutheran congregations. Prior to initiation of any prevention programs, the investigators spent a full year consulting with various professionals, church leaders, and congregational members about possible approaches to drug abuse prevention. It was emphasized that each participating congregation would, with the consultation of the investigators, develop its own prevention program; thus the programs would be based on each congregation's unique strengths, resources, and problems. Ultimately, 50 congregations

expressed interest in taking part in the program, and of these 24 were chosen—6 as chemical abuse information plus social support activities congregations, 6 as chemical abuse information only congregations, and 12 as control congregations.

Pastors in each of the 12 experimental congregations were asked to form 5-person teams and to identify a team leader. Workshops were held for all 12 of the teams in which the consultants presented information on chemical abuse and chemical abuse prevention. With the six information plus support congregations, the consultants worked closely with the pastors and teams to help plan congregational support activities, programs, meetings, and discussions unique to each congregation. As the authors state, a "partnership approach" was paramount throughout the consultation: "we assumed that we had much to learn from those with whom we were working ... we also hoped, through our own openness and honesty, to encourage trusting relationships and open expression of thoughts and feelings."

The authors report outcome data that indicated that consultation to experimental congregations was related to increased levels of congregational activity regarding abuse prevention, that increased levels of congregational activity was related to member "investment in community," and that increased levels of "investment in community" was inversely related to member alcohol consumption. Central to the "social ecology" consultation was the principle of tailoring each program to the specific needs and desires of the congregation. Furthermore, the locus of control for planning and initiating the prevention activities was clearly within congregational members, with the consultants serving primarily as emotional and technical resources.

Data-Based Change: The Congregation Development Program

Pargament and his colleagues (1991) have worked with over 50 churches and synagogues through the Congregation Development Program (CDP), a data-based assessment and feedback program designed to help congregations assess their strengths and weaknesses and plan for change. Through interviews, questionnaires, and visits, the CDP team gathers information about a variety of dimensions of congregation life: its structure; vision (e.g., personal and social mission) of what it should be about; psychosocial climate; priorities for change; satisfaction with programs, education, leaders, services, facilities, and clergy; and the role of religion in the individual lives of the members. The data are then interpreted jointly with the clergy and leaders of the congregation. Particular attention is paid to how the information can help the congregation move closer to its goals. A number of congregations have initiated significant changes in the congregation as a result of the CDP. These changes include new programming for the elderly, the development of small group projects to increase the sense of community in larger congregations, increased representativeness of church boards, and the development of five-year plans.

The CDP points to some unique challenges to working with religious systems: the need to address similarities and differences in values between psychologist and religious systems; the need to clarify differences between groups in methods for solving problems (i.e., faith and dogma versus data and empiricism); and the need to understand the unique nature of religious authority. However, the CDP also underscores the fact that religious systems are, in many ways, like other systems. For example, clergy and leaders respond to the data gathered by the CDP team with the same interest, hope, fears, resistance, and questions found in other systems.

Congregation-Based Economic Sharing: The Goods and Services Exchange

Maton helped to develop a congregation-based economic sharing and barter program as part of a four-year participant-inhabitant study of a non-denominational, religious fellowship (Maton, 1985). Nine members of the congregation participated as volunteer staff in the program. The staff members prepared position papers and spoke at congregational meetings, including Sunday services, about the biblical imperative for widespread sharing and exchanging of goods and services, both within and outside the churches. A congregational goods and services directory was then developed by distributing a checklist of 179 services and goods to all congregational members. Each person was asked to indicate those services and goods they were willing to provide, lend, or exchange. All information was computerized, allowing easy compilation and updating. A hard copy of the directory was printed for each staff member, categorized by type of service or good offered. Information was updated at six-month intervals.

The key component of the program was ongoing encouragement to church members to contact one of the nine staff members whenever they had an economic need. This person would then locate an individual in the directory with the appropriate resource. Either sharing or exchange could be arranged, depending on the desires of the two individuals involved. Examples of economic needs met were the repair of frozen house plumbing, lending a van for moving, painting an apartment, and giving away an old stove. An initial evaluation of program records indicated that many more people were willing to donate services or goods than to enter into exchange arrangements with a member in need. The idea of exchange apparently ran counter to the "freely giving" theology of the group, although project staff had tried to emphasize its importance in facilitating widespread adoption of economic sharing lifestyles.

This program demonstrated the possibility of mobilizing congregational members to donate time and energy for projects conceived as consistent with the theology and mission of the congregation. However, it also demonstrated that successful project components need to be carefully developed to fit the major beliefs and values of setting members.

