



Journal of the Association
of Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists

FALL 2001 & 2002
VOLUMES 26 & 27

EDITOR

Richard German Ellsworth, PhD
Chapman University & California State University

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Carrie Maxwell Wrigley, LCSW
LDS Family Services

Garison L. Jeppesen, LCSW
University of Utah Neuropsychiatric Institute

EDITORIAL BOARD

Victor B. Cline, PhD
University of Utah

Burton C. Kelly, PhD
Brigham Young University

Duane M. Laws, EdD
Eastern Michigan University

P. Scott Richards, PhD
Brigham Young University

Brent Scharman, PhD
LDS Family Services

Beverly L. Shaw, PhD
Los Angeles, California

Timothy B. Smith, PhD
Brigham Young University

Robert F. Stahmann, PhD
Brigham Young University

Eric G. Swedin, PhD
Weber State University

Wendy L. Ulrich, PhD
Ann Arbor, Michigan

CONSULTING EDITORS

Mark O. Bigler, PhD
Weber State University

Richard Grant Ellsworth, PhD
Brigham Young University

Ronald L. Farmer, Mdiv, PhD
Chapman University

Kathleen L. Ringenbach, PhD
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University

Chris Wallace, PhD
Arbinger Institute & Anasazi Foundation

Wendy L. Watson, PhD
Brigham Young University

TECHNICAL

Andrew Ehat
Specialist (Electronic Archive)

David Malmstrom
Design Consultant

Matt Maxwell
Graphic Designer

The AMCAP JOURNAL is published biannually by the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists and is archived at <http://www.amcap.net>. Subscription prices are \$35.00 per year for members (paid as part of Association dues). Single issues are available for \$20.00. Institutional rate is \$70.00 per year; \$40.00 per single issue. Subscriptions and changes of address should be sent to: AMCAP, 2540 East 1700 South, Salt Lake City UT 84108 or email mail@amcap.net. Periodical postage paid at Salt Lake City, Utah, and additional entries. POSTMASTER: send address changes to: AMCAP Journal, 2540 East 1700 South, Salt Lake City UT 84108.

Contributors need not be members of the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists. All manuscripts, books for review, advertising inquiries, and other editorial matter should be sent to: R.G. Ellsworth, editor, amcapjournal@byu.edu 1672 West Ave. J, Suite 207, Lancaster CA 93534. Manuscripts should be submitted in accordance with the Instructions for Contributors in this Journal.

FALL 2001

VOLUMES 26

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial, <i>Richard G. Ellsworth</i>	3
--	---

FALL 2001, VOL. 26

ARTICLES AND ESSAYS

A Comparison of Body Image Satisfaction among Latter-day Saint and Non-Latter-day Saint College-Age Students, <i>AnnMarie Carroll & Diane L. Spangler</i>	6
Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Managing Dual Relationships, <i>Marleen S. Williams</i>	19

CONVENTION ARTICLES

Cleaving: Thoughts on Building Strong Families, <i>Sister Chieko N. Okazaki</i>	27
Extending the Influence of Research and Practice, <i>Janet S. Scharman, with Gary Dixon</i>	36
How to Be Anxiously Engaged Without Being Anxious, <i>Lili De Hoyos Anderson</i>	42

LETTER TO THE EDITOR AND AUTHOR RESPONSE:

Response to Foreknowledge vs. Free Will, <i>Larry W. Lewis</i>	51
Larry Lewis' comments on Foreknowledge vs. Free Will, <i>M. Ardell Broadbent</i>	53

BOOK REVIEW

Religion, Mental Health, and the Latter-day Saints, edited by Daniel K. Judd, <i>reviewed by Eric G. Swedin</i>	57
--	----

The full searchable electronic archive of the Journal is available at this address:
<http://www.amcap.net>



ETERNAL VALUES & PERSONAL GROWTH

a self-improvement book by eminent
Latter-day Saint psychologist
Allen E. Bergin, Ph.D.
and eight
other leading
contributors

An LDS approach to guide you
on your journey to spiritual,
emotional, and social wellness

BYU
STUDIES

274 pages • \$29.95 • 8.5" x 11"
to order: byustudies.byu.edu

EDITORIAL

RICHARD GERMAN ELLSWORTH, PhD

California State University & Editor, AMCAP Journal

This combined issue contains both volume 26 (2001) and volume 27 (2002) of the *AMCAP Journal*. It has been a privilege to work with these thoughtful and accomplished authors in preparing this combined issue. In addition, I am grateful to several prominent LDS scholars who have graciously shared their professional knowledge as anonymous reviewers.

I would also like to thank my dedicated wife and friend, Carol Emily Ellsworth, M.A., for her support, doctrinal knowledge and expert editing skills, without which the task of editing this journal would certainly be much more difficult – and the issue you are now reading would not have appeared for many months, if at all.

And, of course, the encouraging and supportive assistance of the AMCAP Governing Board and journal Editorial Board is sincerely appreciated, especially the extraordinary service of Associate Editor Carrie Maxwell Wrigley, LCSW. Very appropriately, she was honored with the *Distinguished Service to AMCAP* award at the October 2002 Convention. She will continue as Associate Editor now that her term on the Governing Board has been completed.

We are pleased to announce the appointment of Garison L. Jeppeson, LCSW, as an additional Associate Editor. He is a member of the University of Utah clinical faculty in the Graduate School of Social Work and is the director of an adolescent substance abuse treatment program in the Medical School's Neuropsychiatric Institute. In addition, he currently serves as a member of the AMCAP Leadership Council. His professional knowledge and editorial expertise are a welcome addition to the journal staff.

We are also pleased to note the upcoming publication of the monograph *Turning Freud Upside Down*, a compilation of selected AMCAP presentations edited by Dr. Aaron Jackson, the journal's previous editor, and Dr. Lane Fischer, AMCAP's president 1998-2000. This monograph, published by BYU Press, represents volume 24 of the *AMCAP Journal*.

ERRATA

In volume 25 of the *AMCAP Journal*, two references were inadvertently left off the end of Dr. Eric Swedin's article, "Psychotherapy in the LDS Community" (Swedin, 2000). These references, which should have appeared on p. 39, are:

Van de Kemp, H. (1986). Dangers of psychologism: The place of God in psychology. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 14:2, 97-109.

Wilkinson, E. (ed.) (1976). *Brigham Young University: The first hundred years*, vol. 4. Provo: Brigham Young University.

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

We reiterate the call for professionals interested in reviewing relevant books and media (see the *Guidelines for Book and Media Reviewers*, in this issue, p. 123) and solicit suggestions for reviews.

Regarding manuscripts submitted to the journal: because of various address changes, there may have been manuscripts submitted which were not forwarded. Authors of previously submitted manuscripts

should contact the editor if their submissions have not been acknowledged. Note that a more permanent address for the journal has now been established:

<amcapjournal@byu.edu>

All submissions and correspondence regarding the journal should be directed to this address and submitted following the guidelines found in the *Instructions for Contributors* in this issue (p. 124). The *AMCAP Journal* solicits manuscripts from diverse disciplines using diverse methodologies, including qualitative techniques as well as quantitative techniques. These recent comments from an anonymous peer review of a manuscript clearly describe the kind of article we seek:

... bridging the gap between clinical issues and religious doctrine ... clinically sound [and] very useful to clinicians counseling LDS couples ... addresses clinical concerns using LDS language that couples can hear and accept; this seems to [exemplify] the core of culturally sensitive therapy ... blending professional and LDS issues ... the very kind of article that will be useful to AMCAP members...

We are especially interested in discussions integrating a spiritual focus within clinical treatment; specifically, articles that contribute to the scientific literature in the field of spiritually related counseling, via research or clinical report – and, especially, articles which uplift and spiritually encourage therapists or patients. Note that appropriate articles may be theoretical, methodological, or substantive; may report basic or applied research following an established theoretical foundation or be based on new ideas; and/or may reinterpret previously reported research, be position papers, or report specific clinical cases or techniques.

CONTENTS

The journal will continue to include highlights from the AMCAP conventions. In this double-volume issue, it is especially satisfying to present two historically significant “call to arms” addresses by Dr. Jan Scharman (April 1999) and Carrie Maxwell Wrigley, LCSW (March 2001). These remarkable addresses inspired a renewed dedication to the AMCAP mission and its focus on “the Living Christ” and on “serving our brothers and sisters in need”

(see p. 128). Now they can inspire an even wider audience.

Similarly, Dr. Doug Brinley’s suggestions for integrating spiritual truths within counseling and Dr. Marleen Williams’ discussion of dealing with dual relationships are especially relevant, as presented from an LDS perspective. One of the more popular convention presentations has been Dr. Lili De Hoyos Anderson’s delightful discussion of *Telestial*, *Terrestrial*, and *Celestial* anxiety – with meaningful application to clients and therapists alike. Dr. Eric Swedin’s review of Daniel K. Judd’s LDS therapy book rounds out the discussion.

The journal is also pleased to present relevant clinical research by AnneMarie Carroll & Dr. Diane Spangler, and by Dr. Travis Adams & Dr. Robert Stahmann. Comments about this research from the Editorial Board are: “These are very significant articles; we are pleased that AMCAP has been entrusted with them, and hope they will have the impact intended by their insightful authors.”

Questions regarding agency and free will are presented in the insightful dialogue between Larry Lewis and Ardell Broadbent, following up on Sister Broadbent’s earlier article published in Volume 25 of the *AMCAP Journal*. On a related topic, Dr. John Rector and Dr. Eric Swedin ably address the ageless question of the necessity of sin, so clearly articulated by Mother Eve:

Were it not for our transgression we never should have had seed, and never should have known good and evil, and the joy of our redemption, and the eternal life which God giveth unto all the obedient. (Moses 5:11)

More on these interesting topics is planned for the next issue (Volume 28).

Over the years AMCAP has been honored to have LDS church leaders address our conventions, and to have the *AMCAP Journal* publish their addresses. Notably, this issue includes addresses by three LDS leaders who exemplify the integration of spiritual commitment and professional academic accomplishment: Sister Chieko N. Okasaki, Elder L. Lionel Kendrick, and Elder James O. Mason. AMCAP conference attendees praised these inspiring addresses as “a balanced approach to integrating faith and professional service” and as “spiritual and practical perspectives on using gospel principles to deal with emotional problems.” We are pleased to present these three very relevant addresses to the AMCAP membership.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

At the Fall 2000 Convention, AMCAP presented the *Distinguished Service to Humanity Award* to Sister Patricia P. Holland and Elder Jeffrey R. Holland. While listening to their humble response to that presentation I was reminded of a delightful story Elder Holland told many years ago, shortly after he succeeded Dr. Dallin H. Oaks as president of BYU. He talked about having helped a student whose car had broken down in front of the President's on-campus residence. The student was quite impressed with President Holland's help in getting the car started and mentioned having admired him for many years. The student also said he was grateful for such an inspiring good example. Then he said something like "and I'll never forget how you helped me

tonight, President Oaks!" President Holland sheepishly said it must have been really dark that evening, but that this had inspired him to strive to live up to President Oaks' good example.

Similarly, I have been inspired to live up to the good examples of those who have served before, especially when being misidentified as one of them. Indeed, I am especially honored to be mistaken for my father, Dr. Richard Grant Ellsworth. He was a BYU professor for over three decades (and at one time was academic advisor to a young student named Jeffrey Holland), and co-authored a classic book integrating spirituality and psychotherapy (Ellsworth & Ellsworth, 1980). His extensive doctrinal and editorial experience now benefits the *AMCAP Journal*, and me, tremendously. I am especially grateful that he shares so much love along with his experience.

REFERENCES

- Broadbent, M. A. (2000). Factor analysis of theological constructs related to fatalism and free will. *AMCAP Journal*, 25, 17-26.
- Ellsworth, S. & Ellsworth, R. (1980). *Getting to know the real you*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book.
- Fischer, L. & Jackson, A. (2003). Turning Freud upside down (*AMCAP Journal*, volume 24). Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press.
- Swedin, E. (2000). Psychotherapy in the LDS community. *AMCAP Journal*, 25, 27-39.

A Comparison of Body Image Satisfaction among Latter-day Saint and Non-Latter-day Saint College-Age Students

ANNMARIE CARROLL, B.S.

Brigham Young University

and

DIANE L. SPANGLER, PH.D.

Brigham Young University

Several sociocultural factors have been shown to impact body image. The purpose of the present study was to determine whether the sociocultural variable of religion, specifically represented by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saint (LDS) religion, affects body image in college-age students. Questionnaires assessing body image and beliefs about appearance were administered to male and female LDS and non-LDS students at Brigham Young University, University of Utah, Boston University, and California State University at Fullerton. Results indicated that male students, regardless of religion, were more satisfied with their bodies than their female counterparts. Within-gender comparisons indicated that LDS men had higher body satisfaction on all subscales than non-LDS men. In contrast, LDS women did not significantly differ from non-LDS women in mean level of body satisfaction. However, among LDS women, those in Utah differed from those in other states in appearance evaluation, overweight preoccupation, and beliefs about appearance. Regression analyses revealed that beliefs about appearance were a strong predictor of body image for both men and women, but that religion predicted body image only among men. Possible explanations and implications of these results are discussed.

Body image has been defined as the perception and evaluation of one's own bodily appearance as either positive or negative. Some theorists have hypothesized that for some individuals a large portion of their self-concept is based upon body image, and have thus suggested that body image plays an important role in many aspects of these individuals' everyday lives (e.g., Geller, Johnston & Madsen, 1997; Rodin, 1993; Spangler 2002; Vitousek & Hollon, 1990). Hesse-Biber, Clayton-Matthews & Downey (1987) found that poor body image was associated with low levels of self-perceived physical attractiveness,

self-acceptance, social self-confidence, popularity with the opposite sex, assertiveness, and athletic ability. Additionally, other investigators report that those who

AnnMarie Carroll, B.S., is a recent graduate of Brigham Young University. Diane L. Spangler, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor of Psychology in the Department of Psychology at Brigham Young University. Portions of this work were supported by a grant from the Office of Research and Creative Activities, Brigham Young University. Address for correspondence: Diane Spangler PhD, Dept. of Psychology, BYU, 293 Taylor Building, Provo, UT 84602 email <diane_spangler@byu.edu> (801) 422-6475

have higher levels of satisfaction with their appearance had more social activities, greater satisfaction at home, and were more likely to believe that people value each other (Rauste-von Wright, 1989).

Body image, particularly body image dissatisfaction, has also been consistently linked with eating dysfunction. Indeed, several theorists posit that dissatisfaction with body shape and weight are prominent factors in the etiology of eating disorders (e.g., Bruch, 1962; Cash & Deagle, 1997; Monteath & McCabe, 1997; Spangler, 1999; Stice, Shaw & Nemeroff, 1998), and a number of studies have documented poor body image as a prominent risk factor for disordered eating (see Cash & Deagle, 1997, for review). Moreover, studies of the obese by McCarroll-Bittel (1993) found that poor body image hindered weight loss, while improvement of body image played a significant role in helping obese people lose weight. From these studies, it appears that a key to maintaining healthy body weight and eating patterns is to first develop a positive body image.

Research during the last two decades has documented a rise in concern about body image and in weight preoccupation to a level that some term an obsession (Rodin, 1993). Girls as young as eight years old report dissatisfaction with their weight and shape, and 50% of nine-year-olds as well as 80% of ten-year-olds have dieted in an effort to change their physical appearance (Council On Size & Weight Discrimination, 1996). A study of girls ages 13 to 16 found that only 23% had never dieted, 40% were classified as "dieters," and 16% were "often" or "always" dieting (Strong & Huon, 1998). Of adult women in the United States, 48% report a negative body image, 63% were dissatisfied with their current weight, and 49% report being preoccupied with their body weight (Cash & Henry, 1995). Surveys document that body image dissatisfaction is also frequent in men, although less prevalent than in women. In a study conducted in 1986, 34% of men reported a negative body image, 41% were dissatisfied with their current weight, and 44% were preoccupied with concerns about their body weight (Cash, Winstead & Janda, 1986). By contrast, in 1972 only 17% of men were dissatisfied with their appearance (Cloud, 2000). This increase in body dissatisfaction and weight preoccupation parallels a rise in eating disorders (see Stice, 1994, for review), as would be expected because body image dissatisfaction constitutes a risk factor for eating disorders. As body image dissatisfaction is a major predictor of dieting

behavior and eating disorders, it is crucial to understand the factors related to body image dissatisfaction.

FACTORS RELATED TO BODY IMAGE

Culture

Levels of body-image dissatisfaction have been shown to vary as a function of culture and subculture. Within the United States, body image dissatisfaction is highest among Caucasian-American women, whereas African-American and Hispanic women consistently score higher in positive body image than Caucasian Americans (Gray, 1977). Similarly, body image dissatisfaction and eating pathology have been shown to be significantly higher in the United States as compared to several other countries, particularly non-Western countries. Additionally, in persons immigrating to the United States, positive correlations between degree of Westernization and body dissatisfaction and eating pathology have been found (see Stice, 1994, for review). Becker (1995) has explained such findings as demonstrating that cultural-specific aesthetic and moral ideals regarding the body are developed by cultures and that cultures vary in their values and expectations for body shape and weight. Additionally, within-culture variation can occur where the culture assigns different standards and values to the body for particular subgroups within that culture (e.g., ethnic minorities or women).

Media effects

One factor strongly linked to body image dissatisfaction, which may also mediate cultural differences in body dissatisfaction, is the degree of exposure to thin-ideal media. At present, the Western female body ideal is considered ectomorphic or thin. This has changed from a past body norm for women that was more voluptuous. The media in Western cultures have portrayed a steadily thinning ideal of the female body (e.g., Garner, Garfinkel, Schwartz & Thompson, 1980; Stice, 1994). An example of the media's portrayal of an increasingly thinner ideal body size is evident in beauty pageants. In the 1960's, the average Miss America contestant weighed 93% of her expected weight for her respective age and height category. In contrast, in 1988, 60% of the contestants weighed only 85% of their expected weight. Several additional studies report a significant decrease in the average body mass index of women models and actresses over the last two decades (Levine & Smolak, 1996;

Silverstein, Perdue, Peterson & Kelly, 1986; Wiseman, Gray, Mosimann & Ahrens, 1992). Beginning in 1980, the average female model was consistently at least 85% or below of her expected body weight (Wiseman et al., 1992). A body weight this low (85% or less of expected body weight) constitutes one DSM-IV criterion for anorexia nervosa (American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Thus for the first time in history, the weight norm for women as presented by the media fell within a clinically-significant, dysfunctionally low range.