Mentoring and Support for Inner-City Youth: Project RAISE

Project RAISE (Raising Ambition Instills Self Esteem) is a collaborative project involving Baltimore City schools, churches, and other community organizations (cf. Maton & Seibert, 1991). The project is aimed at providing inner-city youth with academic and social supports over a seven-year period in order to enable successful academic performance, high school graduation, viable career plans, and reduced psychosocial problems (i.e., teenage pregnancy, substance abuse, anti-social behavior). Thirteen community organizations, each committed to working with a single group of 60 students over the seven-year period, were recruited for the intervention. The 13 sponsoring organizations include six churches, three universities, two businesses, one government agency, and one fraternity. Each sponsor promises to recruit mentors for all students, to carry out regular after-school academic (e.g., tutoring) and cultural (e.g., museum visits) activities, and to contribute $10,000 in support of the students.

Two central RAISE program components are the mentors recruited by the sponsor and each sponsor's full-time program coordinator—in the case of the churches, both mentors and

program coordinators are generally members of the sponsoring congregation. The mentor helps the student with academic subjects, serves as a model for personal success and responsibility, and provides attention, concern, and caring. The program coordinator organizes the mentoring and after-school activity components of the RAISE program, and also monitors and advocates for students in the schools on a daily basis.

The motivational and organizational bases of the religiously based RAISE mentors and program coordinators may provide distinct advantages when compared to their non-church-based counterparts (cf., Anderson et al., 1991). For instance, church-based mentors and coordinators may perceive a distinctive mission or calling from God to carry out this work, which may provide an especially deep and enduring commitment to the youth served. Also, religious congregations may be especially likely to provide mentors and program coordinators with the support needed to sustain their commitment and involvement over the seven-year project. In addition, parents and students may be more likely to trust and respond to outreach from church-based, rather than business or university-based, individuals, given the location of churches in the local community and the likelihood of common religious and/or cultural beliefs. Finally, the mentors and program coordinators who desire to make a more in-depth connection or special impact on the youth served (beyond periodic, one-on-one meetings) can naturally invite and involve students and parents in various congregational activities, while to do so in a business or university setting is much less feasible.

Indeed, research to date suggests distinctive impacts for the church-based sponsors. For instance, a survey focusing on those sponsoring organizations within three years of program involvement indicated that students served by the religious sponsors were more likely than those served by non-religious sponsors to currently have a mentor (75% vs. 35% of students, respectively); furthermore, among those students with a current mentor, the relationship with the mentor was of longer duration for those with church-based mentors (22.8 months vs. 8.3 months, respectively) (Maton, Seibert, & DeHaven, 1991). In addition, outcome analyses in which each group of RAISE students was contrasted with a non-RAISE comparison sample revealed more consistent academic gains (attendance, grades, promotions) among students served by congregational sponsors (Maton & Seibert, 1991; Maton et al., 1991). Research is currently planned to examine whether the positive effects of the church-based sponsors will continue over time.

Urban churches and other organizations (e.g., businesses) are increasingly involved in programs to help at-risk minority youth, including "adopt a school" programs, various outreach programs, and the provision of adult role models. In Project RAISE, religious organizations are central to an effort to provide mentoring and after-school support activities to disadvantaged youth, and may have a distinctive and positive impact on them.

Community-Based Development: A Partnership with Religious Institutions

Religious institutions have considerable clout when it comes to community development. Much of this clout is financial; churches and synagogues are among the chief providers of money for social and community action programs. But the clout goes beyond dollars. By their involvement in community development programs, religious institutions lend their prestige to the process of change; they enhance the legitimacy of social action to public officials and to the community itself (Maton & Wells, 1995; Speer, Hughey, Gensheimer, & Adams-Leavitt, 1995; Schorr, 1997).

Recognizing the unique resources of religious institutions, the Lilly Endowment developed a program of collaboration between local churches and other community organizations to

revitalize communities (Scheie, Markham, Mayer, Slettom, & Williams, 1991). The program has four goals: (1) to stimulate greater religious institutional involvement in community revitalization, (2) to create new partnerships between religious and community organizations, (3) to strengthen community ministries, and (4) to attract new sources of funding for these activities (p. 5).

In 1989 28 grants were awarded nationally to various forms of religious-community partnership. Most of these partnerships have as their goal the rehabilitation and development of affordable housing for low- to moderate-income families. For example, several religious and community groups came together to form NOAH, the Neighborhood of Affordable Housing in East Boston. NOAH is currently rehabilitating and managing single-room housing units for the elderly, disabled, and working poor. It is also rehabilitating rental housing and converting a vacant church into a youth center.

Scheie et al. (1991) note that viable religious-community partnerships rest on an appreciation of the unique character of each system. They remind the community organization that religious institutions have a different mission—while bringing people to God may occur through community development, it is only one of many paths toward this end. And unlike the community organization, the church is not financially dependent on community revitalization for its survival. Further, religious systems are voluntary organizations that require the support of their members. Thus, they may work according to a longer timetable than the community organization. As Scheie et al. (1991) put it: "They [religious systems] have institutional memories that go back hundreds or thousands of years, and a future vision that stretches to eternity" (p. 75).

In spite of these differences, religious and community organizations have formed effective alliances in this program. As noteworthy as the program's success in community development is its success in obtaining an additional $45 million from sources other than the Lilly Endowment to sustain these partnerships and projects (Scheie et al., 1991). Moreover, the program appears to be increasing the sensitivity and commitment of these religious institutions to community needs, particularly the needs of the poorest. This program illustrates the powerful role the religious institution can play in community life when it looks beyond its own walls to the larger social world.

CHALLENGES, QUESTIONS, AND POSSIBILITIES FOR A COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION

Clearly, religion is an integral part of American life. A very important implication for community psychology follows: *Without an understanding of religion in American life, an understanding of community in American life remains incomplete*. Thus, the processes of learning about, learning from, and working with religious systems are not only legitimate, but essential tasks, for community psychology. Progress has been made in each of these areas. And yet, not surprisingly, this work raises further challenges, questions, and possibilities for a community psychology of religion.

In moving from a person-centered, undifferentiated perspective to an ecological view that encompasses multiple levels of analysis, a richer, more complex picture of religion is beginning to emerge. Shaped by a myriad of personal and systemic forces, religion also affects individuals and society in a variety of ways. Yet the "whys, whens, and hows" of this transaction are far from clear. A key task for community psychology is to develop a deeper

understanding of the processes through which religious institutions, both local and societal, take on their unique identity and, in turn, impact on their members and larger society. Many of the central concepts and methods of the discipline are well-suited to this task (Maton, 1993a). However, this research should encompass not only psychological perspectives, but sociological, anthropological, economic, and theological frameworks as well. In addition, this analysis requires a historical perspective and a diversity of research methods, including ethnographic and qualitative approaches (e.g., Maton, 1993b; Rappaport, 1995; Wuthnow, 1994).

Important implications for community research and action can be drawn from the unique responses of religion to concerns vital to our discipline: the need for meaning and understanding, the need for community and belonging, moving beyond a narrow individualism to a commitment to the public good, and responsivity to disenfranchised and marginal groups. For instance, concerning the need for meaning and understanding, intervention could be considered that enhance the world view, and the sense of historical and life "meaning" of individuals. These interventions could take place in collaboration with any of the primary social institutions, such as family, education, social services, business, or religion. In addition, religion's tradition of helping people come to terms with uncontrollable events points to the importance of careful evaluation of the conditions under which personal control, individualism, and empiricism diminish or enrich individual and social well-being.

The success of many religious systems at building community also underscores important targets for community research and action. Research programs should be geared to discovering the factors that build community in religious and other social settings as a foundation for consultation and intervention efforts. Particular attention should be paid to the idea of ongoing "small group base units," and of participatory role creation, to help restructure and enhance community in settings such as schools, neighborhoods, and places of work. Finally, focusing on our own discipline's needs for enhanced community, we might learn some valuable lessons from religious systems; in particular, the importance of explicit attempts to develop traditions, symbols, and organizational structures that generate continuity, contact, and shared individuality-in-community.

Insights from religious institutions also highlight the significance of research and interventions that help individuals and systems move beyond narrow individualism and to care, reflect, and take action about larger social issues. Particularly needed in our institutions are images and visions effective in empowering individuals and their systems to care for the well-being of themselves *and* each other, rather than at the expense of each other (Bakan, 1966; Sarason, 1987). Concepts, empirical methods, theoretical frameworks, and discourse languages that help generate these synergistic alternatives to narrow individualism are important priorities for our work (e.g., Bellah et al., 1985; Maton, 1987; Pargament & Myers, 1982).

The central role of religion and religious systems in the lives of the disenfranchised and marginal poses serious challenges for community psychology as a field. First and foremost, it raises questions about why so few linkages have been developed with religious systems, given the avowed interests of the discipline in aiding marginal and disenfranchised groups (see Kloos et al., 1995). Furthermore, it challenges researchers to undertake systematic study of the preventive and empowering potential of religious systems, both minority and mainline, which have access to disenfranchised and lower income groups (Maton & Wells, 1995). Finally, it underscores the need for intervention programs, at the individual and institutional levels, which bring together the complementary resources of religion and community psychology (Queen, 1997).