Exposure to such thin-ideal media has been consistently shown to increase body image dissatisfaction, increase weight concerns, and increase dieting among women (Irving, 1990; Levine & Smolak, 1996; Posavac, Posavac & Posavac, 1998; Stice & Shaw, 1994; Stice, Spangler & Agras, 2001). In addition, Turner, Hamilton, Jacobs, Angood, & Dwyer (1997) found that women who viewed fashion magazines endorsed a lower ideal body weight than those who viewed news magazines. Those persons who viewed fashion magazines as compared to those who viewed news magazines were more likely to be frustrated with their bodies after viewing the magazines for only 13 minutes. Posavac et al. (1998) suggest that the effect of thin-ideal media exposure on women's weight concerns results from a social comparison with standards set by the media. According to Posavac et al. (1988), as women are repeatedly exposed to increasingly thinner female images in the media – many of which have been altered by computer – they believe they ought to look as these images do and become increasingly dissatisfied with their own bodies as they compare themselves to an unattainable ideal. Thus, pressure to comply with the thin-ideal “norm” set by the media causes many women to develop body dissatisfaction and consequently resort to unhealthy eating behaviors.

Age

Body satisfaction tends to vary as a function of age and developmental stage. Teenagers are significantly less satisfied with their bodies than pre-adolescents (Brodie, Bagley & Slade, 1994). Furthermore, Gray (1977) found that adult (non-adolescent) individuals tend to have more positive affect about their bodies than adolescent individuals. Research specifically related to college populations has shown that body dissatisfaction and body image concern is higher among this

group than in older adults (Gray, 1977). Furthermore, college-age female students have been shown to have higher rates of eating disorders than the general female population (Schlundt & Johnson, 1990). Some have suggested that this may be due to pressures young adults feel to establish themselves materially and socially during these years, making them more self-conscious about how they appear.

Gender

Confirming within-culture variability in body expectations discussed above, gender appears to significantly contribute to body image, where men consistently report greater satisfaction with their bodies than women. Muth & Cash (1997) found that women have more negative body image evaluations and have a stronger investment in how they look. At all age levels, men were on average more satisfied with their bodies (Rauste-von Wright, 1989). Eighty-four percent of women surveyed about their dieting behavior expressed a desire to lose weight compared to only 45% of men (Hesse-Biber et al., 1987). Women typically want to weigh 3.25 kg less while men want to weigh on average 0.75 kg more (Dolan, Birtchnell & Lacey, 1987). When compared with men, physical appearance seems to have a greater influence on self-esteem for women (Hesse-Biber et al., 1987; Rodin, Silberstein & Striegel-Moore, 1984). Women are more distressed by a weight gain of a few pounds than men are, tend to weigh themselves more often, and are more likely to seek medical help to lose weight (Hesse-Biber et al. 1987).

There are several possible reasons for the existence of a gap in body image satisfaction between men and women. One explanation is that the media plays a role in influencing stereotypes of men and women. A content analysis of magazines showed that women's magazines contained 10.5 times as many body weight related articles as men's magazines (Anderson & DiDomenico, 1992). These media messages and models emphasizing thinness for women demonstrate the different weight and body expectations that society has established for men and women.

Evolutionary theorists also hypothesize that gender differences in body image satisfaction occur because women tend to base their ability to attract a mate on their physical appearance. According to this theory, the more a woman believes she can use her body to attract

others, the more she will be satisfied with her body (Koff, Rierdan & Stubbs, 1990). In contrast, men's social status is hypothesized to be determined predominantly by income and occupation. In summarizing 30 years of research, Powers (1971) found that in the United States women typically seek mates with good earning potential, while men seek mates who are physically attractive. According to evolutionary psychology, this is due largely to the different role that each parent plays in raising a child. Fathers typically invest more indirect resources such as food and money, whereas mothers tend to invest more direct physical and psychological resources (Eagly & Wood, 1999). As a result, to ensure their survival and their reproductive success, the two sexes developed different criteria for mate selection and mate attraction.

Religion

While there exists a great amount of research on some sociocultural factors that influence body image, little to no research has been conducted on the effects of religion on body image. Given that research has demonstrated that other sociocultural factors have a large impact on body image, it is also possible that religion affects body image. For example, religious subcultures may develop their own norms and values about the body that could counteract or moderate the effects of mainstream cultural values or norms about the body. Various religions have viewed the body as ranging from "carnal and devilish" to "holy" and a "temple of God." Religion often prescribes body rituals of what to wear and how to look. Many religions also have rules about how and what to eat. Thus there are several avenues by which religion could impact body image, weight preoccupation, and eating patterns.

Research on body image within the Latter-day Saint (LDS) community is particularly sparse. LDS doctrine teaches that bodies are a gift from God, that gaining a body is one of the primary objectives of mortal life, and that the Lord "looketh not on the outward appearance" but "looketh on the heart" (1 Samuel 16:7). However, it is unknown whether these religious tenets affect actual body image of LDS church members. Due to these prescribed beliefs, one might expect to find higher body satisfaction and a more positive body image among LDS persons.

However, other LDS subculture factors may negate this proposed positive effect or even lead to higher body

dissatisfaction among LDS persons. LDS members are simultaneously commanded, "be ye therefore perfect" (Matthew 5:48) and to be self-disciplined. The directive for perfection and self-discipline may be misapplied and lead LDS persons to be overly critical of themselves, including their bodies. Thus, the pressure to be perfect may cause LDS persons to be more critical of their bodies than non-LDS persons.

There is also a phenomenon somewhat unique to the LDS culture, and especially at Brigham Young University, where a great deal of pressure is put on LDS young adults to get married. At the 1963 commencement address, university president Ernest L. Wilkinson presented a quote attributed to Brigham Young: "any unmarried man over the age of 25 is a menace to society." Another president of the LDS church, Harold B. Lee, has said, "No man who is of marriageable age is living his religion who remains single" (Lee, 1973, p. 99; quoting President Joseph F. Smith, 1919, p. 272). In some preliminary interviewing of BYU students, it was found that many young women feel this pressure to get married causes them to almost abuse their bodies in order to fit the ideal body shape. Consistent with evolutionary theory (noted above), they believe that to attract a mate, they must look a certain way – which is usually perceived as conforming to the media-portrayed thin-ideal. A study in the general population conducted by Berschied & Walster (1972) supports this perception. They found "an unexpectedly high correlation between physical attractiveness and a woman's social experience." In blind-date tests they conducted, the more physically attractive the date, the more he/she was liked, irrespective of other characteristics such as a higher intelligence level or an exceptional personality (Berschied & Walster, 1972). Additionally, in a meta-analysis of studies examining the relationship between women's physical attractiveness and social success, Feingold (1992) reported that attractive women were perceived as more sociable, dominant, mentally healthy, intelligent, and socially skilled than their less attractive counterparts. Thus, if it is the case that women in the marriage-imperative LDS subculture believe that marriage is dependent upon appearance, then their concern for appearance may be particularly heightened.

The objective of the current study was to determine whether the sociocultural factor of religion had any impact on level of body image satisfaction, and specifically to

compare LDS and non-LDS students on levels of body satisfaction. Additionally, LDS students in Utah were compared to LDS students outside of Utah to determine whether there was any difference in body image within the more LDS-dominate subculture of Utah. Based on past research findings, it was expected that female students – regardless of religion – would have a more negative body image and greater body dissatisfaction than male students. It was also hypothesized that LDS female students would be more critical of their bodies than non-LDS women due to the real and perceived pressures to attract a mate.

METHOD

Participants

Participants consisted of 307 LDS and 190 non-LDS students selected from Brigham Young University, the University of Utah, California State University Fullerton, and Boston University. Both LDS and non-LDS students at each university were sampled. Students were taken from different parts of the country and different universities in order to compare LDS students' perceptions of body image to non-LDS students, and to compare students in Utah to those outside of Utah. Of the participants, 268 were women and 229 were men. Sixty-four percent fell between the ages of 18-21, 27% between the ages of 22-25, 7% between the ages of 26-29, and 2% fell in the category of 30 and older. Ninety-three percent of the participants were single, and 7% were married.

Procedures

After permission was obtained from instructors, participants in courses that fulfilled General Education requirements received a packet of questionnaires to complete on a voluntary basis. They either completed and returned the packet at the end of the class period or took the packet home and returned it the following class period, depending upon the instructor's wishes. General Education classes were chosen to avoid any bias that could arise from sampling participants that were largely from one particular field of study.

Measures

The Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire (MBSRQ) (Brown, Cash & Mikulka, 1990) is a 69-item standardized, attitudinal assessment of body image composed of 10 subscales. Respondents rate their level

of (dis)agreement with statements on a 1 (*definitely disagree*) to 5 (*definitely agree*) scale. Four MBSRQ subscales (described below) were used in the current study. The numeric responses for each scale were averaged so that the possible scores for each scale ranged from 1 to 5. Factor analytic studies have confirmed the factor structure and construct validity of the MBSRQ, and several additional studies have shown the MBSRQ to possess convergent and divergent validity as well as internal consistency and test-retest reliability (see Cash, 1994, for a review of the psychometric properties of the MBSRQ). The four subscales used in this study were:

1. The *Appearance Evaluation scale* (APPEVF) consists of seven items that determine satisfaction with one's looks. Higher scores indicate a more positive feeling about appearance, whereas lower scores indicate greater unhappiness with physical appearance. The internal consistency (Cronbach's *alpha*) of the Appearance Evaluation scale was .88 and the 1-month test-retest reliability was .86 (Cash, 1994).
2. The *Appearance Orientation scale* (APPORF) includes 12 items that measure the extent of investment in one's appearance (e.g., time spent in grooming behaviors). Higher scores on this scale indicate greater time and effort devoted to grooming and greater investment in appearance. Lower scoring subjects are less concerned about and less invested in their physical appearance. The internal consistency of the Appearance Orientation scale was .86 and the 1-month test-retest reliability was .89 (Cash, 1994).
3. The *Overweight Preoccupation scale* (OWPR) assesses level of fat anxiety, weight vigilance, dieting, and eating restraint. A higher score in this area indicates a greater level of preoccupation and concern about becoming overweight. The internal consistency of the Overweight Preoccupation scale was .74 and the 1-month test-retest reliability was .84 (Cash, 1994).
4. The *Body Areas Satisfaction scale* (SATIS) measures degree of (dis)satisfaction with specific areas of the body (face, hair, torso, muscle tone, height, and weight). Individuals rate their satisfaction with each body part on a 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied) point scale. The internal consistency for the Body

Areas Satisfaction scale was .75 and the 1-month test-retest reliability was .80 (Cash, 1994).

In addition, a fifth scale was also used:

5. *Beliefs About Appearance Scale* (BAAS). The BAAS (Spangler, 1997) is a 20-item, self-report scale that assesses the degree of endorsement of beliefs about the consequences of appearance for relationships, achievement, self-view, and feelings. Higher scores indicate greater endorsement of beliefs that positive feelings, self-worth, and interpersonal and work success are dependent upon appearance. Degree of agreement with statements about appearance in each of these domains is rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*extremely*). This scale possesses acceptable internal consistency (coefficient alpha = .95), test-retest reliability [$r(9\text{-month}) = .74$], as well as convergent, discriminant, and predictive validity (Spangler, 2002; Spangler & Stice, 2001).

Data Analyses

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the means on the subscales of the MBSRQ and the BAAS between four groups consisting of: male LDS, male non-LDS, female LDS, and female non-LDS. Several planned (*a priori*) contrasts were made between: (a) men and women; (b) LDS men and LDS women; (c) non-LDS men and non-LDS women; (d) LDS and non-LDS men, (e) LDS and non-LDS women. An additional independent *t*-test was conducted between LDS students in Utah versus LDS students in other states. Finally, a regression analysis was performed to determine whether religion or other demographic variables predicted body image satisfaction and appearance orientation. The order of entry of variables in the regression equations was: age, LDS status, state (living in or outside of Utah), and beliefs about appearance (BAAS).

RESULTS

ANOVA

The overall ANOVA was significant for all subscales of the MBSRQ and for the BAAS, indicating the existence of group differences on all measures. Table 1 displays the overall ANOVA *F*-values and their respective *p* values. Results from the planned contrasts are presented below.

Table 1
ANOVA Analysis

Scale	F	df(b, w)	p
APPEVF	13.66	(3, 489)	.000
APPORF	2.74	(3, 493)	.043
SATIS	15.56	(3, 465)	.000
OWPR	40.20	(3, 463)	.000
BAAS	3.52	(3, 486)	.015

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

Between-Gender Contrasts

Men versus Women. The planned contrast comparing men and women (regardless of religion) revealed significant mean differences on every scale (see Table 2). Specifically, men had more positive feelings about their physical appearance and were significantly more satisfied with their bodies than women. In addition, men had lower levels of appearance investment and weight preoccupation, and were less likely to believe that their success, happiness and self-worth were dependent upon their appearance than were women.

LDS Men versus LDS Women. Furthermore, when comparisons were made between LDS men and LDS women the differences became even more pronounced in beliefs about appearance. LDS men had more positive feelings about their physical appearance, and higher body satisfaction than LDS women. LDS men also had significantly lower levels of weight preoccupation and markedly lower levels of beliefs that their success, happiness, and self-worth were dependent upon their appearance than LDS women, but did not differ from LDS women in the amount of time and effort devoted to appearance.

Non-LDS Men versus Non-LDS Women. In contrast, comparisons of non-LDS men with non-LDS women revealed that non-LDS men and non-LDS women did not differ in their level of beliefs that their appearance was central to their success, happiness and self-worth, nor did these non-LDS groups differ in their levels of

body satisfaction. However, non-LDS men were less preoccupied with their weight and invested less time and effort into their appearance than non-LDS women.

Within-Gender Contrasts

LDS Men versus non-LDS Men. Significant differences were found between LDS and non-LDS men on all the

subscales of the MBSRQ and on the BAAS. Specifically, LDS men were significantly higher than non-LDS men in positive feelings about their physical appearance, were significantly more satisfied with their bodies, and invested more time and effort into their appearance. LDS men were also significantly less preoccupied with their weight than non-LDS men. Scores on the BAAS indicated that

Table 2
ANOVA Planned Contrasts, between gender

Scale		mean (sd)	t	p
Men (n = 229) vs. Women (n = 268)				
APPEVF	Men Women	3.16 (.40) 2.99 (.40)	4.54	.000
APPORF	Men Women	3.09 (.39) 3.18 (.36)	-2.42	.016
SATIS	Men Women	3.60 (.60) 3.30 (.68)	4.87	.000
OWPR	Men Women	1.88 (.72) 2.70 (.95)	-9.93	.000
BAAS	Men Women	22.71 (13.55) 25.07 (16.24)	-1.67	.096
LDS Men (n = 155) vs. LDS Women (n = 152)				
APPEVF	Men Women	3.25 (.44) 3.00 (.42)	-5.37	.000
APPORF	Men Women	3.15 (.39) 3.19 (.37)	-.92	.358
SATIS	Men Women	3.76 (.56) 3.31 (.67)	5.95	.000
OWPR	Men Women	1.77 (.70) 2.72 (.95)	-9.45	.000
BAAS	Men Women	20.62 (12.69) 25.98 (16.51)	-3.13	.002
Non-LDS Men (n=74) vs. Non-LDS Women (n=116)				
APPEVF	Men Women	3.07 (.37) 2.97 (.38)	1.62	.107
APPORF	Men Women	3.04 (.39) 3.17 (.35)	-2.35	.019
SATIS	Men Women	3.44 (.64) 3.29 (.69)	1.52	.129
OWPR	Men Women	2.01 (.74) 2.68 (.96)	-5.21	.000
BAAS	Men Women	24.79 (14.40) 24.15 (15.97)	.28	.776

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

Table 3
ANOVA Planned Contrasts, within gender

Scale		mean (sd)	t	p
Men				
APPEVF (n=155)	LDS Non-LDS	3.25 (.44) 3.07 (.37)	3.11	.002
APPORF	LDS Non-LDS	3.15 (.39) 3.04 (.39)	2.03	.043
SATIS	LDS Non-LDS	3.76 (.56) 3.44 (.64)	3.46	.001
OWPR	LDS Non-LDS	1.77 (.70) 2.01 (.74)	-1.97	.049
BAAS	LDS Non-LDS	20.62 (12.69) 24.79 (14.40)	-1.96	.050
Women				
APPEVF (n=152)	LDS Non-LDS	3.00 (.42) 2.97 (.38)	.55	.580
APPORF	LDS Non-LDS	3.19 (.37) 3.17 (.35)	.34	.731
SATIS	LDS Non-LDS	3.31 (.67) 3.29 (.69)	.21	.836
OWPR	LDS Non-LDS	2.72 (.95) 2.68 (.96)	.37	.712
BAAS	LDS Non-LDS	25.98 (16.51) 24.15 (15.97)	.98	.326

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

LDS men were significantly less likely than non-LDS men to believe that their success in either relationships or work was dependent upon their physical appearance or that positive feelings and self-esteem were dependent upon their physical appearance. Table 3 lists the means and standard deviations in these subgroups.

LDS Women versus non-LDS Women. In contrast to the men, no statistical differences were found on any of the MBSRQ subscales or on the BAAS between LDS and non-LDS women. Table 3 lists the means and standard deviations in these subgroups.

Mean comparisons of LDS students in Utah versus outside Utah

LDS Men in Utah versus LDS Men outside of Utah. Comparisons of LDS men in Utah with LDS men in the other states revealed little difference. LDS men in Utah scored marginally higher on the Appearance Evaluation scale than men in other states. No statistically significant differences were found on any of the other subscales. Table 4 lists the means and standard deviations in these subgroups.

LDS Women in Utah versus LDS Women outside of Utah. Analyses comparing LDS women in Utah to LDS women in other states revealed several differences. LDS women in Utah invested significantly more time and effort into their appearance than LDS women in other states, and reported a greater level of preoccupation with weight. Scores on the BAAS indicated that LDS women in Utah were significantly more likely than LDS women from other states to believe that their success in relationships and work is dependent upon their appearance and that the occurrence of positive feelings and self-esteem are dependent upon their appearance. Table 4 lists the means and standard deviations in these subgroups.