The increasing importance of spirituality in individual lives points to another potentially important area of focus for community psychology. Much of the current work on this topic has

an individualistic, even anti-institutional, bias (Pargament, 1999; Zinnbauer, Pargament, & Scott, in press). Spirituality, however, cannot be understood outside of a larger social context. There are, in American society, a number of community settings, unaffiliated with religious institutions, that are explicitly designed to enhance spiritual development. For example, by the 1980s, it was estimated that 400 new spiritual organizations had been formed (Hood et al., 1996). Furthermore, many Americans meet regularly with others in some form of small group that builds upon, and/or contributes to, interests in spirituality (cf., Roof, 1993; Wuthnow, 1994). Included among these groups are a variety of settings that are not connected to institutionalized religion, such as self-help groups (e.g., Alcoholics Anonymous), women's spirituality groups, and certain men's self-development organizations (e.g., Mankind Project; Mankowski, Maton, Anderson, Burke, & Hoover, in press). Clearly, a community psychology of religion, broadly and meaningfully defined, needs to encompass the varied manifestations of spirituality in American culture, both within mainstream and non-mainstream religious traditions and across a diversity of settings that may or may not be allied with institutionalized religion. Taken together, they represent important sites to examine the confluence of the search for spirituality and community in American society, and the impact of this search on individual lives and the larger community.

As noted previously, most of the work in the community psychology of religion has taken place at the organizational, or local institutional, level of analysis. It is an important priority to continue research and interventions at this level. In addition, however, a central challenge for future research and action is to focus on religion at the cultural or social institutional level of analysis, as illustrated by the work of Bellah et al. (1985). Collaborative research with other social science disciplines may facilitate research at this level of analysis. Projects can also be implemented that attempt to support and develop denominational and ecumenical policies and theologies consistent with the cultural values of respect for diversity, the dignity and strength of the individual, and social justice. At the national level, this type of work would require close collaboration with major policymaking groups (e.g., the National Council of Churches; National Association of Black Churches; American Council of Bishops), and dialogue with theologians with a national influence. Alternatively, psychologists could aide in the creation of new religious settings (e.g., social action congregations) that may, in turn, influence mainline religion and culture.

In this chapter, we have stressed the importance of recognizing and respecting the unique resources and limitations of religion and of psychology. One final challenge, and a source of ongoing questioning, for a community psychology of religion concerns the most appropriate response to differences in values and world views between psychologist and religious institution. When there is substantial overlap in both the goals and chosen interventions of community psychologist and particular religious setting, value-related questions are less likely to come to the foreground. For example, both the psychologist and the religious community may feel comfortable in working towards a greater sense of community and competence within a congregation through active participative problem-solving methods. However, in other settings, differences in values may raise major dilemmas. For instance, what happens when the religious systems defines numerical growth as the *sine qua non* of well-being, while the psychologist believes that "bigger is not necessarily better"? Or, what happens when the psychologist and religious system differ in the value they place on certain religious problem solutions, such as deference to religious authority or passive forms of prayer?

There is no straightforward solution to the problem of differences in values and world views. Certainly, the psychologist must struggle with the tension between the need to promote his or her own values, and the need to affirm diverse ways of being human. The psychologist

may then choose to work with more compatible systems, work within the system to create change, or work towards the creation of alternate settings. Regardless of the choice, value concerns should be an important topic of dialogue between psychological and religious communities as a prelude to work together. This dialogue may help prevent abuses of power, and promote greater trust and cooperation between groups.

In sum, as yet, our knowledge of religious systems is modest. What we do know highlights the important and challenging opportunities to learn about, learn from, and work with religious institutions. A community psychology perspective provides a significant framework for these basic and applied tasks. Further progress towards a community psychology of religion requires increased efforts on the part of our discipline to wrestle with the complexity, power, and diverse implications of religion in American life.

REFERENCES

Albee, G. W. (1982). Preventing psychopathology and promoting human potential. *American Psychologist, 9*, 1043–1050.

Anderson, R. W., Jr., Maton, K. I., & Ensor, B. E. (1991). Prevention theory and action from the religious perspective. *Prevention in Human Services, 10*, 9–28.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human experience: Isolation and communion in western man*. Boston: Beacon.

Barton, A. H. (1971). Selected problems in the study of religious development. In M. Strommen (Ed.), *Research on religious development* (pp. 836–855). New York: Hawthorn.

Batson, C., Schoenrade, P., & Ventis, W. (1993). *Religion and the individual: A social-psychological perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Baugh, J. R. (1988). Gaining control by giving up control: Strategies for coping with powerlessness. In W. R. Miller and J. E. Martin (Eds.), *Behavior therapy and religion: Integrating spiritual and behavioral approaches to change* (pp. 125–138). Newbury Park: Sage.

Becker, E. (1968). *The structure of evil*. New York: G. Braziller.

Beit-Hallahmi, B. (1974). Psychology of religion 1880–1930: The rise and fall of a psychological movement. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 10*, 84–90.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benson, P., & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self-esteem and locus of control. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12*, 297–310.

Benson, P. L., & Williams, D. L. (1982). *Religion on capitol hill: Myths and realities*. New York: Harper & Row.

Benson, P. L., Woods, P. K., Johnson, A. L., Eklin, C. H., and Mills, J. E. (1983). *Report on 1983 Minnesota Survey on Drug Use and Drug-Related Attitude*, Minneapolis: Search Institute.

Berger, P. L. (1967). *The sacred canopy: Elements of a sociological theory of religion*. New York: Doubleday.

Berger, P. L., & Neuhaus, R. J. (1977). To empower people: The role of mediating structures in public policy. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy.

Bergin, A. (1983). Religiosity and mental health: A critical reevaluation and meta-analysis. *Professional Psychology, 14*, 170–184.

Berton, P. (1965). *The comfortable pew*. Toronto, Canada: McClelland and Stewart.

Bickel, C., Sheers, N. J., Estadt, B. K., Powell, D., & Pargament, K. I. (1998). Perceived stress, religious coping styles, and depressive affect. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 17*, 33–42.

Boyte, H. C. (1984). *Community is possible: Repairing America's roots*. New York: Harper and Row.

Campbell, E., & Pettigrew, T. (1959). Racial and moral crisis: The role of Little Rock ministers. *American Journal of Sociology, 64*, 509–516.

Carney, F. S. (1978). Ethics: Theological ethics. In W. T. R. Reich (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Bioethics* (pp. 429–437). New York: Free Press.

Carroll, J., Dudley, C., & McKinney, W. (1986). *Handbook for congregational studies*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Carson, R. J. (1976). *Mental health centers and local clergy: A source book of sample projects*. Washington, D.C.: Community Mental Health Institute.

Cohen, E., Mowbray, C. T., Gillette, V., & Thompson, E. (1991). Preventing homelessness: Religious organizations and housing development. *Prevention in Human Services, 10,* 169–186.

Cole, B., & Pargament, K. I. (1999). Spiritual surrender: A paradoxical path to control. In W. Miller (Ed.), *Integrating spirituality in treatment: Resources for practitioners* (pp. 179–198). Washington, D.C.: APA Books.

Donahue, M. J. (1985). Intrinsic and extrinsic religiousness: Review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 400–419.

Ellis, A. (1960). There is no place for the concept of sin in psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 7,* 188–192.

Ellison, C. G. (1993). Religious involvement and self-perception among Black Americans. *Social Forces, 71,* 1027–1055.

Eng, E., & Hatch, J. W. (1991). Networking between agencies and black churches: The lay health advisor model. *Prevention in Human Services, 10,* 123–146.

Evans, B. F. (1979). Campaign for human development: Church involvement in social change. *Review of Religious Research, 20,* 264–278.

Frazier, E. F. (1964). *The Negro church in America.* New York: Schocken.

Freud, S. (1949). *The future of an illusion.* New York: Liveright.

Gallup, G., Jr., & Castelli, J. (1989). *The people's religion: American faith in the 90's.* New York: MacMillan.

Garrison, V. (1977). Doctor, espiritista or psychiatrist?: Health-seeking behavior in a Puerto Rican neighborhood of New York City. *Medical Anthropology, (Spring),* 66–191.

Glock, C. Y., Ringer, B. B., and Babbie, R. (1967). *To comfort and to challenge: A dilemma of the contemporary church.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glock, C., & Stark, R. (1966). *Christian beliefs and anti-Semitism.* New York: Harper.

Gorsuch, R. (1988). Psychology of religion. *Annual Review of Psychology, 39,* 201–221.

Gutierrez, G. (1988). *A theology of liberation.* London: SCM.

Hallie, P. (1979). *Lest innocent blood be shed.* New York: Harper and Row.

Hathaway, W. L., & Pargament, K. I. (1991). The religious dimension of coping: Implications for prevention and promotion. *Prevention in Human Services, 9,* 65–92.

Haugk, K. (1976). Unique contributions of churches and clergy to community mental health. *Community Mental Health Journal, 12,* 21–27.

Haugk, K. (1985). *Christian caregiving—a way of life.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.

Herman, S. N. (1977). *Jewish identity: A social psychological perspective, Volume 48.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Hood, R. W., Jr., Spilka, B., Hunsberger, B., & Gorsuch, R. (1996). *The psychology of religion: An empirical approach* (2nd ed.), New York: Guilford.