Regression Analyses

Male. Four separate regression analyses were conducted for each of the four MBSRQ subscales used as dependent variables. Predictors were age, LDS status, state (i.e., in or outside of Utah) and BAAS scores, respectively. As shown in Table 5, the overall models (F values) were significant for all four regressions. For men, LDS status and beliefs about appearance (i.e., the BAAS) were significant predictors of appearance orientation, body satisfaction and weight preoccupation. Specifically, being LDS was associated with greater

feelings of body satisfaction and positive feelings about one's appearance, greater investment in appearance, and lower weight preoccupation. Having lower levels of dysfunctional beliefs about appearance (as measured by the BAAS) was associated with higher body satisfaction, and lower investment in appearance and lower weight preoccupation. No other variable consistently predicted

Table 4

Scale means of LDS students in Utah versus outside of Utah, by gender

Scale	m (SD)	t	df	p
Men				
APPEVF (n=99) Utah (n=56) Non-Utah	3.31 (.47) 3.17 (.35)	1.975	152	.051
APPORF Utah Non-Utah	3.14 (.39) 3.13 (.33)	.300	152	.765
SATIS Utah Non-Utah	3.78 (.56) 3.75 (.54)	.224	137	.823
OWPR Utah Non-Utah	1.72 (.61) 1.79 (.77)	-.569	137	.570
BAAS Utah Non-Utah	20.66 (12.54) 20.42 (13.13)	.111	152	.912
Women				
APPEVF (n=94) Utah (n=58) Non-Utah	3.00 (.46) 2.99 (.37)	.106	148	.915
APPORF Utah Non-Utah	3.26 (.40) 3.09 (.32)	2.710	150	.008
SATIS Utah Non-Utah	3.29 (.64) 3.33 (.71)	-.339	143	.735
OWPR Utah Non-Utah	2.87 (.97) 2.53 (.89)	2.152	142	.033
BAAS Utah Non-Utah	28.47 (17.37) 22.02 (13.71)	2.347	148	.020

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

MBSRQ subscales in men.

Female. For women, the only variable that predicted body image satisfaction and related variables was beliefs about appearance (see Table 5). Having lower levels of beliefs that success, happiness and self-worth are dependent on appearance was associated with higher body image satisfaction and more positive feelings about

one's appearance, as well as lower levels of investment in grooming and lower weight preoccupation.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with previous research, women in the present study regardless of religion had a more negative

Table 5
Regression Analyses

Model	Predictor	Beta (std error)	t	p
Men (n=229)				
APPEVF F(4,216)=3.90, p<.004 R ² = .13	AGE	-.08 (.04)	-1.18	.24
	LDS	-.15 (.06)	-2.06	.04
	STATE	-.10 (.06)	-1.44	.15
	BAAS	-.11 (.00)	-1.65	.10
APPORF F(4,217)=6.18, p<.000 R ² = .11	AGE	-.09 (.04)	-1.42	.16
	LDS	-.17 (.06)	-2.42	.01
	STATE	.00 (.05)	0.03	.98
	BAAS	.29 (.00)	4.47	.00
SATIS F(4,202)=10.65, p<.000 R ² = .18	AGE	-.14 (.06)	-2.19	.03
	LDS	-.22 (.09)	-3.10	.00
	STATE	-.04 (.08)	-0.62	.54
	BAAS	-.29 (.00)	-4.49	.00
OWPREOC F(4,202)=4.94, p<.001 R ² = .09	AGE	.10 (.07)	1.48	.14
	LDS	.16 (.11)	2.26	.03
	STATE	.01 (.10)	0.17	.87
	BAAS	.21 (.00)	3.05	.00
Women (n=268)				
APPEVF F(4,255)=7.92, p<.000 R ² = .12	AGE	-.19 (.03)	-0.31	.75
	LDS	-.03 (.05)	-0.45	.63
	STATE	-.03 (.05)	-0.52	.60
	BAAS	-.33 (.00)	-5.61	.00
APPORF F(4,257)=6.21, p<.000 R ² = .13	AGE	-.08 (.03)	-1.35	.18
	LDS	-.01 (.05)	-0.14	.89
	STATE	-.07 (.05)	-1.11	.27
	BAAS	.27 (.00)	4.52	.00
SATIS F(4,245)=15.16, p<.000 R ² = .21	AGE	-.02 (.05)	-0.41	.68
	LDS	-.03 (.08)	-0.42	.67
	STATE	-.04 (.08)	0.66	.51
	BAAS	-.45 (.00)	-7.70	.00
OWPREOC F(4,243)=27.15, p<.000 R ² = .31	AGE	.07 (.07)	0.97	.33
	LDS	.00 (.11)	-0.44	.96
	STATE	.01 (.11)	0.11	.91
	BAAS	.55 (.00)	10.28	.00

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

Table 6
Correlations between variables, male participants

Scale	APPEVF	APPORF	SATIS	OWPR EOC	BAAS
APPEVF	--				
APPORF	.26**	--			
SATIS	.52**	.17*	--		
OWPR EOC	-.17*	.17*	-.21**	--	
BAAS	-.14*	.27**	-.33**	.24**	--

*p < .05

**p < .01

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

Table 7
Correlations between variables, female participants

Scale	APPEVF	APPORF	SATIS	OWPR EOC	BAAS
APPEVF	--				
APPORF	.16**	--			
SATIS	.63**	.06*	--		
OWPR EOC	-.33*	.35*	-.41**	--	
BAAS	-.33*	.28**	-.44**	.55**	--

*p < .05

**p < .01

APPEVF = Appearance Evaluation Scale; APPORF = Appearance Investment Scale; SATIS = Body Satisfaction Scale; OWPR = Weight Preoccupation Scale; BAAS = Beliefs About Appearance Scale

body image than their male peers. However, religion (i.e., being LDS or not) was significantly associated with the pattern of differences between men and women. LDS men and women differed primarily in their views of their body such that LDS women were significantly less satisfied with their bodies than LDS men and significantly more likely to believe that their success, happiness, and self-esteem are dependent upon their physical appearance than LDS men. In contrast, non-LDS men and women differed primarily in their investment in appearance such that non-LDS women were more preoccupied with their body weight than non-LDS men and invested more time and effort into their appearance than non-LDS men.

The pattern of differences *within* gender were also associated with being LDS or not. For men, results indicated that male LDS college students had a more positive body image than their non-LDS counterparts. Specifically, LDS men had higher satisfaction with their overall appearance, greater satisfaction with their individual body parts, were less preoccupied with body weight, and were not as likely to believe their interpersonal or occupational success nor their personal worth depended upon their appearance than non-LDS men. It also appears that LDS men tend to put more time and effort into their appearance than their non-LDS male counterparts. Regression analyses confirmed the significant contribution of being LDS to the prediction of body image for men. These findings suggest that the LDS subculture does have an impact on the body image of the LDS male. Of all groups, LDS men had the most positive views of their bodies and were the least likely to believe that their success, happiness and worth were based on their physical appearance. One possible explanation for these findings is that the pro-body principles in LDS doctrine cause LDS men to be more accepting and appreciative of their bodies, and less likely to view them as a commodity for interpersonal, occupational or esteem gain. Consistent with LDS doctrine, LDS men may actually view their bodies as sacred and as gifts from God, thereby instilling greater satisfaction with their bodies. Additionally, LDS doctrine and scripture which discourage vanity and de-emphasize physical appearance as central to a meaningful life may have contributed to the significantly lower endorsement of beliefs that appearance is central to success, happiness and esteem observed among LDS men.

In contrast, comparisons of LDS women to non-LDS women revealed no statistical difference that would indicate that female LDS college students have a more positive or more negative body image than their non-LDS counterparts. It appears that for LDS women the pro-body LDS doctrine does not have an impact on body image as it does for LDS men. The lack of a "doctrinal" effect for LDS women may be because the ambient culture, with its strong emphasis on thinness for women, negates the positive impact that LDS pro-body doctrine could have on LDS women's view of their bodies. It is also possible that the emphasis on mating in the LDS subculture and the strong emphasis in Western culture on the importance of physical appearance for women's social status and marriageability interact, resulting in LDS women being more critically focused on their bodies which negates the potential positive influence of LDS pro-body doctrine on body image in LDS women. Indeed, LDS women were more likely than any other group to believe that their interpersonal success, happiness and worth were based on their physical appearance.

Also consistent with this interpretation, LDS women in Utah reported being more preoccupied with their weight, spent more time and effort on their appearance and grooming, and were more likely to believe that their happiness, worth and interpersonal and work success were dependent upon their physical appearance than LDS women living outside of Utah. In contrast, comparisons of LDS men from Utah with LDS men from other states showed little difference. The differences found between LDS women in Utah compared to LDS women in other states could be due to the large LDS population in Utah which may amplify the LDS directive to mate above that found in other states. Therefore, as evident in the current pattern of findings, LDS status does not differentiate level of body image dissatisfaction, level of dysfunctional beliefs about the body, or level of weight preoccupation among women, but living in Utah where the LDS subculture mating pressures are arguably stronger does.

The dominant LDS culture in Utah may also affect how LDS women in Utah perceive their gender role. Utah is well-known as a more conservative state. As a result, women in Utah may be more likely to adhere to a more "traditional" female gender role. The gender roles purported in evolutionary theory, that women primari-

ly nurture children and men primarily provide material resources, are encouraged within the LDS community. As such, these values may heighten "expected" gender role conformity in women in Utah. Indeed, theorists have hypothesized that physical appearance is central to the traditional female gender role. Studies have documented significant positive correlations between an individual's level of affirmation of the traditional female gender role and level of endorsement of the thin-ideal body type for women (Stice et al., 1994). Furthermore, attractive women are rated as more traditionally feminine than less attractive women, regardless of the woman's actual adherence to traditional female gender role behaviors and attitudes (Stice, 1994). Thus, if traditional female gender role expectations are higher in Utah, then it would be expected that greater conformity to central aspects of the traditional female gender role (e.g., thin, attractive appearance) would also be higher in Utah.

Another potential reason that LDS women in Utah were more likely to have a greater preoccupation with their weight and their appearance is that they were more likely to believe that positive outcomes in relationships, work, self-esteem and mood were dependent upon their physical appearance than LDS women outside of Utah. This difference in level of endorsement of such beliefs appears pivotal because greater endorsement of such beliefs consistently and significantly predicted a higher level of body image dissatisfaction in both men and women regardless of religion. In fact, the BAAS score was the only significant predictor of body image variables in women. These findings suggest that individuals' beliefs about the consequences of their appearance are central in determining their level of body image satisfaction. This finding is consistent with other studies which document that beliefs about appearance prospectively predict level of body (dis)satisfaction, thin-ideal internalization, self-esteem, and engagement in dieting (Spangler, 2002) and are an important risk factor in the development of eating pathology (Stice, Presnell & Spangler, 2002). Taken together, these findings suggest that any variable (such as traditional gender role endorsement or emphasis on appearance for marriageability) that increases the believability of dysfunctional beliefs about the body (as measured by the BAAS) will likely also increase body image dissatisfaction, thin-ideal internalization, dieting and eating pathology.

CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Consistent with the growing body of literature demonstrating the effects of sociocultural variables on body image, this study found religion to have a significant impact on body image. As such, it would be valuable to conduct more research investigating the effects of religion on body image. The current findings suggest that religious beliefs and practices may have an effect on body image to the extent that they either increase or decrease the endorsement of dysfunctional beliefs about the body regarding the degree of centrality of appearance for relationships, marriageability, work, life satisfaction, and self-worth. Different aspects of religious belief and practice could be examined to determine which aspects affect body image positively and negatively. The current findings suggest that LDS *doctrine* about the sacredness of the body may serve to increase positive body image. In contrast, the LDS *culture* emphasis on mating and perceived centrality of appearance for marriageability for women, as well as strong adherence to the traditional female gender role, may serve to reduce positive body image among women. Such a pattern may not be evident in LDS men because LDS culture emphasizes a man's ability to provide and to achieve occupationally whereas LDS culture emphasizes a woman's role as a wife and mother. Given these gendered directives in LDS culture, it may be that LDS men are more susceptible to ideas that their marriageability, worth and life satisfaction are based on their performance, whereas LDS women are more susceptible to ideas that their marriageability, worth and life satisfaction are based on their appearance (i.e., ability to attract a mate and maintain a relationship using their appearance).

Future studies could examine these hypotheses more comprehensively by directly assessing attitudes about gender roles and attitudes about marriageability in addition to body image and beliefs about appearance. Future research could also explore the ways in which LDS status confers a more positive body image in men, and then apply such findings to increase body image among LDS and non-LDS men and women.

REFERENCES

- American Psychiatric Association (2000). *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* 4th edition - DSM-IV-TR (Text

- Revision). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Anderson, A.E. & DiDomenico, L. (1992). Diet vs. shape content of popular male and female magazines: A dose response relationship to the incidence of eating disorders? *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 11, 283-287.
- Becker, A.E. (1994). Nurturing and negligence: Working on others' bodies in Fiji. In T. Csordas (Ed.), *Embodiment and Experience: The Existential Ground of Culture and Self* (pp. 100-115). NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. (1972, October). Beauty and the beast. *Psychology Today*, pp. 42-46, 74.
- Brodie, D. A., Bagley, K. & Slade, P. D. (1994). Body-image perception in pre- and post-adolescent females. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 78, 147-154.
- Brown, T. A., Cash, T. F. & Mikulka, P. J. (1990). Attitudinal body-image assessment: Factor analysis of the Body-Self Relations Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 55, 135-144.
- Bruch, H. (1962). Perceptual and conceptual disturbances in anorexia nervosa. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 24, 187-194.
- Cash, T. F. (1994). *Users' manual for the Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire*. Norfolk, VA: Old Dominion University.
- Cash, T.F. & Deagle, E.A. (1997). The nature and extent of body-image disturbances in anorexia nervosa and bulimia nervosa: A meta-analysis. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 22, 107-125.
- Cash, T.F. & Henry, P.E. (1995). Women's body images: The results of a national survey in the U.S.A. *Sex Roles*, 33, 19-28.
- Cash, T.F., Winstead, B.W. & Janda, L.H. (1986). The great American shape-up: Body image survey report. *Psychology Today*, 20, 30-37.
- Cloud, J. (2000, April). Never too buff. *Time Magazine*, 64-68.
- Council On Size & Weight Discrimination (1996). *Facts and Figures*. Washington DC: author
- Dolan, B.M., Birtchnell, S.A. & Lacey, J.H. (1987). Body image distortion in non-eating disordered women and men. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 31, 513-520.
- Eagly, A.H. & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54, 408-423.
- Feingold, A. (1992). Good-looking people are not what we think. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 304-341.
- Garner, D.M., Garfinkel, P.E., Schwartz, D. & Thompson, M. (1980). Cultural expectations of thinness in women. *Psychological Reports*, 47, 483-491.
- Gray, S.H. (1977). Social aspects of body image: Perception of normalcy of weight and affect of college undergraduates. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 45, 1035-1040.
- Hesse-Biber, S., Clayton-Matthews, A. & Downey, J.A. (1987). The differential importance of weight and body image among college men and women. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 113, 509-528.
- Irving, L.M. (1990). Mirror images: Effects of the standard of beauty on the self- and body-esteem of women exhibiting varying levels of bulimic symptoms. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9, 230-242.
- Koff, E., Rierdan, J. & Stubbs, M.L. (1990). Gender, body image, and self-concept in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 10, 56-58.
- Lee, H.B. (1973). General Priesthood Address, 143rd Semi-annual Conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. *Ensign*, January 1974, 96-101.
- Levine, M.P. & Smolak, L. (1996). Media as a context for the development of disordered eating. In L. Smolak, M.P. Levine & R. Striegel-Moore (Eds.), *The developmental psychopathology of eating disorders* (pp. 183-204). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- McCarroll-Bittel, E. (1993). The relationship of body image, weight, dieting status, race and age of onset of obesity to restrained eating pattern in middlescent women. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 54, 2997-B.
- Monteath, S.A. & McCabe, M.P. (1997). The influence of societal factors on female body image. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 137, 708-727.
- Muth, J.L. & Cash, T.F. (1997). Body-image attitudes: What difference does gender make? *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 1438-1452.
- Posavac, H.D., Posavac, S.S. & Posavac, E.J. (1998). Exposure to media images of female attractiveness and concern with body weight among young women. *Sex Roles*, 38, 187-201.
- Powers, E.A. (1971). Thirty years of research on ideal mate characteristics: What do we know? *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 1, 207-215.
- Rauste-von Wright, M. (1989). Body image satisfaction in adolescent girls and boys: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 18, 71-83.
- Rodin, J. (1993). *Body traps*. NY: Norton.
- Rodin, J., Silberstein, L. & Striegel-Moore, R. (1984). Women and weight: A normative discontent. In T.B. Sonderegger (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation: Psychology and gender* (pp. 269-307). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Schlundt, O.G. & Johnson, W.G. (1990). *Eating disorders: Assessment and treatment*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Silverstein, B., Perdue, L., Peterson, B. & Kelly, E. (1986). The role of the mass media in promoting a thin standard of bodily attractiveness for women. *Sex Roles*, 14, 519-523.

- Smith, J.F. (1919). *Gospel doctrine: Selections from the sermons and writings of Joseph F. Smith*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book Co.
- Spangler, D.L. (1997). The Beliefs About Appearance Scale. Unpublished Manuscript, Brigham Young University.
- Spangler, D.L. (1999). Cognitive-behavioral therapy for bulimia nervosa: An illustration. *JCLP/In Session: Psychotherapy in Practice*, 55, 669-713.
- Spangler, D.L. (2002). Testing the cognitive model of eating disorders: The role of dysfunctional beliefs about appearance. *Behavior Therapy*, 33, 87-105.
- Spangler, D.L. & Stice, E. (2001). Validation of the Beliefs About Appearance Scale. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 25, 813-827.
- Stice, E. (1994). Review of the evidence for a sociocultural model of bulimia nervosa and an exploration of mechanisms of action. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 14, 633-661.
- Stice, E., Presnell, K. & Spangler, D.L. (2002). Risk factors for binge eating onset: A prospective investigation. *Health Psychology*, 21, 131-138.
- Stice, E., Schupak-Neuberg, E., Shaw, H. & Stein, R. (1994). The relation of media exposure to eating disorder symptomatology: An examination of mediating mechanisms. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 836-840.
- Stice, E. & Shaw, H. (1994). Adverse effects of the media portrayed thin-ideal on women, and linkages to bulimic symptomatology. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 13, 288-308.
- Stice, E., Shaw, H. & Nemeroff, C. (1998). Dual pathway model of bulimia nervosa: Longitudinal support for dietary restraint and affect-regulation mechanisms. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 17, 129-149.
- Stice, E., Spangler, D.L. & Agras, W.S. (2001). Exposure to media-portrayed thin-ideal images adversely effects vulnerable girls: A longitudinal experiment. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, in press.
- Strong, K.G. & Huon, G.F. (1998). An evaluation of a structural model for studies of the initiation of dieting among adolescent girls. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 44, 315-326.
- Turner, S.L., Hamilton, H., Jacobs, M., Angood, L.M. & Dwyer, D.H. (1997). The influence of fashion magazines on the body image satisfaction of college women: An exploratory analysis. *Adolescence*, 32, 603-614.
- Virousek, K.B. & Hollon, S.D. (1990). The investigation of schematic content and processing in eating disorders. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14, 191-214.
- Wiseman, C.V., Gray, J.J., Mosimann, J.E. & Ahrens, A.H. (1992). Cultural expectations for thinness in women: An update. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 11, 85-89.

Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Managing Dual Relationships

MARLEEN S. WILLIAMS, PhD

Brigham Young University
AMCAP President, 2003-2005

Because LDS people often seek psychological help from LDS counselors, the potential for ethical dilemmas around dual relationships is high. This article reviews current professional literature concerning ethical responses to dual relationships in the context of LDS culture and practices. Recommendations are made for ethical decision making. Steps in the decision-making process are outlined.

Because LDS people often want to see LDS counselors, the potential for dual relationships is high, particularly in small communities or areas where there are few LDS counselors and a fairly large LDS population. If the client's concerns involve spiritual issues or concerns that are intertwined with LDS beliefs, practices, and values it is important that the counselor have correct understanding of those beliefs, practices, and values. Few non-LDS counselors have training or competency in such cross-cultural counseling with LDS clients. This can make appropriate referrals to non-LDS counselors hard to find in some locations.

Dual or multiple relationships can occur when professionals assume two or more roles simultaneously or sequentially with a person seeking their help. This may involve taking on more than one professional role, such as counselor and teacher, or combining professional and non-professional roles, such as counselor and friend (Herlihy & Corey, 1992).

Many LDS counselors find themselves grappling with ethical dilemmas around dual relationships; for example:

You have been seeing a client who is in your stake but not in your ward. You serve on the high council of that stake. The client is very distressed about his unhappy marriage;

his wife is cruelly insensitive toward him and he is depressed and lonely. At high council meeting it is announced that at the next high council meeting, there will be a church court held for your client as a result of an affair your client is allegedly having with his secretary. As a member of the high council, you are expected to sit on that church court.

Professional organizations for counselors and therapists all have ethical standards related to dual relationships. These standards prohibit dual relationships that may cause harm to clients. However, there is little consensus among professionals regarding what specific behaviors are unethical (see Tyler & Tyler, 1994; Plaut, 1997; Borys &

Marleen S. Williams PhD, AMCAP's President 2003-2005, is a licensed clinical psychologist and Associate Clinical Professor of Counseling Psychology in the Counseling & Career Center at Brigham Young University. She has presented at many national and international conventions including AMCAP and APA. Her research focuses on work with women's issues, spirituality, and eating disorders. She has served in LDS church leadership positions on both ward and stake levels and is currently serving as Young Women's President. Address for correspondence: Marleen S. Williams PhD, Counseling and Career Center, 1548 WSC, BYU, Provo UT 84602. email <marleen_williams@byu.edu>

Pope, 1989). The one exception is sexual intimacy with clients; there is nearly universal consensus among professionals that sexual intimacy is always harmful to the client and therefore unethical. Additionally, it is a felony in many states for a mental health professional to have sex with a client (Boylan, Malley & Reilly 2001). Most therapists and counselors would consider providing therapy to a friend unethical (Geyer, 1994), but there is less consensus on issues such as sending holiday greeting cards, inviting clients to an open house reception, or serving together in community or church activities (Oordt, 1990).

The complexity of issues and concerns in making ethical decisions makes absolute rules and answers difficult to determine. The problem is not just in the duality of roles and expectations; it is in (1) the human tendency to have incomplete and imperfect self-awareness, and (2) the potential this creates for exploiting others for personal advantage.

Understanding underlying dynamics of both the client and the counselor, the cultural backgrounds of both, and the nature and duration of services, are all important in making ethical decisions.

Not all dual relationships are harmful. That is, boundary *crossing* may not always be the same as boundary *violation*. For example, accepting a small gift such as flowers picked from the client's garden may be therapeutically useful, especially if the client's culture attaches important significance to giving such gifts. Rejection of the flowers may be seen as rejection by the client. On the other hand, accepting a new car from a client or a gift of stock from the client's company may change the nature of the relationship in therapy or the dynamics of power, and lead to exploitation of the client and/or ineffective therapy.

A long list of rules and absolute answers may not be as effective in understanding ethical behavior as would be understanding the principles that underlie ethical behavior. One of the chief attributes of effective ethical decision making is the ability to recognize the existence of an ethical dilemma (Rest, 1982). Dual relationships may be unavoidable at times. But the key is to find ways of minimizing the risk of harm to the client. Being aware of situations that may cause harm is the first line of defense against unethical behavior. Dual relationships can be problematic when:

- they compromise the effectiveness of therapy,
- they create client concerns about being harmed by the dual nature of the relationship,

- observers of the relationship feel therapeutic effectiveness is compromised,
- the therapist is vulnerable to false allegations and misperceptions by the client.

Kitchener & Harding (1990) have defined three important factors as harmful: (1) *Incompatibility of Expectations*, (2) *Divergence of Responsibility*, and (3) *Power Differential*.

INCOMPATIBILITY OF EXPECTATIONS

A basic assumption of the therapy relationship is that the welfare and best interest of the client comes first. Confidentiality is an important part of assuring safety for the client's personal disclosure. Dual relationships can strain the limits of confidentiality or the trust that confidentiality will be honored. Even though the therapist may honor the "letter of the law" regarding confidentiality, the client may fear that subtle or accidental "slips" could occur. In addition, the therapist may feel pressure to disclose confidential information in order to perform church assignments more effectively.

Also, the client may inaccurately expect that the therapist's church position may lead to greater access to services, welfare, and/or position for the client. The client may then feel betrayed when this does not occur. For example, if the therapist serves as the Relief Society President in the client's ward, the client may believe that the therapist can influence whether or not the Bishop will provide welfare or financial assistance if the client discloses financial concerns in therapy. If that assistance is not as forthcoming as the client hoped, this could have a negative impact on the therapeutic relationship.

Discussing confidentiality and its limits with clients can be very helpful in reducing incompatibility of expectations. Because at times working with church leaders can be useful and in the best interest of the client, discussing informed consent and allowing the client to choose whether or not to sign a release of information can reduce misunderstandings. Of course, clients also must be informed of legal mandates to report abuse and "duty in warn" obligations.

DIVERGENCE OF RESPONSIBILITY

"No man can serve two masters" (Matt.6:24). In fact, a therapist who is involved in a dual relationship may

feel divided loyalties. This can result in a loss of objectivity. For example, if the client discloses personal concerns to a therapist who also serves in the ward Bishopric, how might these disclosures in therapy impact recommendations for assignments and callings? A particular church assignment might be desired and even useful for the client but may not be best when the needs of the entire ward are considered. This creates conflict for the therapist and the possibility of harm for the client or reduced effectiveness of therapy. The client may feel not cared for, or misunderstood – and the potential for real or perceived emotional abandonment increases significantly.

Dual roles involving multiple sources of power and authority can also create confusion for the client. Does working through issues related to sexual behavior imply forgiveness by the church for sexual offenses if the therapist is also the bishop or stake president? If the client's former therapist is later called as the bishop, the client may assume ecclesiastical forgiveness even though the offenses were never addressed with previous church authorities – but had been discussed in previous therapy. If the therapist formerly served as a bishop or is the bishop of another ward, the client may erroneously assume priesthood authority exists (and ecclesiastical forgiveness) where it does not.

Of course LDS therapists do not have authority to speak for the church when serving in the role of therapist. Richards & Potts (1995) surveyed 205 LDS counselors and therapists concerning spiritual practices in therapy. A major ethical concern mentioned by these counselors and therapists was the danger of usurping religious authority. Indeed, LDS therapists working with LDS clients need to be very alert regarding potential confusion about their own roles as opposed to the roles assigned to priesthood and church leaders (for example, ethical standards for psychological treatment prohibit imposing values on a client, whereas, “preaching the word” may be a required requisite for a particular church calling). Careful ongoing reflection regarding differences between these roles and assignments can reduce or eliminate confusion.

Another concern mentioned by Richards & Potts (1995) was the danger of engaging in *priestcraft* – by either being paid for spiritual services or seeking to create more business for oneself by providing spiritual services for a fee (see 2 Nephi 26:29, Alma 1:16, Acts 8:18-

21). Mixing spiritual services such as giving priesthood blessings with psychotherapy can not only confuse clients about therapeutic versus ecclesiastic roles and responsibilities, but could readily be construed as engaging in priestcraft. As well-meaning as such practices might be, it is much more in the client's best interest to avoid the potential harmful effects of such role confusion. Instead, the skillful use of spiritually-based interventions which address clients' spiritual concerns and needs, can be very effective in helping clients find peace and meaning regarding the painful events of their lives (Richards & Bergin, 1997).

POWER DIFFERENTIAL

Any time there is a difference in power there is a possible potential for exploitation. The greater the difference in power, the greater the potential for abuse of that power.

The therapist has access to personal knowledge about the client – personal history, psychological profile, strengths and weaknesses, hopes and fears, relationship patterns, sexual habits and personal secrets. Much of this information is not available about other church members who are not in therapy. Clients do not have similar access to such information about the therapist. This creates vulnerability for the client. When the therapist also has power in other roles (such as ecclesiastical, financial, or social), the danger for harm to the client increases. Clients may also fear being seen as less worthy or spiritually flawed if they discuss concerns with a therapist who also has a church role.

Personal self-disclosure may also play a role in the therapy relationship. A therapist's personal information that may appropriately be disclosed in church classes, meetings or talks is not usually available to clients. Although disclosing such information may at times be helpful, it may very well be potentially harmful; therefore the potential impact should always be carefully considered.

Being aware of boundaries that define counseling and therapy and differentiate it from other relationships can help in decision-making. Asking such questions as “what does a therapist do?” versus “what does a home teacher, Bishop, or Relief Society President do?” can help in maintaining roles and reducing dual role conflict. Keeping therapy confined to time, place, and location designated for therapy can also reduce dual role problems.

Under the right circumstances and with good judgment, social activities, accepting a gift, carefully considered personal disclosures, and linking therapy concerns to the client's real-life church experiences can be not only innocuous but even very beneficial. A certain level of intimacy, closeness, trust and caring is necessary for a productive therapeutic relationship. Rigid rules can never replace careful awareness of ethical issues, self-knowledge, good clinical judgment, and a deep personal commitment to the welfare of the client.

Attempting to understand the dialectical complexity of dual relationships may engender feelings like (the comic strip character) Charlie Brown's as he struggles with growing beyond "all-or-nothing" thinking and declares:

We have not succeeded in answering all of our problems. Indeed, we often feel we have not completely answered any of them. The answers we have found only serve to raise a whole set of new questions. In some ways we feel we are as confused as ever, but *we believe we are confused on a much higher level, and about more important things.* (Charles Schulz)

SEXUAL INTIMACY

The area of least confusion around ethical standards, of course, regards sexual intimacy with a client. Despite the fact that the prohibition against sexual involvement with clients has been the clearest and most publicized proscription of all ethical standards, sexual exploitation is the most frequent classification of ethical complaints (Pope, 1990). Training in making ethical decisions related to managing sexual attraction in therapy is critical in knowing how to ethically respond to clients. Although education, self-awareness, and skills training are vital – a strong sense of personal ethics and a dedicated regard for the welfare of others are even more compelling for maintaining professional boundaries. Unfortunately, only about 12% to 20% of respondents in training programs report having received in-depth training on managing sexual attractions in clinical practice (Glaser & Thorpe, 1986).

Apparently because of the sensitive nature of this issue many educators have been hesitant to address these concerns directly with trainees. Although no standard educational approach exists, open discussion and self-awareness appear to be strong factors in helping therapists maintain a buffer against the sexual exploitation of

clients (Pope, Sonne & Holroyd, 1993; Hamilton & Spruill, 1999).

The therapist's willingness to minimize the negative impact of client-therapist sexual involvement is often used as a rationale for condoning the behavior. Offending therapists often rationalize sexual misconduct as a "reconstructive sexual experience" for the client. Research suggests, however, that such intimacies have a devastating impact on clients. In a survey conducted by the Wisconsin Psychological Association (1985), every respondent who reported sexual involvement with a therapist endorsed all negative-effect statements on a questionnaire with "strongly agree." Women who reported sexual involvement with therapists initially appeared to feel protective of the therapists and to blame themselves for the sexual involvement, but the emotional outcome is described as being very similar to the emotional sequelae of parent-child incest (Bates & Brodsky, 1988; D'Addario, 1977; Kardener, 1974; Marmor, 1972; Pope & Bouhoutsos, 1986; White, 1986). Typical responses include ambivalence, guilt, emptiness and isolation, sexual confusion, identity and boundary disturbance, lability of mood, depression and anxiety, inability to trust, suppressed rage, suicidal risk, and cognitive dysfunction, especially in attention, concentration, flashbacks and intrusive thoughts (Pope, 1987). It is more common for the therapist to end the sexual relationship than for the client to do so (Chesler, 1972a).

Although offenses may occur under a variety of circumstances, research suggests a profile of the vulnerable therapist who is most likely to slip into an ethical violation. Ninety-two percent of reported violations involve male therapists with female clients. Violations also occur, however, between all gender combinations with female as well as male therapists and same-sex as well as heterosexual clients (Bouhoutsos, Holroyd, Lerman, Forer & Greenberg, 1983).

The most common personality style among offenders is the therapist who seeks to become a "guru" (Chesler, 1972b). Such therapists are exploitative, strong personalities who desire to create an empire of followers. Marmor (1976) reported that therapists who become sexually involved with clients often have a strong desire to be seen by others as loving and affectionate but harbor hostility toward women and have a subtle sadistic need to exploit, humiliate, or reject them. They often use reaction formation as a defense against feelings of masculine inadequacy

or fear of being seen as homosexual. They also exhibit some psychopathic tendencies and are less likely to believe it is necessary to follow conventional rules. Psychotherapy often takes on a "cult aspect." These therapists expect the client to become a "true believer" in the therapist's method. The "cult leader" therapist tends to have narcissistic, grandiose, and paranoid features and encourages others to idealize him as an authority. Clients are encouraged to become "true believers" and accept the therapist's theory as valid, true, and superior to all others. Alienation from other views is strongly encouraged. Clients may be told that other therapists or methods cannot be helpful and that the "cult leader" therapist holds special skills or abilities not known or used by other therapists. This therapist becomes the "teacher or master" with the client in a position of significantly less power as a "pupil." The group of "believers" is seen as an elite "family" who become hostile and suspicious of other forms of intervention. Devaluation, harassment, or denigration of those who defect, depart, or seek other solutions may be done in the name of "concern" or "caring" (Schoener & Milgram, 1984).

However, not all therapists who offend fit this profile. Situational and other personal variables that contribute to ethical violations include (Marmor 1976, Schoener & Conroe 1989):

- Being alone and isolated from others
- Eroticized transference
- Seductiveness or flirtatiousness of client
- Libidinal needs of the therapist not met (therapist's marital problems)
- Naive or poorly trained therapist (i.e., misses important dynamics until it is too late)
- Little awareness of boundaries or unable to spot violations such as breaking rules for clients, special privileges, or behaviors such as walking the client to her car or giving her a ride home
- Therapy style; i.e., "lifelong parenting" contract, vague goals, no clear treatment plan
- Therapeutic "drift" – evolves into a more personal relationship with no termination plan or periodic review of goals. The therapist looks forward to seeing the client for her/his own needs rather than the client's.
- Abrupt change in therapy style
- Working outside area of competency
- Unique characteristics that create attraction and/or over-identification with client – resulting in a blind spot, conflict in identity or sexual preference
- Recent divorce or interpersonal loss in the life of the therapist
- Family dynamics and resemblances to the therapist's significant others

Note that although sexual intimacies with a client are strictly forbidden by ethical standards, sexual attraction to a client is not equivalent to sexual intimacy. Many professionals and trainees hesitate to address concerns about attractions because they fear experiencing attraction will be equated with acting unethically. This *conspiracy of silence* actually creates increased risk for ethical violation because it blocks important awareness of normal feelings and responses and creates blind spots that increase vulnerability. Clients are aware even when therapists keep silent: McClerian (1972) found that client awareness of sexual feelings between client and therapist was reported in 43.5% of cases, with 22% being uncertain or perceiving weak sexual feelings, and 34% reporting no attraction.

Although feelings of attraction in therapy are widespread, acting out is not. Being capable of experiencing temptation is certainly different from surrendering to temptation. Being able to separate thoughts and feelings from behaviors is an important key to self-awareness. It is crucial to "avoid the avoidance" when acknowledging one's own sexuality (Pope, Sonne & Holroyd, 1993). Acknowledging and accepting complex cognitive, affective, and physical responses is an important part of professional development and functioning. Attempting to avoid awareness of that information leads to a loss of understanding of one's own motivations, intentions, and behaviors. Exploration and understanding of oneself is best done in an environment that is safe, non-judgmental, and supportive.

Learning about typical reactions to sexual attraction to a client can make it easier for therapists to accept and then understand their own response to sexual feelings and accompanying reactions. Knowing that such feelings are normal and experienced by other therapists decreases feelings of isolation and shame, and facilitates discussion and consultation that can reduce ethical violations. The therapist then has active agency to choose strategies and interventions that protect the welfare of both the client and the therapist. Blind spots created by the therapist's defense mechanisms do not then have the

power to catch the therapist unaware.

Common responses by therapists who experience attraction to clients are reported by Pope, Sonne & Holroyd (1993):

- Surprise, startle, and shock
- Guilt
- Anxiety about own unresolved personal issues
- Fear of losing control
- Fear of being criticized
- Frustration at not being able to speak openly with client
- Frustration at not being able to make sexual contact
- Confusion about tasks
- Confusion about boundaries and roles
- Confusion about actions
- Anger at the client
- Fear or discomfort about frustrating the client's demands (Pope, et al, 1993)

Although these thoughts and feelings are common and typical, it is important to remember that the client's well-being always comes first. Indeed, despite such responses, the therapist must stay committed to ethical principles. Sexual intimacies with a client are never therapeutic. It is a sacred trust to bear the burden of one's own frustrations, unmet hopes, and longings in the service of the client's welfare.