Horton, A. L., Wilkins, M. M., & Wright, W. (1988). Women who ended abuse: What religious leaders and religion did for these victims. In A. L. Horton and J. A. Williamson (Eds.). *Abuse and religion: When praying isn't enough* (pp. 235–246). Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Hrabowski, F. A. III, Maton, K. I., & Greif, G. (1998). *Beating the odds: Raising academically successful African American males.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Jacquet, C., Jr. (1986). *Yearbook of American and Canadian churches 1986.* Nashville: Abingdon.

Jacquet, C., Jr., & Jones, A. M. (1991). *Yearbook of American and Canadian churches 1991.* Nashville: Abingdon.

James, W. (1902). *The varieties of religious experience.* New York: Random House.

Jason, L. A. (1997). *Community building: Values for a sustainable future.* Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Jenkins, R., & Pargament, K. (1988). Cognitive appraisals in cancer patients. *Social Science and Medicine, 26,* 625–633.

Kelley, D. (1977). *Why conservative churches are growing.* New York: Harper & Row.

Kelly, J. (1986). Context and process: An ecological view of the interdependence of practice and research. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 14,* 581–599.

Kennell, J. (1985). *The role of a Nazarene church in the lives of its member: A test of three models.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH.

Kloos, B., Horneffer, K., & Moore, T. (1995). Before the beginning; Religious leaders' perceptions of the possibility for mutual beneficial collaboration with psychologists. *Journal of Community Psychology, 23,* 275–291.

Koenig, H. G. (1994). *Aging and God.* New York: Haworth.

Koenig, H. G. (1997). *Is religion good for your health*? New York: Haworth.

Koenig, H. G., Bearon, L. B., Hover, M., & Travis, J. L. (1991). Religious perspectives of doctors, nurses, patients, and families. *Journal of Pastoral Care, 45,* 254–267.

Krause, N., & Van Tran, T. (1989). Stress and religious involvement among older blacks. *Journal of Gerontology and Social Sciences, 44,* S4–S13.

Larson, D. B., Pattison, E. M., Blazer, D. G., Omran, A. R., & Kaplan, B. H. (1986). Systematic analysis of research on

religious variables in four major psychiatric journals, 1978–1982. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 143*, 329–334.

Lasch, C. (1979). *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*. New York: Norton.

Levin, J. S., & Vanderpool, H. Y. (1991). Religious factors in physical health and the prevention of illness. *Prevention in Human Services, 9*, 41–64.

Lindenthal, J. J., Myers, J. K., Pepper, M. P., & Stein, M. S. (1970). Mental status and religious behavior. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 9*, 143–149.

Mankowski, E. S., Maton, K. I., Burke, C. K., Hoover, S. A., & Anderson, C. A. (in press). Collaborative research with a men's organization: Psychological impact, group functioning, and organizational growth. In E. Barton (Ed.), *Mythopoetic perspectives in men's healing work*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Marx, G. T. (1967). *Protest and prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.

Maton, K. I. (1985). *Economic sharing among members of a religious setting: Patterns and psychological correlates*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Maton, K. I. (1987). *Towards an integrated, strengths model of the person in community research: The role of providing and receiving support to well-being*. Paper presented at the First Biennial Conference on Community Research and Action, Columbia, SC, May 20.

Maton, K. I. (1988, August). *A contributory, strengths, bidirectional perspective on congregational member well-being*. Paper presented at the 96th Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, GA.

Maton, K. I. (1989a). Community settings as buffers of life stress: Highly supportive churches, mutual help groups, and senior centers. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 17*, 203–232.

Maton, K. I. (1989b). The stress-buffering role of spiritual support: Cross-sectional and prospective investigations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 28*, 310–323.

Maton, K. I. (1993a). A bridge between cultures: Linked ethnographic empirical methodology for culture-anchored research. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*, 701–727.

Maton, K. I. (1993b). Moving beyond the individual level of analysis in mutual help group research: An ecological paradigm. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 29*, 272–286.

Maton, K. I., Hrabowski, F. A. III, & Greif, G. (1998). Preparing the way: A qualitative study of high achieving African American males and the role of the family. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 26*, 639–668.

Maton, K. I., & Pargament, K. I. (1987). The roles of religion in prevention and promotion. *Prevention in Human Services, 5*, 161–205.

Maton, K. I., & Rappaport, J. (1984). Empowerment in a religious setting: A multivariate investigation. *Prevention in Human Services, 3*, 37–72.

Maton, K. I., & Salem, D. (1995). Organizational characteristics of empowering community settings: A multiple case study approach. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 631–656.