Being self-aware can lead to appropriate consultation with another professional or supervisor. A therapist's best protections against ethical problems or false allegations are:

Self awareness: ask, "What am I thinking and feeling? What is triggering this response? How do these thoughts and feelings impact my behavior? What are my own needs, concerns and unresolved issues? How can I address and resolve them other than through my client?" Individual therapy can provide a safe, non-judgmental environment to explore your concerns while protecting your privacy.

Consultation: discuss your concerns about the client with a supervisor or another trusted professional. Don't let shame detract you from consulting; nearly all therapists have had similar situations. Consult professional literature to learn other ways of managing attractions without causing damage to clients. It can be most helpful to process the case with another trusted professional before any confrontation with the client about sexual dynamics

in therapy. Therapists who have offended are less likely to have consulted prior to committing the offense.

Documentation: include in your notes that you consulted on the case and what the recommendations were. If it is not in the notes, you cannot later document these wise actions. Documenting consultation and subsequent action taken can protect from false accusations. In a training environment, audio or video tapes of sessions also provide documentation of what happens in therapy.

Sometimes a therapist may not directly experience sexual responses because of defenses against self-awareness. Common clues to unacknowledged feelings in therapy may include (see Pope et al., 1993):

- Dehumanizing of the client (i.e., responding to the client as a diagnosis not as a person, or misdiagnosing)
- Dehumanizing the therapist (i.e., keeping distance; acting on a perfunctory, impersonal level)
- Avoidance
- Obsessive thoughts about the client
- Slips and meaningful mistakes
- Fantasies about the client
- Special treatment
- Isolation of client (i.e., disrupting other helpful or meaningful relationships; imposing restrictions)
- Isolation of therapist – avoiding consultation or practicing alone
- Creating a secret
- Seeking repeated reassurance on the same issues from colleagues despite good consultation
- Boredom or emotional numbness as a protective reaction (Pope, et al, 1993).

Unwise treatment practices that should be avoided include (Pope, et al, 1993):

- Routine hugging of clients without carefully evaluating the dynamics of the client and the therapy relationship. The therapist may not always be sure of how the client will experience and receive a hug.
- Face-to-face hugs
- Therapy conducted in other than a professional setting or standard service hours without others nearby. Do not meet alone at night in your office or go alone to a client's home.

- Excessive touching
- Holding the client or allowing the client to sit on your lap
- Socializing with the client
- Excessive or inappropriate self-disclosure
- Attempting to directly affect the client's life (i.e., setting up dates or business contacts for the client) (Pope, et al, 1993)

Awareness of ethical issues and well-reasoned thoughtful decision making can reduce harm and result in more helpful outcomes. Steps in ethical decision-making can include (Kitchner, 1984; Bersoff, 1995; Beauchamps & Childress, 1994; Meara, Schmidt & Day, 1996; Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs of the APA, 1990):

1. *Be Aware Of When An Ethical Dilemma Exists*

- Ask, "What professional ethical codes apply?" "What legal issues are involved?" "What laws apply?"
- Determine what are the professional and institutional standards of care.
- Look for conflicts between codes, laws, and principles.
- Contact appropriate authorities if in doubt (professional ethics committee, Child Protective Services, institutional director, legal services).

2. *Consider What Moral Principles Are Involved*

- Some important principles to consider are:
- Autonomy – the right of competent persons to freedom of choice and action so long as the rights of others are respected.
- Non-maleficence – "above all, do no harm."
- Beneficence – contributing to the health and welfare of clients.

- Justice – fairness and equality.
- Fidelity – faithfulness, loyalty, and the expectation that promises will be kept.
- Veracity – truthfulness that leads to trust.

3. *Follow a Decision-Making Process*

- Define the problem.
- Generate all possible alternatives.
- Analyze and evaluate possible risks and outcomes of alternatives.
- Consider ethical, legal, and moral implications of all alternatives.
- Be alert to client variables that may impact outcome such as culture and diversity.
- Consult with appropriate colleagues.
- Choose a Course of Action while assuming responsibility for that action.
- Consider informed consent and discuss concerns with the client when necessary.
- Implement a Course of Action.
- Evaluate the results of the Course of Action.
- Stay involved in an ongoing decision-making process.
- Be prepared to re-evaluate and change action if necessary

Many individuals enter the helping professions because of a personal attribute of kindness and a desire to ease suffering. Those qualities are strong allies in one's ability to "succor the weak, lift up the hands that hang down and strengthen the feeble knees" (D&C 81:5). It is also important, however, to follow the Lord's admonition to be "wise as a serpent, yet without sin" (D&C 111:11). By thoughtfully following the spirit of both of these inspired statements, therapists will find improved wisdom in managing the ethical dilemmas of dual relationships.

REFERENCES

- Bates, C. & Brodsky, A. (1988). *Sex in the therapy hour*. NY: Guilford Press.
- Beauchamp, T.L. & Childress, J.F. (1994). *Principles of biomedical ethics*, 4th edition. NY: Oxford.
- Bersoff, D.N. (1995). *Ethical conflicts in psychology*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Board of Ethnic Minority Affairs of the APA (1990). *Guidelines for Providers of Psychological Services to Ethnic Linguistic, and Culturally Diverse Populations*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Borys, D.S. & Pope, K.S. (1989). Dual relationships between therapist and client: A national study of psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 20 (5), 283-293.
- Bouhoutsas, J., Holroyd, J., Lerman, H., Forer, B., & Greenberg, M. (1983). Sexual intimacy between psychotherapists and patients.

- Professional Psychology: Research and Practice* 14, 185-196.
- Boylan, J.C., Malley P.B. Reilly, E.P. (2001). *Textbook and Resource Guide for Counseling and Psychotherapy* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Brunner-Routledge
- Chesler, P. (1972a). *Women and madness*. NY: Avon Books.
- Chesler, P. (1972b). The Sensuous Psychiatrist. *New York Magazine*, 6, 52-61.
- D'Addario, L. (1977). *Sexual relationship between female clients and male therapists*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Apr, 38 (10-B): 5007.
- Geyer, M..C. (1994). Dual role relationships and Christian counseling. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 22 (3), 187-195.
- Glaser, R.D., & Thorpe, J.S. (1986). Unethical intimacy: A survey of sexual contact and advances between psychology educators and female graduate students. *American Psychologist*, 41, 43-51.
- Hamilton, J.C. & Spruill, J. (1999). Identifying and reducing risk factors related to trainee-client sexual misconduct. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 30 (3), 318-327.
- Herlihy, B. & Corey G. (1992). *Dual relationships in counseling*. Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.
- Kardener, S.H. (1974). Sex and the physician-patient relationship. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 131, 1134-36.
- Kitchener, K.S. (1984). Intuition, critical evaluation, and ethical principles: The foundation for ethical decision-making in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12, 43-55.
- Kitchener, K.S. & Harding, S.S. (1990). Dual role relationships. In B. Herlihy and L. Golden, *Ethical Standards Casebook*, 4th edition, 146-154. Alexandria, VA: American Association for Counseling and Development.
- Marmor, J. (1972). Sexual acting-out in psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychoanalyses*, 32, 3-8.
- Marmor, J. (1976). Some psychodynamic aspects of the seduction of patients in psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 36, 319-23.
- McClernan, J. (1973). *Implications of Sexual Attraction (Feeling) in the Counselor-Client Relationship*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Mar, 33, (9-A): 4844.
- Meara, N.M., Schmidt, L.D., & Day, J.D. (1996). Principles and virtues: A foundation for ethical decision, policies, and character. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 24, 4-77.
- Oordt, M.S. (1990). Ethics of practice among Christian psychologists: A pilot study. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*. Fall, Vol, 18 (3), 255-260.
- Plaut, S.M. (1997). Boundary violations in professional-client relationships: overview and guidelines for preventions. *Sexual and Marital Therapy*, 12 (1), 77-94.
- Pope, S. (1990). Therapist-Patient Sexual Involvement: A Review of the Research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 10, 477-490.
- Pope, K.S. & Bouhoutsos, J. (1986). *Sexual Intimacy Between Therapists and Patients*. NY: Praegar.
- Pope, K.S., Sonne, J.L. & Holroyd, J. (1993). *Sexual Feelings in Psychotherapy*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Rest, J. (1982). The major components of morality. In W. Kurtines and J. Gerwitz, *Moral Behavior and Moral Development* (pp. 24-40). NY: Wiley.
- Richards, P.S. & Potts, R.W. (1995). Using Spiritual Interventions in Psychotherapy: Practices, Successes, Failures, and Ethical Concerns of Mormon Psychotherapists. *Professional Psychologist: Research and Practice*, 26 (2), 163-170.
- Schoener, G.R. & Melgrom, J.H. (1984, May). Processing Complaints of Therapist Misconduct. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association, Los Angeles California.
- Schroener, G.R. & Conroe, R.M. (1989). The Role of Supervision and Case Consultation In Primary Prevention. In Schoener, Milgrom, Gonsiorck, Luepker & Conroe (eds.) *Psychotherapist's Sexual Involvement with Clients: Intervention and Prevention*. Minneapolis MI: Walk-In Counseling Center.
- Schulz, Charles, C. *Peanuts*, Reprinted by permission of United Features Syndicate. New York: NY.
- Tyler, J.M. & Tyler, C. (1994). Ethics in supervision: Managing supervisee rights and supervisor responsibilities. *Directions in Mental Health Counseling*, 4 (11), 4-25.
- White, W.L. (1986). *Incest in the Organizational Family: The Unspoken Issue in Staff and Program Burnout*. Rockville, MD: HCS, Inc.
- Wisconsin Psychological Association (1985). *Task Force on Misconduct by Psychotherapists- Membership List*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Psychological Association.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS PRESENTED AT THE FALL 2001 AMCAP CONVENTION - OCTOBER 4, 2001

Cleaving: Thoughts on Building Strong Families

SISTER CHIEKO N. OKAZAKI

*First Counselor, Relief Society General Presidency 1990-1997
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*

My dear brothers and sisters, aloha!

I am so delighted to be with you today for your annual convention. I always learn so much by spending a few hours seeing the professional challenges that you face, and even better, seeing how you share with each other the solutions that you have found as you have applied both professional study and personal prayer to these problems. I was so thrilled when Eileen DeGruccio told me that the theme for your conference is "In the Shelter of Our Homes: Empowering Families with Hope and Strength in the Midst of the Storms Around Us." I know that you exist as a professional group because people have problems. You chose your profession because you wanted to help. The people you see are people who are lacking in hope and strength. They are the people being battered by the storms that are not only around our homes but inside our homes. By giving the confer-

ence a positive phrasing and by creating a verbal vision of homes as shelter, I think you've already done much to increase the level of hope and strength that you have as you meet your clients.

It is interesting, brothers and sisters, how national thinking has swung to an emphasis on marriage and family, which is where the Church's emphasis has been all the time. Some of our national leaders could be giving sound bytes out of the *Proclamation on the Family*, and maybe they are. The General Authorities and local leaders have worked very hard to be sure that as many leaders as possible, as well as ordinary people, are exposed to the clearly stated principles of the proclamation.

My remarks today are titled: "Cleaving: Some Thoughts on Building Stronger Families." When I was invited to give this talk, I thought immediately of Jesus' instructions about marriage – and these instructions are also the picture of the ideal marriage:

For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh. Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder. (Matthew 19:5)

Now I've read and heard this scripture literally hundreds of times, and it is obviously talking about unity. How could you be more united than two people being one flesh? But thinking about it, I realized that I didn't actually know what "cleave" meant. In fact, I was confused. I knew what a cleaver was. I use one all the time

Sister Chieko N. Okazaki served from 1990 to 1997 as first counselor in the Relief Society general presidency. She describes herself as a "child of humble Japanese laborers on a plantation on the big island of Hawaii." She converted to the LDS Church from Buddhism at the age of fifteen and later married Edward Y. Okazaki who also became a convert to the Church. He passed away in March 1992. They are the parents of two sons. She graduated (M.A.) from the University of Northern Colorado, taught school in Hawaii, Utah and Colorado for twenty-three years, and later became an elementary school principal for ten more years. She is the author of several best-selling books and tapes and has given many presentations all over the world. This presentation ©2001 by Chieko N. Okazaki. All rights reserved. For permission, please contact her at: <chieko5889@msn.com>

when chopping up meat and vegetables for sukiyaki. But that couldn't possibly be what Jesus meant when he talked about "cleaving to," was it? I looked a little further in the scriptures. Romans 12:9 talks about "cleaving to that which is good" and Jacob 6:5 talks about "cleaving unto God as he cleaveth unto you." But the Doctrine and Covenants (45:48) predicts that when Jesus sets foot upon the Mount of Olives at his second coming "it shall cleave in twain." That sounds more like what I do on my chopping board. And what about all of those instructions about "cloven-hoofed" animals in Deuteronomy (e.g., 14:7)? Or that line in the hymn (*Hymns*, p. 111): "Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in thee"?

By now I was thoroughly confused, which is always a state of mind for me in which I am prepared to learn something. So I went to the Bible dictionary. The word is not even in it. So I hauled out Webster's dictionary and there discovered that there really are two meanings of the word, and they come from two etymological roots.

The first meaning is the kitchen meaning of "to divide by ... a cutting blow; split, separate into distinct parts and especially into groups having divergent views." Etymologically, this word is related to the Greek *glyphein*, "to carve," the Latin *glubere*, "to peel," Old Norse *kljúfa*, "to split" and Old English *cleofan*, which means the same thing: "to split."

The second meaning of the word is "to adhere firmly and closely, or loyally and unwaveringly; see *stick*." This form of the word comes from the Old Norse and Old English words for "clay" which is *claeg* in Old English and is related to *kleben* in Old High German. The verb form is the Old English *clifian*, meaning "to stick."

Now *clifian* is not pronounced too much differently from *cleofan*, which is why both of them have yielded the word *cleave* in modern English; but their origins and meanings are the exact opposite. The *cleofan* form will split kindling or granite or chop vegetables into chunks while the *clifian* form is like sticky clay that glues things together. An Old English family, then, would cleave [glue] clay into the cracks of a mud-and-wattle wall of its hut to keep out the rain and then make the interior warm by cleaving [split] wood in small chunks for the fire.

You counselors and psychotherapists see a lot of families in the kitchen-cleaver stage but they have come to you because what is being cleaved apart is a family unit that began with the hopes and dreams of glue—cleaving

so close together that they could become one flesh. I don't have to tell you how hard this job [glue] can be once this process [split] begins.

Well, today I certainly have no special expertise on how, exactly, you can do that. You're the experts. You're professionally trained to supply that sheltering space in which hope and strength can take root again. It would be foolish and a waste of time for me to try to tell you how to do your jobs. But as I prayerfully thought about what to share with you, I came to the conclusion that I have had the immense privilege of talking to women all over the world. They have shared with me their faith and their fears and their frustration. They have shared their joy and their anger, their sorrow and their peace. Every one of these women, whether they have been single or married, mothers or childless, have to deal with the same problems. They have to be strong to meet the challenges that confront them. They have to find ways of living the gospel in a world that looks very different to the eyes of faith than to the eyes of unbelief. They are all called upon to love the unlovable and forgive the unforgivable. They all have to come to Christ as individuals. For some, the greatest challenges are within their own homes. For others, home is the shelter where they regain their strength for going out and tackling difficult situations that await them there.

I would like to do three things in this talk. First, to share with you some of my thoughts about how to build strong marriages. Second, to share some thoughts about the importance of building strong parent-child relationships. And then I would like to share with you a cause dear to my heart which I think will strengthen already-strong homes and make a place in even severely damaged families in which family members may begin to find shelter and apply the little drops of glue that can stick them together instead of the cutting blow that separates them into different parts.

MAKING STRONG MARRIAGES

A few days ago, I was reading the answers of some children to questions about various Bible stories. This time the particular question was, "How did Adam and Eve spend an average day in the Garden of Eden?" Twelve-year-old Craig hypothesized: "Probably they took long walks in the new moonlight that God had created and tried to figure out what to do about loneliness.

That's when they decided to have the first children." Eight-year-old Catherine took a more aesthetic approach. She said: "They drew pictures of God and colored them in with crayons they made out of vegetables," adding, "Most of the pictures of God came out green." And nine-year-old Jerome was already a philosopher. He said: "They had deep talks about what they were there for ... people have been trying to figure that out ever since" (Heller, 1994, p. 15).

Well, we have an advantage perhaps in knowing what we're here for, but I suspect that, on average, we have just as much trouble as the next person in trying to figure out what to do about it.

Ann Landers is certainly not in the same category as the scriptures, but what she says will sound familiar to you. She got a letter from three men who, with their wives in a group, were discussing the quality of the marriages they observed around them. They asked Ann what she thought about this question: "If you had it to do over again, would you marry the person to whom you are now married?"

Ann Landers ran that question in her column on Valentine's Day of 1977. She says (1996, p.21), "Within 10 days, my office was bombarded with more than 50,000 pieces of mail, and letters continued to pour in for weeks after." She requested only postcards, but more than 7,000 took the time to write a letter about whether they would or would not remarry their current spouse. Thirty percent signed their cards and letters – and 70% of that group "said yes, they would marry the same person again" while the rest wouldn't. Women wrote 80% of these signed cards and letters; men wrote the rest.

The unsigned cards and letters were much more evenly divided: "48% said yes, and 52% said no. The breakdown according to sex was 70% from females and 30% from males." Then she gave a sampling of the responses (1996, pp. 19-21):

- From San Jose, Calif. A wife wrote: "I may feel different tomorrow, but tonight I am voting no. It's Valentine's Day, and this clown to whom I've been married for 15 years (5 children) didn't even give me a card."
- A man in Pittsburgh sent two dozen cards (unsigned). On each card, he wrote (in green ink), "I vote no. She's murder."
- A woman from San Francisco wrote a letter saying, "I voted no yesterday. I was drunk. My husband is an angel – a lot better than I deserve. Please change my vote to yes."

• From Davenport, Iowa: "Female, married 27 years. We are the happiest couple in town. I vote yes." At the bottom of the card, hastily scrawled in pencil, was a word from her husband, who obviously had been asked to drop the card in the mailbox. He wrote, "That's what she thinks! I vote no."

• From Akron Ohio: "I am 12 years old. I read your column every day. My parents got into a fight tonight over how to vote in your survey. My mother said she was voting no because my dad spends too many nights playing backgammon. Dad said their marriage was a lot better than most – even with her griping about him playing so much backgammon. He said he would vote yes. The conversation suddenly turned to how much my mother's brother cost my dad in business. I think you'd better put them both down as no."

• From Oklahoma City: "In the 32 years we've been married, my husband never once told me he loved me – even though I asked him several times. He always answered, 'I'm not the mushy type.' Tonight, he clipped out your column and wrote across it. 'Yes. She is a beautiful person. I'm a lucky man.' I cried like a baby. Make that two yeses from O. City."

Brothers and sisters, the point is this – and as professionals you already know this – get your information about what Latter-day Saint women are thinking and feeling about their marriages directly from them, not from their spouse. And of course, the same goes for what men are thinking and feeling. Surveys about marital satisfaction and other sources of statistical information are helpful in painting a broad picture, but they can't predict what answers you will get from individuals. Furthermore, as you already know, many members of marital couples, especially the women, may feel confused about their feelings. Sometimes when women hear in lessons and talks that righteousness is happiness and if they're being obedient and working hard and holding family home evening and reading the scriptures and fulfilling their callings, then they must be happy. Well, if they're not happy, it's sometimes very difficult for them to figure out why they're not happy – and, most especially, what to do about it.

It has been my experience (and you would know this better than I) that many women don't have a way to process their feelings that don't fit the model, so they try to cope in one of three ways. First, they deny their real

feelings or repress them. Second, they admit that they're experiencing difficulty, but they minimize these discrepant feelings by saying, "This is just a bad phase I'm going through" or "It's true I'm not very happy, but that's not important." Or third, they blame themselves.

It takes much patient listening and careful questions, and especially an environment of support and love and understanding, for many of these sisters to feel safe enough to start exploring their confused and confusing feelings. Such expressions come with difficulty and hedged about with many qualifiers. They say, "I'm not complaining, but ..." "I know I'm lucky to have a husband who's active in the Church, but ..." "I know our bishop is already too busy but ..." or "It doesn't really affect my testimony but ..." They don't want others to think they're whining or unappreciative or unwilling to serve. They're actually incredibly positive, appreciative, and willing to serve, "but ..."

It is at the point where they say "but ..." that they can start to recognize and deal with the problems. As professionals, you are aware of the fact that both men and women (but perhaps women more frequently than men) are used to hearing messages and trying very hard to follow those messages. As a result, if they receive counsel from a father or a bishop or even a therapist suggesting that their problems can be quickly and easily solved if they will only do one or two simple things, sometimes they will accept this counsel only to discover it doesn't work. Then they experience increased struggles – once again blaming themselves or minimizing their problems and denying their real feelings.

I am not going to share the personal experiences of these women who have confided in me. Because you also have professional requirements about keeping confidences, I know you will understand. But Wendy Top, who is the author of an inspirational book for women and their need to find freedom in Christ and his atonement (2000), says that she used to be one of these women. She writes:

For a time, I paid a high and ongoing price in the form of clinical depression for trying to match up to the mirage of "Molly Mormon/Patty Perfect." I spent many years trying to do every good thing I saw in others (sometimes resenting them for it) or heard about at church or read about in the *Ensign*. For instance, I would see Sister A with all her lovely children and think, "I should be having more children. I am supposed to have a lot of children like Sister A."

I would hear in Relief Society about how everyone loved Sister B because she was always the first person to bring in a meal or give a baby shower, and I would think how selfish I was with my time and how I should be more like Sister B. In sacrament meeting I heard Sister C say that her family had never missed a family home evening, and I felt unworthy because we missed quite regularly. I fretted that my husband and I should be as faithful as Sister C and her husband. I often mistook well-intentioned Mormon traditions for carved-in-stone commandments. I got caught on the treadmill of trying to do everything I was ever asked to do in the Church, being concerned about what others might think if my children didn't earn their award, causing strife in my marriage because my husband drank Coke. The list could go on ... I just assumed that if it was taught in the Church, or if other LDS sisters were doing it, it was part of the gospel and I had to do it. (Top, 2000, pp. 10-11)

So that's the first point I want to make. Many times, the barriers to happier, holier living for women is their feeling that they shouldn't have any problems living the gospel, that being the wife of an active Melchizedek Priesthood holder and having a temple marriage should have trouble-proofed their marriage, and that their lives have to be lived out according to one true script.

I strongly feel that the best way to build happier, healthier families is by strengthening individuals, and that the best way to do that is to strengthen their faith and hope in *Christ*. There are actually two parts to this. The first part is that women need to be strong individuals, not weak. Sister Barbara W. Winder, a past General President of the Relief Society, commented:

Sometimes we hear of priesthood bearers being overly critical of their wives and children. Some time ago I was visiting a region where a joint priesthood/Relief Society leadership meeting was held. One of the priesthood leaders was the husband of the Relief Society president. During the meeting principles of cooperation were discussed and expressions of appreciation were given for the opportunity to work together. But the actions of this couple spoke louder than words. He treated her as a servant, thrusting her his coat to hang up, criticizing her cooking and homemaking skills, [and] scolding the children for minor infractions. (Winder, 1988, pp. 64-65)

Sister Winder then quoted President Spencer W. Kimball as saying in his priesthood meeting address in October 1979:

Our sisters do not wish to be indulged or to be treated condescendingly; they desire to be respected and revered as our sisters and our equals. I mention all these things, my brethren, not because the doctrines or the teachings of the Church regarding women are in any doubt, but because in some situations our behavior is of doubtful quality. (Kimball, 1979, p.49)

Then Sister Winder concluded:

Let neither [men nor women] envy the other for their differences; let both discern what is superficial and what is basic in those differences and act accordingly. And may the brotherhood of the priesthood and the sisterhood of the Relief Society be a blessing in the lives of all members of the Church as we help each other along the path of perfection. (Winder, 1988, p. 65)

A strong marriage is one in which the partners have learned to cleave together [glue], not cleave apart [split]. Service and self-sacrifice are foundational principles of the gospel. In a marriage, I think it is true that one partner will be called upon to be forbearing and patient and self-sacrificial with the weaknesses of the other; but there is something lopsided and wrong if only one partner in the marriage is always called upon for self-sacrifice or if only one partner is always required to be patient. You will know best how to redress such lopsidedness. Some of the women I have listened to have not had good experiences in therapy. As a result, I also feel that any approach or technique or instruction that is aimed at strengthening one individual by weakening a second individual will ultimately backfire, even if the first individual is motivated by love and self-sacrifice to cooperate with such a program of weakening.

I subscribe wholeheartedly to the importance of strong families! I could not be a more fervent believer in the proposition that each child will thrive best in a family with two loving and righteous parents. I know the importance of righteous priesthood leadership in the home; in fact, my husband's priesthood power literally saved my life on one occasion. And I realize that there are strong and righteous men who are patiently doing

far more than their share because the wives and mothers who should be their appreciative full partners are behaving irresponsibly. In other words, if there is a problem with creating partnerships in marriages, my sense is that both husbands and wives need to sacrifice, accommodate, and compensate.

Of course no marriage is going to be successful if either partner is scrupulously keeping track of who works longer or harder, who makes the most sacrifices, and who is giving more to the relationship. I am not suggesting that couples in trouble should be taught to be better accountants, I am suggesting that they should be taught to be better partners. In our current culture, you may assume that this means teaching them to adopt traditional roles of relating to each other and stop making a fuss about it. Instead, consider very carefully the strengths and weaknesses of everyone in the family – even pray for inspired insight – and then find ways to help husbands and wives become partners to each other and help parents and children become partners to each other. Building a peaceful and loving home will take every ounce of love, strength, and sacrifice that both partners possess. As someone once remarked: “Chains do not hold a marriage together. It is threads, hundreds of tiny threads which sew people together through the years” (Signoret, 1996, p.8). Here's a little story to keep in mind:

Eliza met a tailor when he was 20. He had never been to school. She married him. Taught him to read, write, spell. He learned fast. Became President. Inherited post-Civil War reconstruction problems. Beat an impeachment rap by just one vote after trying to fire his Secretary of War for justifiable reasons. Bought Alaska from the Russians for \$7 million. Lost his try at a second term. Ran for U.S. Senate instead, and won. His name? Andrew Johnson. America will reach its full maturity when an Andrew does the same for an Eliza. (*Bits & Pieces*, 1986, p. 2)

So the first request is to listen carefully to what women say, including the things they have not yet been able to articulate even to themselves. Strengthen women as marriage partners by strengthening them as individuals who turn to Christ, who are guided by the power of his spirit, and who feel the hope and joy that come from his love. Focus on the unity [glue] that comes from cleaving together as partners rather than splitting [cleaver] apart.

After all, brothers and sisters, Jesus asked husband

and wife to become “one flesh” (Matthew 19:5). But you can’t become “one flesh” if the husband is flesh but the wife is just a pretty embroidered dishtowel or a cardboard cut-out of a woman.

MOTHERHOOD AND FATHERHOOD

The second message is about becoming better parents. It is about doing the *glue* kind of cleaving instead of the *splitting* kind of cleaving. Nearly all of the women I know love their children with all their hearts and are doing absolutely the best they can for them. Now I know that you see careless, negligent, even criminal parenting among your clients. Mothers and fathers continually need to learn parenting skills to help them create a loving environment for the family, and the same is true for you to continually help parents to acquire those skills.

My heart is wrapped around my sons and the two wonderful women they have brought into our family and the children that have been born into those families. Quite simply, nothing else is as important to me as they are. But I have listened to the stories of many women who feel that their lives are wasted and useless because their children have made some negative choices. And I also listen to the pain of single women who are subtly excluded because they have no children.

I want to share some very touching statements by children about their mothers: Eleven-year-old Ling Tai said: “My mother is like the weather and I am just a seed. Without the sun or the rain I would not be able to grow into a flower, healthy and beautiful. Her warmth and love makes me grow. Bigger and bigger.” Erica Llantoudes, now age seventeen, searched her memory back to her first consciousness to describe her mother: “Even when she is angry, her eyes are never looking at me angrily. Since the day I remember myself I never saw her looking at my sister or me angrily.” Six-year-old Rachel Darbon marveled at her mother’s mysterious powers: “When it is time for me to tidy up my bedroom I hide things under the bed. I don’t know how she knows they are there.” And the last statement again comes from Ling Tai: “My life is like a long piece of string, full of knots. But my mother’s love is another piece of long string, with no tangles no knots. It just runs forever” (Exley, 1992).

These are very tender expressions. They capture what I think is the universal desire of women all over the world to be good mothers. I know that there are many

reasons why women fail in that goal. Some of them are too inexperienced. Some of them have received very bad mothering themselves and are still immature children themselves. Some of them are too exhausted by their lives and problems. Some of them are too frightened by the immensity of the task of mothering.

You not only have to deal professionally with these mothers, trying to help them grow past their limitations so that they can be the kind of mothers they want to be, but all too often you also have to deal, fifteen or twenty or thirty years later, with the children who have been neglected or abused or emotionally starved because of the inadequacies of these mothers. Help them to remember that part of the glory of the gospel is not only that we have a loving Father in Heaven who holds out the promise to every worthy woman of eternal motherhood, but that we also have a Mother in Heaven, about whom we will remember more some day. Perhaps it is true that each mother *inherits* part of her motherhood and *invents* part of it, but I think it would inspire women to be reminded that they can remember and recover an eternal model of motherhood – and that, whatever the inadequacies of their mortal father and mother, they have eternal parents who are fulfilling in every way.

And let me tell you just two stories to remind us that children sometimes have their own agendas: One mother who was teaching her children about fire safety quizzed them: “What’s the first thing you should do when the smoke alarm goes off?” Her five-year-old son immediately answered, “Take dinner out of the oven!”

And another mother reported playing a Bible song called “Train Up a Child” for her daughter, Emily, who asked what “train up” meant. The mother explained that “it means to teach children about God and the difference between right and wrong.”

“Are you and Daddy training me up?” Emily asked.

“We’re trying to,” the mother said.

Emily turned back to the stereo and muttered, “We’ll see about that!” (*Christian Parenting Today*, 2000, p. 16).

Brothers and sisters, probably most of you are parents as well as therapists. So you know that we are all in this together. All of us need all the hands we have got, or can enlist, to keep rowing and bailing (so to speak) at the same time. None of us has a spare hand with which to point fingers at someone else. I’m just glad that AMCAP members, as a group, have miraculously sprouted extra limbs so that, in addition to doing your own rowing and bailing, you can offer a

helping hand to parents who will do better when they know better, thanks to you.

FAMILY READING

The third point I want to make is about a cause that is dear to my heart. This cause is reading to children – but I would like to describe its many positive possibilities as family reading. Having a “library for learning” is one of the four points that President Thomas S. Monson outlined in his “Hallmarks of a Happy Home.” He said:

Reading is one of the true pleasures of life. In our age of mass culture, when so much that we encounter is abridged, adapted, adulterated, shredded, and boiled down, it is mind-easing and mind-inspiring to sit down privately with a congenial book. (Monson, 2001, p.5)

This is certainly true, but it is his next sentence that I want to focus on: “Young children also enjoy books and love to have their parents read to them.” Family reading has its own dynamic. The other three hallmarks that President Monson mentions are “a pattern of prayer, a legacy of love, and a treasuring of testimony” (Monson, 2001).

These qualities do indeed characterize happy homes, but I would submit to you that reading is a little different. Reading can be an entering point toward happiness even when a home is desperately and apparently terminally unhappy. There may be so much conflict in a home that prayers become opportunities for political statements, love seems like only a distant dream, and one person’s testimony becomes a club to beat up another member of the family. In such circumstances, reading is a neutral and low-conflict activity that can form the foundation for adding prayer, love, and testimony.

One of my friends, Nancy Kerr, is president of the Reading Foundation in Kennewick, Washington (see: www.readingfoundation.org/home.asp). The local school district has set as a resolute goal the challenge of being sure that 90% of the third-graders graduate from that class reading at or above grade level [see Rosier, 2002], since they have discovered that children who aren’t caught up at that point may never catch up for their entire academic careers. Nancy’s job is to get parents reading to children twenty happy minutes a day from birth (Fielding, Kerr & Rosier, 1998, pp. 74-75). And I mean literally from birth. One of their projects is to send newborns home from the commu-

nity hospitals with a reading kit containing a library card, a first book, pamphlets about reading, and a baby bib proclaiming in cross-stitch “Read to Me!” [see Kerr, 2002].

I became aware of Nancy and her group at the same time that Karen Morgan here in Utah was successfully working for passage of a bill to mandate accountability and grade-level testing. And of course our Relief Society general presidency, during the term of our office, had stressed literacy as a worldwide service project. But what really kept my attention was my little grandson, Kenzo, who just turned two and who lives near enough that I can see him almost every day. We spend a lot of time reading to each other, and he is already to the stage where he will announce, “I read, Nana!” and recite the entire text of a book, turning the pages at the appropriate intervals.

I enjoy these sessions enormously, but just the other day, while reading with Kenzo, I focused briefly not upon all the good things that were happening, but upon all the bad things that were not happening. And I realized that much of the tension and conflict in dysfunctional families simply couldn’t happen in a reading setting. For instance,

- There was no shouting, no squabbling, and no shoving. Kenzo was sitting happily next to me, “being cozy” as he says. We were conversing in quiet tones and laughing a lot. I was praising him for identifying letters or explaining pictures. In short, it was a completely positive interaction that did not leave room for a negative interaction.
- It is an orderly experience but one that does not require much planning. It avoided the extreme regimentation that would not accommodate personal feelings or the situation of the moment, but it also had enough structure that it was not just random, potentially dangerous or disobedient behavior.
- It eliminated one of the things that children get into a lot of trouble for, namely, being messy or destructive. Kenzo was turning the pages carefully. He knew how to put books down and pick them up. He was learning to respect property, and in this case, his own.
- It eliminated a lot of the fatiguing noise and irritating chatter of a radio or TV that is on constantly in the background. Kenzo and I were deeply involved in an experience with words, but it was purposeful, meaningful words. We were selecting the images, rather than simply accepting whatever came in from the TV or radio.
- It eliminates competition for time and attention. Isn’t reading a good way to produce security for a child, giving him a lot of control over a desired and desirable

activity that will guarantee him the attention of a significant adult? Granted, Kenzo is a first child, so it is easy for me and his parents to give him undivided attention frequently. Individual reading might not be possible in households with many children, particular children who are close in age; but group reading is a possibility. There are a lot of advantages to reading individually with a child (or having the child read to the parent) if a parent can manage it.

- It eliminates or controls some of the fear of new experiences by providing a bridge to the larger world. Kenzo likes bugs, so I brought over a new book about insects the other day. We read the book and then we went outside where he squatted down and observed the ants in the garden with fascination for a long time. When the ants finally disappeared in their anthill, he straightened up, looked all around the yard, stared into the sky, and shouted, "Magpie, Nana!" There was a bird I had identified for him only a few days earlier and which he remembered. Then he announced with great satisfaction, "There's a lot of creatures around. It's a wild world, Nana!" Maybe he'll be a philosopher, too, when he's nine! And he is not filled with fear or anxiety about the world outside his home.

Now, brothers and sisters, I said at the beginning of this talk that it would be foolish of me to suggest therapeutic techniques for you. I still feel that way, but please evaluate this suggestion on its merits. There's no law that says reading to each other has to stop when a child turns six or nine or sixteen. Maybe a parent and a child have a relationship so conflicted that there are very few things they can talk about, and you wish you could just give them a script and have them stumble through a few pleasant speeches, just so they get the idea. Well, reading to each other can be a way to do just that. They don't have to talk about chores or their relationship or getting in on time or their grades. They can just enjoy twenty minutes of *Huckleberry Finn* or *The Secret Garden* or stories about Jesus.

An older child who wouldn't tolerate being read to or reading aloud to a parent might not be so prickly if he or she is reading to a younger brother or sister, and the results are the same. It is an nondistracting, positive activity that provides both spontaneity and structure. It simply eliminates a whole range of negative behaviors – at least for those twenty minutes – and there are all of the positive results too. What if a beleaguered parent, instead of wishing the kids would simply disappear, was

thinking of ways to do household chores together so that one of the children can be reading aloud while the parents and other children work together.