Maton, K. I., & Seibert, M. (1991). *Third year evaluation of Project RAISE*. Unpublished evaluation report. University of Maryland Baltimore County, December.

Maton, K. I., Seibert, M., & DeHaven, G. (1991). *First year evaluation of Project RAISE II*. Unpublished evaluation report, University of Maryland Baltimore County, December.

Maton, K. I., Teti, D., Corns, K., Vieira-Baker, K., Lavine, J., Gouze, K. R., & Keating, D. (1996). Cultural specificity of social support sources, correlates and contexts: Three studies of African-American and Caucasian youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24*, 551–587.

Maton, K. I., & Wells, B. (1995). Religion as a resource for well-being: Prevention, healing, and empowerment pathways. *Journal of Social Issues, 51*, 177–193.

McGaw, D. B. (1979). Commitment and religious community: A comparison of a charismatic and a mainline congregation. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 18*, 146–163.

McIntosh, D., & Spilka, B. (1990). Religion and physical health: The role of personal faith and control beliefs. In M. L. Lynn & D. O. Moberg (Eds.), *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion. Vol. 2* (pp. 167–194). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology, 14*, 6–23.

Meylink, W. D., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1986). New perspectives for clergy–psychologist referrals. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity, 5*, 62–70.

Moore, T. (1991). The African-American church: A source of empowerment, mutual help, and social change. *Prevention in Human Services, 10*, 147–168.

Niebuhr, H. R. (1963). *The responsible self: An essay in Christian moral philosophy*. New York: Harper and Row.

Pargament, K. I. (1982). The interface among religion, religious support systems and mental health. In D. Biegel and A. Naperstak (Eds.), *Community support systems and mental health*. New York: Springer.

Pargament, K. I. (1992). Of means and ends: Religion and the search for significance. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 2*, 201–229.

Pargament, K. I. (1997). *The psychology of religion and coping: Theory, research, practice*. New York: Guilford.
Pargament, K. I. (1999). The psychology of religion *and* spirituality? Yes and no. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 9*, 3–16.
Pargament, K. I., Brannick, M., Adamakos, H., Ensing, D., Kelemen, M., Warren, R., Falgout, K., Cook, P., & Myers, J. (1987). Indiscriminate proreligiousness: Conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of the Scientific Study of Religion, 26*, 182–201.
Pargament, K., Echemendia, R., Johnson, S., Myers, J., Cook, P., Brannick, M., & McGath, C. (1987). The conservative church: Psychosocial advantages and disadvantages. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 15*, 269–286.
Pargament, K. I., Ensing, D. S., Falgout, K., Olsen, H., Reilly, B., Van Haitsma, K., & Warren, R. (1990). God help me (I): Religious coping efforts as predictors of the outcomes to significant negative life events. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 18*, 793–824.
Pargament, K. I., Falgout, K., Ensing, D. S., Reilly, B., Silverman, M., Van Haitsma, K., Olsen, H., & Warren, R. (1991). The congregation development program: Data-based consultation with churches and synagogues. *Professional Psychology, 22*, 303–404.
Pargament, K., Grevengoed, N., Kennell, J., Newman, J., Hathaway, W., & Jones, W. (1988). Religion and the problem solving process: Three styles of coping. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 27*, 90–104.
Pargament, K. I., & Hahn, J. (1986). God and the just world: Causal and coping attributions to God in health situations. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 25*, 193–207.
Pargament, K., Johnson, S., Echemendia, R., & Silverman, I. (1985). The limits of fit: Examining the implications of person-environment congruence in different religious settings. *Journal of Community Psychology, 13*, 20–30.
Pargament, K. I., Maton, K. I., & Hess, R. E. (Eds.). (1992). *Religion and prevention in mental health: Research, vision, and action*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
Pargament, K., & Myers, J. (1982). *The individual-system spiral: A foundation of value for action in community psychology*. Presented at American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.
Pargament, K., Silverman, I., Johnson, S., Echemendia, R., & Snyder, S. (1983). The psychosocial climate of religious congregations. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 11*, 351–381.
Pargament, K., Sullivan, M., Tyler, F., & Steele, R. (1982). Patterns of attribution of control and individual psychosocial competence. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 1243–1252.
Pargament, K. I., Tyler, F., & Steele, R. (1979a). The church/synagogue and the psychosocial competence of the member: An initial inquiry into a neglected dimension. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 7*, 649–664.
Pargament, K., Tyler, F., & Steele, R. (1979b). Is fit It? The relationship between church/synagogue-member fit and the psychosocial competence of the member. *Journal of Community Psychology, 7*, 243–252.
Payne, I. R., Bergin, A. E., Bielema, K. A., & Jenkins, P. H. (1991). Review of religion and mental health: Prevention and the enhancement of psychosocial functioning. *Prevention in Human Services, 9*, 11–40.
Queen, E. L. II, (1997). Seeing ourselves in others: Changing civic roles for religious organizations. *Wingspread Journal, 19*, 10–12.
Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1939). *Taboo*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Rappaport, J. (1981). In praise of paradox: A social policy of empowerment over prevention. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 9*, 1–25.
Rappaport, J. (1995). Empowerment meets narrative: Listening to stories and creative settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 795–807.
Rappaport, J., & Simkins, R. (1991). Healing and empowerment through community narrative. *Prevention in Human Services, 10*, 29–50.
Roberts, B., & Thorsheim, H. (1987). A partnership approach to consultation: The process and results of a major primary prevention field experiment. In J. G. Kelly and R. Hess (Eds.), *The ecology of prevention: Illustrating mental health consultation*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth.
Roberts, K. A. (1990). *Religion in sociological perspective*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Roberts, K. A. (1991). A sociological overview: Mental health implications of religio-cultural megatrends in the United States. *Prevention in Human Services, 9*, 113–135.
Roof, W. C. (1993). *A generation of seekers: The spiritual journey of the baby-boomer generation*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
Roozen, D., McKinney, W., & Carroll, J. (1984). *Varieties of religious presence*. New York: Pilgrim Press.
Rubin, J. Z. (1982). *Being a positively marginal Jew*. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association: Washington, D.C., August.
Sarason, S. B. (1986). And what is the public interest? *American Psychologist, 41*, 899–905.
Sarason, S. B. (1987). *Barometers of community change*. Invited address to the First Biennial Conference on Community Research and Action, Columbia, S.C., May 21.