Think of all the time families spend in the car. I'm sure, if there are three people in the car, there are at least four opinions about which radio station or which CD they should listen to. Wouldn't a couple of chapters from *Swiss Family Robinson* or from the high school U.S. history assignment provide a better launching pad for family interaction?

And what about a husband and wife? They may not have good ways of talking to each other yet. They may not trust each other enough to be honest. They may not love each other enough to share their hearts and their thoughts. They may even feel too hurt and damaged to pray together. But if they were reading (say, the scriptures) together aloud twenty minutes a day – in the car, after breakfast, during food preparation or clean up – isn't this an activity that is structured enough to be safe, neutral enough to reduce conflict, and positive enough to provide a bridge toward communication upon which even tentative steps may be taken toward each other?

One of the most inspiring stories that Nancy Kerr told (Fielding, et al, 1998) was about visiting a child development class at the high school. One of the unmarried teenage mothers had just given birth and had brought her baby daughter to class for the first time. The teacher brought out one of the reading kits and whispered to Nancy,

"This is something you might like to see ..."

The girl's friends were admiring the baby and asking questions such as "How much does she weigh?" and "How was the delivery?" When there was a pause, [Nancy said,] I offered my compliments and added, "I hope you're reading to her?"

"Of course! Every night," responded the new mother swiftly. "Her father and I even read to her before she was born."

Stunned at the image of two unwed teens reading to their unborn child, [Nancy] managed to ask, "How did you know to do that?"

Before she could answer, another teen jumped in, "Twenty minutes a day! It's everywhere – radio, TV, newspapers. You've got to read to children." (Fielding, et al, 1998, p. 35)

Brothers and sisters, I have been appalled and concerned at the statistics of illegitimate births in the United States. This birth was one of those statistics. But

the image of a teenage boy taking his turn to read to the bulge in his girlfriend's abdomen before the birth of the baby they had conceived under who knows what conditions, fills me with a lot of hope that their little daughter might not grow up as one of America's neglected children in one of America's poverty-stricken families.

CONCLUSION

Dear brothers and sisters of AMCAP, thank you for giving me this space in which to share my thoughts. Remember the etymological explorations as to how "cleave" can mean both splitting asunder and gluing together. Remember how we began, with the nine-year-old philosopher who thinks that Adam and Eve spent a typical day in the Garden of Eden by having "deep talks about what they were there for" – and that we've been trying to figure this out ever since (Heller, 1994, p. 15).

Then remember my request that you listen carefully to the stories and also the silences of women so that they can become stronger partners by becoming stronger individuals. Help them turn to Christ, learn to rejoice in his love, to rely on the power of his atonement, and draw on his unfailing strength during difficult times.

Second, I talked about women as mothers and asked you, for the sake of both mothers and fathers, to strengthen both men and women in being good parents.

And third, I shared with you my own passion about teaching children to read and reading with them – and continuing to read, not only for all of the good things it

brings with it but also because of all the dysfunction it can eliminate, or at least hold at bay, for twenty minutes. Remember Kenzo, happy and contented in his "wild world," and remember the unwed teenage couple reading to their unborn daughter.

President Gordon B. Hinckley will be known for many mighty works and words in this generation, but perhaps his most significant work will be that of providing the blessings of the temple to many thousands of members for whom family sealings would have remained only a cherished but distant dream. This achievement is coupled with the standard he has held up for responsible, loving, and disciplined family life. Let me close with his vision of how to empower families with hope and strength – a vision that energizes your work. He says:

I believe in the family where there is a husband who regards his companion as his greatest asset and treats her accordingly; where there is a wife who looks upon her husband as her anchor and strength, her comfort and security; where there are children who look to mother and father with respect and gratitude; where there are parents who look upon those children as blessings and find a great and serious and wonderful challenge in their nurture and rearing. The cultivation of such a home requires effort and energy, forgiveness and patience, love and endurance and sacrifice, but it is worth all of these and more. (Hinckley, 1997, p. 205)

I bear witness to the power and eternal truthfulness of that vision, and I do it in the name of Jesus Christ, amen.

REFERENCES

- Bits & Pieces* (April 1986). New York: United Technologies Corp.
- Christian Parenting Today* (January/February 2000). Let's Eat and Training Trouble, p. 16.
- Exley, Helen (1992). *To the world's best mother*. New York:Exley.
- Fielding, L., Kerr, N. & Rosier, P. (1998). *The 90% Reading Goal*. Kennewick WA: The New Foundation Press.
- Heller, David (1994). *Just build the ark and the animals will come*. New York:Villard Books.
- Hinckley, Gordon B. (1997). *Teachings of Gordon B. Hinckley*. Salt Lake City:Deseret Book.
- Hymns of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints* (1985). Salt Lake City:The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.
- Kerr, N. (2002, Fall). Early learning critical to scholastic success. *Migrant Education News*. Washington State Migrant Education Program, Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction. available: www.migratednews.org/NovWeb/1Reading.htm
- Kimball, S.W. (November, 1979). Our Sisters of the Church. *Ensign*, 48-49.
- Landers, Ann (1996). *Wake up and smell the coffee*. New York:Villard.
- Monson, Thomas S.(October 2001). Hallmarks of a happy home, *Ensign*, pp. 2-8.
- Rosier, P. (2002, January). Our goal: 90 percent reading. *The School Administrator*, 20-23.
- Signoret, Simone (1996). Quoted in R. Louv, *The web of life*. Berkeley CA: Conari Press, p. 8.
- Top, Wendy D. (2000). *Getting past the labels: How the truth makes women free*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft.
- Winder, Barbara W. (1988). More, Savior, like Thee. In *Brigham Young University 1988 Devotional and Fireside Speeches*, pp. 64-65.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS PRESENTED AT THE SPRING AMCAP CONVENTION - APRIL 1999

Extending the Influence of Research and Practice

JANET S. SCHARMAN, PhD

*Brigham Young University
AMCAP President, 1997-1999*

with

GARY DIXON, MS

*Vice-President, Bonneville International
President, The Foundation for a Better Life*

Just a few years ago, we celebrated the twentieth anniversary of AMCAP (see Bush, 1995). That was a time to reflect upon what actually prompted a handful of LDS mental health specialists to formalize their association and create this organization of Mormon Counselors & Psychotherapists. Among their thoughts at the time (Jensen, 1978; Lankford, 1975) were at least three things:

1. First was to create a safe haven from the many special interest groups in the field who can be very powerful and very confusing – and sometimes very distracting from the most important things (i.e., spiritual and eternal).

2. Another was, as members of a profession that is self-proclaimed to be the most non-religious of all professions, to be able to gather together and escape from that non-religious theme.

3. Third, they hoped to be able to learn new skills and to refresh previous learning in an atmosphere of shared values; that is, to take the very best of what is known professionally and mesh that with great spiritual truths.

AMCAP has done those things and done them well – and will continue to do them. Of course, an important question for each of us is, “What can I learn from this organization to help me?” However, to this question should also be added another: “How can I use what I learn

here to bless others, to reach out to the rest of the world?”

A few weeks ago, Elder M. Russell Ballard spoke at a regional conference in the North Davis County area in Utah, and essentially what he said was:

We claim to have a living prophet who receives modern-day revelation. We also claim to believe in prophets of old who foresaw our day. And yet how often is it that we fail to acknowledge, or even recognize, that we are living out the fulfillment of those prophecies right now? (Ballard, 1999a)

A few years ago Elder Henry B. Eyring (1997) spoke about attending to the prophecies of church leaders, about paying attention to what the prophets are saying. He said that our choice is either to accept what they have to say or ignore them. But once a decision to ignore them is made, we stand on much more dangerous ground

Janet S. Scharman PhD, AMCAP President 1997-1999, is a graduate (PhD) of the University of Utah. She previously was the Dean of Students and currently is the Vice President of Student Life at Brigham Young University. Address for correspondence: A-333 ASB, BYU, Provo UT 84602 (801) 422-2387 email <jan_scharman@byu.edu>

because we are no longer able to hear the words of the Lord in the same way. We are not nearly as receptive to the inspired counsel that could guide, help and direct us. Therefore, following the ongoing counsel and guidelines of the church leaders becomes vitally important.

A couple of weeks ago Mahatma Gandhi's grandson, Arun Gandhi, spoke at the Brigham Young University Forum. The general theme of his lecture was quite interesting. He stated (Gandhi, 1999) that the twentieth century has been the most violent of any period of time in the history of the world. The most violent! Just think about what that might mean, in terms of prophecies and *signs of the times*. What comes to mind when thinking of "wars and rumors of wars" (Matt. 24:6)? It is an all-too-familiar phrase! This past week the media has broadcast the terrible events in Kosovo. And there have also been other tragic events around the world (and our hearts go out to those who suffer as a result of them). But even though the coming wars in the "last days" will be bigger than these, there might very well be more than just bombs and bullets and blood. Perhaps an even "bigger" war will be waged, attacking the very core of those things that are of eternal importance (see Bensen, 1974; Eyring, 1999b). For example:

- The number of people who are experiencing major depression nowadays is ten times greater than it was just two generations ago (Elliott & Tyrrell, 1999), yet indicators of general well-being are as high as they have ever been. There are no major worldwide wars, inflation is low, interest rates are low, unemployment is low, luxuries are more available than they have ever been. Yet depression is on the rise (see Bensen, 1974). And while in the past major depression was considered a disorder of middle-aged women, it is now significantly (Elliot & Tyrrell, 1999) affecting teenagers and young adults (young adults are now the most rapidly growing group suffering from depression, both men and women). Think about what that means: these young people are at the age of making major decisions shaping their identities and their sexual preferences, determining whether or not they will get married and have families, what they are going to do for careers, what kind of contributions they are going to make to society, what roles they are going to play. If they can be confused at this stage and caused to deviate from a wise course, what a pow-

erfully tragic tool that influence could be!

- Advertisers are furiously targeting youth. The figures are surprising: in 1998 a staggering \$119 billion dollars were spent by teenagers. It is expected this figure will go up to \$136 billion by the year 2001 (Proctor, 1999). Some children cannot repeat one word of the Sunday School topic, yet they can repeat every word of many TV and radio commercials.

Maureen Jensen Proctor, who wrote *Madison Avenue Wants Your Children*, says:

The television screen gives us a very different set of commandments than we get from the burning bush: Thou shalt endlessly covet. Thou shalt grow up too fast. Thou art the center of the universe. Thou shalt put the gods of materialism and business before all else. (Proctor, 1999)

If any part of that is true, and it certainly seems to be, it is a very sad commentary on how things have shifted in society in recent years. Emotionally, senses and sensitivities are being challenged at every turn. To watch TV or movies nowadays, besides being subjected to sex and violence, is to experience a very high-energy kind of "attack" through visual sensations and high-intensity musical stimulation.

For example, several weeks ago, Brent [S. Brent Scharman PhD, AMCAP President 1988-89] and I took a couple of grandchildren to see the animated movie *Prince of Egypt* (Chapman, et al., 1999). It was really quite an interesting movie. But it starts out with a lot of very loud music and really dramatic images: the perspective goes up to building tops and mountain tops, then it shows a slave carrying a heavy load on his back, and he trips and falls, then is beaten with a whip. The look of terror on his face is intense. Then Rameses and Moses race chariots through the city creating havoc. The chariots tip over; there is a lot of loud music and very loud sounds. Well, about ten minutes into this onslaught, the three-year old crawled onto my lap, hid his face, closed his eyes, and went to sleep. That is how a lot of children react to this kind of over-stimulation or to frightening things. But it is not just children: adults also act similarly when bombarded with too much, because sometimes it is just too hard to keep dealing with it all.

An obvious example of the war being waged over things of eternal significance is the past year's historical events: the president of the United States was

impeached, and we watched a Senate trial. These are pretty momentous events. And yet how often during the course of these events, did we hear all that was talked about on the radio or TV, and felt like turning it off – just did not want to have to handle it any more? There is a significant social impact. These things heard on the TV or radio and read in the newspapers have now become so commonplace that people who just a few years ago would have blushed at the words “oral sex” are now discussing such things in social settings, in church, even in AMCAP meetings! Society has become significantly desensitized (see Ballard, 1999b).

A few weeks ago an article in the *Salt Lake Tribune* (Jackson, 1999) reported a survey of certain sexual behaviors among a thousand people randomly sampled across the United States. Of these 1000 randomly surveyed people, 9% admitted to having made love at work. And even more interestingly, 12% said they had accidentally interrupted colleagues who were making love at work. Now there are some looks of shock in the audience. What many of you may be thinking is, “This doesn’t happen where I work – I must work in a pretty boring place!” But the fact is that *something* is happening. It is not known if this is happening more commonly nowadays than in the past, or if society is just more open now and it has become more acceptable to talk about such things (see Ballard, 1999b). Once again, though, these are the kinds of things that our society, including the children, is being exposed to.

Tom Lickona PhD, a developmental psychologist and a professor at the State University of New York at Cortland, has researched college-aged people who have engaged in premarital sex (Lickona, Lickona & Boudreau, 1994; Lickona, 1994). Note that all the people he interviewed had willingly been involved in premarital sex. So this is not about people who have been raped or sexually abused or coerced or seduced, or who have been forced in any way at all. These are people who have willingly participated in premarital sex. His interviews resulted in some very interesting findings. Dr. Lickona said:

In discussions of teen sex, much is said about the dangers of pregnancy and disease – but far less about the emotional hazards. And that’s a problem, because the destructive psychological consequences of temporary sexual relationships are very real. (Lickona, 1994, p. 34)

What he found is that a significantly high percentage of these people who chose to engage in premarital sex reported feeling emotionally distraught afterwards. They felt distrustful of relationships, oftentimes embarrassed or depressed. About a year ago, at a conference at the *Institute on College Student Values* in Tallahassee, Dr. Lickona reported specifically what some of these young people had said. One of the most powerful quotes is from a young woman who said, “There is no condom for the heart” (Lickona, 1998).

Of course, spiritually-aware counselors and psychotherapists would understand these things. But sometimes there is a real hesitancy to speak out. Dr. Lickona does not know very much about the truths taught in the LDS church. Rather, he is merely talking about his research. AMCAP members already know these principles but may sometimes be a little reluctant to move clients in spiritual directions that might very well be most helpful and healthful for them. Dr. Lickona gave the example:

we would never get a group of young people together and talk about the problems of drug usage, and then say “you know, in spite of everything we have said, if you still want to use drugs, let’s give you some clean needles and hook you up with a good drug dealer.” (Lickona, 1998)

And yet, as Dr. Lickona points out, that is exactly what is happening all around this country regarding premarital sex.

Another example of this war we are all involved in is related to this AMCAP convention theme – the family. Characteristics of the changing family over the last several years are really astounding. In 1975, 32% of women with children under 2 years of age were working outside the home. But in 1995, 83% of women went back to work within 6 months after childbirth (Advancing Women, 1998). Now for some women this was a choice, but for many it was *not* a choice. It was something they felt compelled to do, oftentimes because of financial reasons. In an informal survey (Advancing Women, 1998) in the state of Utah, working women with children were asked why they were working. The vast majority said it was to provide necessities for their family, not because they were dissatisfied at home or they needed more stimulation, but because of serious financial needs. They talked about things like orthodontic braces and music

lessons and college and missions. Of course, it is very hard to judge exactly what *necessities* are compared to *luxuries*. But the truth is that society is changing in such a way that more women are feeling compelled to go back to work, even when they would prefer to stay home with their babies. This is a very difficult issue for them, financially as well as personally.

Only 7% of U.S. families conform to the "Ozzie and Harriet" model: that is, a husband working outside the home and a woman working as a homemaker, with two children in their home (Advancing Women, 1998). Most of the children being raised now do not know these models or who Ozzie and Harriet were (or Donna Reed or others like them); they don't have any idea what these characters symbolize. Grandma does not know about MTV; the children do not know about Ozzie and Harriet. Certainly there are some very big differences between children's experiences and role models today and those of their parents and grandparents.

Another important statistic regarding families is that almost half (48%) of married working women provide at least half of their family's income (Families and Work Institute, 1995). This is an important statistic because it means both husband and wife are being exposed to the same kinds of stresses and pressures at work (and likely long hours, with high demands). When they both get home, which of them has enough energy to be able to pick up the pieces for the family and hold it together?

Another example comes from Eric Jensen's book (1998), *Teaching with the Brain in Mind*, which talks about what is really helpful in raising young children. He talks about the high sensitivity a developing fetus has to the mother's stress levels and nutrition. For many young people, nutritional levels are oftentimes very low. Certainly this is common in the university setting; young students eat terribly unbalanced meals and are under very high stress. Jensen (1998) also points out that because of the way the brain is being organized in infancy, if a child is exposed to stress or violence within weeks or months after being born, the developing brain is actually reorganized so as to become more impulsive and more aggressive. No wonder many educators report the number of children with impulsive and aggressive behaviors has been rising dramatically in recent years.

Jensen (1998) discusses a recent poll which showed that 82% of parents say they do not encourage reading at home. Eighty-two percent – that is astounding! These

parents say their children are too distracted by TV to read. Another poll stated that 90% of children aged 9-13 play video games, and that 26% of them play about 6 hours a day. Now, when they are in front of the video machines, they are not doing other things, and this can be very important developmentally. They are focusing on two-dimensional kinds of things instead of three-dimensional; this impacts them socially and physically in some very dramatic ways (see Jensen, 1998).

One more example of modern spiritual warfare has to do with computers. There are two things I really love about computers: I love email, and I love being able to correct a mistake without having to redo the whole thing; I love being able to cut and paste. These are great advantages! But the computer has also brought great problems, and one of these problems is pornography. Recently, at BYU, the Student Life secretary was doing an Internet search and did not know exactly where to find what she was looking for, so she just typed in a word – a pretty benign word. All of a sudden what popped up on the screen were two very large-breasted naked women! She let out a little bit of a scream. This is not the best thing to have on a computer in an office that oversees the BYU Honor Code! She exited from that program pretty quickly, and everyone had a good laugh. But the reaction might have been quite different if this had been a child who accessed that site in the privacy of his bedroom.

Society is bombarded with such things. One of the people who works at the university library mentioned there is a program which is able to detect a lot of the incoming pornographic web sites, and thus these sites can be blocked from the campus network. He said that one night he left work about 8:00 pm, got back to work at 7:00 am, and found there were over 400 new pornographic sites identified that had been published onto the Internet overnight. This could be overwhelming!