Sarason, S. B. (1993). American psychology, and the needs for transcendence and community. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 21*, 185–202.

Schaefer, C. A., & Gorsuch, R. L. (1991). Psychological adjustment and religiousness: The multivariate belief-motivation theory of religiousness. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 30*, 448–461.

Scheie, D. M., Markham, J., Mayer, S. E., Slettom, J., & Williams, T. (1991). *Religious institutions as partners in community based program development: Findings from year one of the Lilly Endowment Program.* Minneapolis, MN: Rainbow Research.

Schorr, L. R. (1997). *Common purpose: Strengthening families and neighborhoods to rebuild America.* New York: Anchor.

Schumaker, J. F. (Ed.) (1992). *Religion and mental health.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Shafranske, E. P., & Malony, H. N. (1990). Clinical psychologists' religious and spiritual orientations and their practices of psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy, 27*, 72–78.

Shifrin, J. (1991). The religious community and mental illness: The problems—the possibilities. *Psychologists Interested in Religious Issues Newsletter, 16*, 1–15.

Siegel, J. M., & Kuykendall, D. H. (1990). Loss, widowhood, and psychological distress among the elderly. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58*, 519–524.

Speer, P. W., Hughey, J., Gensheimer, L. K., & Adams-Leavitt, W. (1995). Organizing for power: A comparative case study. *Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 57–73.

Spilka, B., & Bridges, R. A. (1991). Religious perspectives on prevention: The role of theology. *Prevention in Human Services, 9*, 93–112.

Strommen, M., Brekke, M., Underwager, R., & Johnson, A. (1972). *A study of generations.* Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg.

Troeltsch, E. (1931). *The social teachings of the Christian churches* (O. Wynn, trans.). New York: Macmillan.

Tyler, F., Pargament, K., & Gatz, M. (1983). The resource collaborator role: A model for interactions involving psychologists. *American Psychologist, 38*, 388–398.

Weaver, A. J., Samford, J., Kline, A. E., Lucas, L. A., Larson, D. B., & Koenig, H. G. (1998). What do psychologists know about working with clergy? An analysis of eight APA journals: 1991–1994. *Professional Psychology, 28*, 471–474.

Williams, D. R., Larson, D. B., Buckler, R. E., Heckman, R. C., & Pyle, C. M. (1989). *Religion and psychological distress in a community sample.* Paper presented at American Psychological Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Williams, M. D. (1974). *Community in a black Pentecostal church.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Wilson, B. R. (1959). An analysis of sect development. *American Sociological Review, 24*, 3–15.

Wimberly, E. P. (1979). *Pastoral care in the black church.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Wulff, D. M. (1997). *Psychology of religion: Classic and contemporary* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Wuthnow, R. (1994). *Sharing the journey: Support groups and America's new quest for community.* New York: Free Press.

Zinnbauer, B. J., Pargament, K. I., & Scott, A. B. (in press). The emerging meanings of religiousness and spirituality: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Personality.*