Or it could be energizing, considering that AMCAP members are uniquely qualified – because of training, education, experience, and the knowledge of great truths – to fight for what is right in this battle for the hearts and minds of children. We should be thinking of what we can do to help, what talents we can share, knowing we understand something of human development and what it takes to really help people change. And, because of our spiritual commitment we know these things at a much deeper level than many other professionals who

have similar training. So, how can we use this knowledge to bless lives? This is one of the significant problems AMCAP members face – how to send a message from our vantage point to other professionals, one that will truly be heard (see Ballard, 1999b).

Gary Dixon, Vice-President of Bonneville International, has graciously offered to talk for a few minutes about what the LDS Church has done in this regard, one of the ways the Church is sharing its message.

**GARY DIXON, M.S., VICE-PRESIDENT
OF BONNEVILLE INTERNATIONAL**

Thank you, Dr. Scharman. About 25 years ago, this question was asked: knowing all the wonderful truths of the restored gospel of Jesus Christ, how can the Church reach out with these truths to the rest of the world? This question was answered with the *Homefront* series (*Homefront* PSA Series, 1972). There were a lot of doubters, by the way, who said “Well, they are never going to let the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints put their name on television and not charge for it.” As a matter of fact, we did not know if the *Homefront* series would be broadcast even if the Church *did* pay for it. But it started with a very small effort in the beginning. Now let me show you a few of these spots. And by the way, I want to mention we have a great deal of appreciation for the counseling and the psychotherapy field. We tap into your world often and hire the services of a number of counselors and therapists to find those moments that would be most applicable in a *Homefront* setting. Long ago it became quite apparent that writers can live only so much life and have so many experiences, while therapists collectively have thousands upon thousands. So we interview on a regular basis many psychotherapists and counselors, and are very appreciative. You can see some of those experiences displayed here today [video of several *Homefront* clips: “Family: Isn’t It About ... Time?”].

In the beginning, we were quite concerned about whether TV stations would continue to accept these spots. They are sent out as public service announcements, meaning that the Church does not pay anything for the time, just like Smokey-the-Bear ads, for instance. In spite of the doubters, the popularity of the *Homefront* spots began to grow, largely because of this great truth about families: we *all* come from families

and are all part of families. Thus, these *Homefront* moments on the screen have become universally accepted. Last year, in 1998, *Homefront* aired 130,000 times across the USA at no charge. The key in this effort is to make sure that people are watching. Nielsen surveys show that *Homefront* was seen on average 1.3 million times a day across the USA. This is a real credit to the many people over the years who have contributed to the effort. It is also a credit to the encouragement of Church leaders, such as Elder M. Russell Ballard, who has often challenged us to learn to use the media more effectively. As the *Proclamation on the Family* reminds us, “The family is central – central to the Creator’s plan for the eternal destiny of His children” (Hinckley, 1995, p. 101). The *Homefront* spots have a little laugh sometimes, they are a little poignant sometimes – but all of us can see ourselves in them. Each of the *Homefront* spots is about things that are immediately applicable. But even more importantly, together they provide a national audience the chance to associate the Church’s name with these truths.

I want to thank AMCAP for the hundreds and hundreds of moments you have given the writers and producers and directors over the years, because this series could not have been produced without you.

JAN SCHARMAN, PhD

Gary, thank you. That is a real benefit to the world. AMCAP is also starting to expand its outreach: Dr. David Bush (AMCAP Vice-President) has set up an AMCAP website [editor’s note: the current AMCAP website address is: <http://www.amcap.net>]. This is a great way of publishing gospel truths within the helping professions to more people in the world. But personally speaking, there are things that individual members of AMCAP can do. For example, instead of focusing on the benefits of membership in our own work with clients – “What’s going to help me?” – we need to ask, “What can I do as a therapist and a member of this Church with a special gift that the rest of the world does not have (it is called the Holy Ghost) that can really bless people’s lives?” Of course, many AMCAP members are already doing this in their clinical practices and classrooms. But there might be just a little more – a letter to an editor, an article for a journal, a presentation in another professional setting – which takes a stand and

shares ways to spiritually bless people's lives.

In a meeting a couple of weeks ago Elder Henry B. Eyring said (1999a), "There is always going to be more to do than can possibly be done; get used to it!" Notice that rather than saying what might be expected (for example, "Now, let's get our goals set; let's prioritize"), he just said, "There is a work to be done; the prophet has set the pace; and we are the ones to do it." There are many great opportunities to bless people's lives, to be a positive influence. The *Homefront* series has probably significantly touched many lives. And AMCAP members have an exceptional ability to do the same thing – to creatively help God's children, with his help.

There is absolutely no question what the outcome of

the ongoing spiritual war is going to be. The only really important question is: what side will you be on? And what can you contribute to victory?

Please know that the AMCAP Board appreciates all of your great efforts. There are so many very fine things already being done! It is a privilege to be associated with this organization. It is a wonderful privilege twice a year to be able to rub shoulders with AMCAP members at these conventions. There is really something special here; there is not another organization like this any place. Great things can happen when we are willing to think about how to share spiritually. Thank you for all the good things you are doing, for the opportunity to serve, and for your support.

REFERENCES

- Advancing Women (Accessed September 21, 1998). Working moms. *Advancing Women* web site, <www.advancingwomen.com/workingmoms.html>.
- Ballard, M.R. (March 21, 1999a). Talk presented at the Davis North Regional Conference. Bountiful, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.
- Ballard, M.R. (1999b, May). Like a flame unquenchable. *Ensign*, 85-87.
- Benson, E.T. (1974, November). Do not despair. *Ensign*, 65-67. Reprinted in *Ensign*, 1986, October, 2-5.
- Bush, D.W. (1995). A conversation with past AMCAP presidents 1975-1995. Printed in *AMCAP Journal*, 2000, 25, 75-89.
- Chapman, B., Hickner, S. & Wells, S. (Directors) (1999). *The Prince of Egypt* (film). Universal City, California: Dreamworks Pictures.
- Elliott, R. & Tyrrell, M. (Accessed February 1999). Major Depression Facts – Why the sudden increase? *Clinical-Depression* web site, <www.clinical-depression.co.uk/Depression_Information/facts.htm>. Brighton, UK: Uncommon Knowledge Ltd.
- Eyring, H.B. (1997, May). Finding safety in counsel. *Ensign*, 25, 24-27.
- Eyring, H.B. (1999a, March). Talk presented to the BYU Student Service Association leadership group. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.
- Eyring, H.B. (1999b, May). The Power of Teaching Doctrine. *Ensign*, 73-75.
- Families and Work Institute (1995). *Women: The New Providers: a survey of 1,502 women*. Cited in *Advancing Women*, 1998.
- Gandhi, A. (March 23, 1999). The 21st century is coming, but where are we going? Forum Lecture, Marriott Center. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University.
- Hinckley, G.B. (1995, November). Stand strong against the wiles of the world. *Ensign*, 98-101.
- Homefront* series. (1972-1999). Family: Isn't It About ... Time? Salt Lake City: Bonneville International. <www.boncom.com/hfawards.htm>
- Jackson, M. (February 11, 1999). Troublesome trysts: What's going on in the cubicle? *The Salt Lake Tribune*, p. A1.
- Jensen, E.P. (1998). *Teaching with the Brain in Mind*. Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development / Brain Store Inc.
- Jensen, V. (1978, Fall). A vital predecessor: LDSPGA and a broader vision: AMCAP. *AMCAP Journal*, 3, 3-30.
- Lankford, D. (1975, October). Editorial comments. *AMCAP Journal*, 1, 3.
- Lickona, T. (1994). The neglected heart. *American Educator*, 34-39.
- Lickona, T. (February 1998). Talk presented at the Institute on College Student Values, Tallahassee, FL.
- Lickona, T., Lickona, J. & W. Boudreau (1994). *Sex, Love and You*. New York: AveMaria Press.
- Proctor, M.J. (Accessed March 22, 1999). Madison Avenue wants your children. *Meridian Magazine* web site, <www.meridian-magazine.com/articles/000825madison.html>.

PRESENTED AT THE SPRING 2001 AMCAP CONVENTION - 30 MARCH 2001

How to Be Anxiously Engaged Without Being Anxious

LILI DE HOYOS ANDERSON, LCSW, PhD

Brigham Young University

Gospel principles suggest a three-realm conceptual model to understand and address life stresses. Telestial, terrestrial, and celestial kinds of stress are identified, with responses offered to each level of stress. Particular attention is called to the tendency of church members to get trapped in terrestrial stress.

The scriptures address three distinct kinds of stress corresponding to the three kingdoms of glory. Each of the kingdoms is characterized by varying levels of light, intelligence, truth, and law (see D&C 88:22-32). Stress can be usefully categorized according to these same parameters (De Hoyos, 1986). Such categorization brings greater insight and more effective application of principles which correctly target the problem and offer real solutions.

TELESTIAL STRESS - "THE SOAP OPERA SYNDROME"

Some might think that all stress should be considered *telestial*, because it is pretty unpleasant, but in fact there are also such things as *terrestrial* stress and *celestial* stress (which will be discussed later).

Telestial stress could well be nicknamed the *Soap Opera Syndrome* (Anderson, 1994), named from an incident that happened in my life many years ago:

We had moved from Utah just in time for my husband to start a Masters in Social Work program at the University of Oklahoma. I was nine months pregnant and probably should not have gone anywhere, but I did not want to stay in Utah and have the baby alone. This

was a difficult time; there already were two preschoolers at home, and the baby was two weeks overdue. My husband would call home several times daily to see if I had gone into labor. Of course, he did not want to remind me that the baby was overdue, so he would just call and ask, "How's it going?" and I would reply, "You want to know how it is going? Listen!" – then I would hold the phone out because usually someone in the house was screaming (and much of the time it was me). After the baby was finally born, I was so exhausted; I would sit on the couch for long periods of time with the baby, not wanting to move. I would feed the baby, hold the baby, then send one of the older kids for a diaper so I could change the baby. After a while, I started watching TV. There were only game shows or soap operas. I got tired of the game shows so one day I watched a soap opera, then I watched two, then I watched three in a row – for about four or five months. One day my four-year-old said, "Mom, why is that man yelling at that

Lili De Hoyos Anderson LCSW PhD is a clinical social worker in private practice in Draper Utah, and adjunct faculty at Brigham Young University, School of Family Life. An earlier version of this presentation was published in the February 1994 Ensign. Correspondence should be addressed to Lili De Hoyos Anderson PhD, e-mail <lilianders@aol.com>

lady?" Now I had promised years before to never dismiss or avoid a child's question, but how could I give a real answer without going into the sordid details of the last three weeks' episodes leading up to this particular fight? I thought for a moment then said, "OK, Adam, this is the answer: these people are making really bad choices; they're not living the way Heavenly Father wants us to live; they're breaking all kinds of commandments – and it makes them miserable." Adam looked up at me and, with that child's instinct, he asked, "Then why are we watching it?" Ouch! So we turned off the TV and have never watched another soap opera since. (see Anderson, 1994, p. 47)

All these years later now, thinking about telestial stress, my answer to Adam still is a pretty good definition of telestial stress: living in ways that are contrary to the commandments of God and then paying the price for it – or as the scriptures warn, "sowing the wind and reaping the whirlwind" (Hosea 8:7, Mosiah 7:30).

The commandments are not arbitrary hoops God asks us to jump through in order to win a prize. They are advance information about which behaviors bring happiness and which bring sorrow. As Alma so succinctly put it, "wickedness never was happiness" (Alma 41:1). There is a great deal of stress in life that comes as a result of sin.

Several years ago, a rather gruesome cover story in *Newsweek* magazine (Adler & McCormick, 1994) called "A Week in the Death of America" reported how many people had been killed in this country in one week. In many cases, pictures of the victims were included, with their names, ages, and brief synopses of how they died. After reading every case, I was surprised to find myself feeling somewhat comforted. This was because, in almost every case, the victims were living telestial lifestyles – and I do not live like that. Many of them were involved in committing crime or in some kind of drug deal; some were involved in love triangles which exploded in violence. These were ugly situations, the kind we are generally protected from if we obey basic commandments. Certainly, if we are active members of the Church and are worthy of a temple recommend, we will be largely free of such telestial stress. Of course, the article reported a few innocent victims; however, such innocent victims were clearly the exception: one person happened to have been in a video store that was robbed,

and he became caught in the violence that ensued. This demonstrates how the telestial realm can indeed encroach on terrestrial or celestial lives. But overall, our lives are much better when we do not sin, and therefore are much safer from telestial stress.

Most of us do not need to be persuaded of the dangers of telestial living, but many children and adolescents may still need to be convinced. Counselors who work directly with the youth need to successfully communicate this message. Young people are bombarded with constant advertisements for telestial living. In light of such enticements, many begin to feel that God is trying to ruin their fun – getting in the way of their going to desirable movies, or attending parties, or wearing the popular kind of clothes. These young people seem to entirely miss the connection between sin and sorrow. But the *Great Plan of Happiness*, contained in the scriptures (see Alma 42:8), is the best teaching tool.

In Alma 36, Alma speaks to his son, Helaman, as he transfers the stewardship of the sacred record to him. Alma explains how he came to know the truth of these things for himself. He recounts the familiar story of his rebellious youth and of the angel who shook the earth with a loud voice, telling Alma "[even] if thou wilt of thyself be destroyed, seek no more to destroy the church of God" (Alma 36:9). Alma fell into some sort of coma for three days and three nights. At this point in the story, Alma tells Helaman something quite interesting: he says,

... the angel spake more things unto me which were heard of my brethren, but I did not hear them. For when I heard the words – If thou wilt of thyself be destroyed, seek no more to destroy the Church of God – I was struck with such great fear and amazement lest perhaps I should be destroyed ... (Alma 36:11)

This is amazing. Obviously, Alma would have heard this concept before – from his father, his Sunday School teachers, Young Men's leaders, or whoever – but apparently it never really got through to him. And although the angel went on to deliver other words that undoubtedly continued to shake the earth, Alma did not hear them – because he was still reeling from the shock that he would have to pay a price for the choices he was making. This stunned him to the point that it permanently changed his life.

Perhaps Alma, like some of today's young people, had

never really understood agency. Elder Boyd K. Packer (Packer, 1992, p. 67) carefully does not mention the term “free agency,” but instead refers to “agency” or “moral agency” – emphasizing that agency is not precisely “free.” Too often, individuals may have the mistaken idea that agency is *free* – meaning they can do whatever they want and get away with it (this is one of Satan’s great lies!). However, the fact is that agency actually means: we can go to hell if we really insist. Indeed, we may try to argue our right to do something contrary to the commandments by protesting, “but I have free agency!” However, what this really means is, “yes, I can destroy myself if I choose, and God won’t stop me because he allows me that choice.” *The Great Plan of Happiness* should be regularly reviewed and taught – so young people can come to understand, like Alma, the consequences of their choices.

Another aspect of God’s Plan that may help to avoid telestial stress is understanding that the consequences of sin are often deferred. Sometimes this may confuse young people as they see people getting away even with murder and all sorts of other sins as well. Expecting an immediate consequence, however, is a lack of understanding of the Plan. Consider for a moment what would happen if every time we did something wrong a lightning bolt came from heaven and zapped us just enough to hurt, and if every time we did something good, an immediate reward appeared – maybe a hundred dollar bill. Given such circumstances, how would we behave? On our worst day, it wouldn’t take long to figure out the system, but all it would prove is that we can indeed keep our hands off an electrified fence. It would not in any way demonstrate virtue or help us to become more Christlike. It would be a kind of “cattle prod” salvation.

But virtue is acquired as we make correct choices without an immediate reward, and maybe even with a cost to the correct choice. Christ taught, “For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same?” (Matthew 5:46). It is when we love those that hate us that we come closer to developing a Christlike love. Alma 12:12 teaches that a space is needed between action and consequence, between sin and punishment or between virtue and reward in order to allow for the true exercise of agency. Young people (and older ones, too) need to know that while there is a space between action and consequence, positive or negative, the day of judgment (meaning, *accountability*) will indeed come.

The solution to telestial stress is simply to repent and obey: if we obey the commandments of God and repent of our sins, we do not have to be subject to telestial stress.

TERRESTRIAL STRESS: “THE MARTHA SYNDROME”

The *Martha Syndrome* refers to that Martha who is depicted in the painting which hangs in Relief Society meeting rooms all over the world. This painting shows Martha and her sister, Mary, with Christ as they fed him in their home one evening. Mary and Martha were the sisters of Lazarus and this good family had a lot of significant interaction with Christ. The last four verses of Luke chapter 10 tell of Martha complaining to the Savior because her sister isn’t helping in the kitchen. The Savior responds with words we have often heard, “Mary has chosen the better part, and it shall not be taken from her” (Luke 10:42). Just before those words, however, are other important words which, I think, define terrestrial stress: “Martha, Martha: thou art careful and troubled over many things” (Luke 10:41). Note that Martha was “careful and troubled” over many terrestrial things – at that moment, it was preparing a meal. Many things that we are troubled over fall into this terrestrial category. These are not evil things; evil could be identified and eliminated more easily. It is much more difficult at the terrestrial level because the focus of attention is on good things, but things which are nevertheless *of the world*.

LDS women, in particular, seem to have problems with the *Martha Syndrome*. We have much care and trouble over cub scouts, the PTA, homemaking meetings, cooking, cleaning and the like. Moms worry about their children’s homework, and the science fair, and getting children to soccer practice, and music lessons, and then keeping all the baby books and scrapbooks up to date. There are church callings to magnify and a garden to grow, and fresh produce to can, and food storage to be obtained and rotated – and, oh yes, we’re really not cooking with enough whole wheat! And are we actively supporting the political candidate of our choice? And are our homes like the temple? And are we getting enough exercise? This list could quite literally consume many pages. Every time we turn around – or hear a speech in church or another Relief Society lesson – there is another thing we can add to the list.

I remember as a young mother developing such a list.

I remember lessons on cooking with whole wheat. So I'd go home and try to get my kids to eat it (now that is an interesting challenge!). Another day, another lesson mentioned it is really not enough to eat whole wheat, we need greens, too, while living off food storage. So they taught us how to sprout the wheat and use those sprouts in several different ways. I even tried that (which was another interesting challenge, by the way!).

Once there was a lesson explaining that if our family exchanged a lot of colds and flu, it was probably because we did not disinfect our doorknobs regularly. So, for a while, I strapped a can of Lysol to my belt and disinfected every doorknob in sight.

Some lessons remind us that we were losing out on our LDS pioneer heritage by not quilting more. I do not descend from pioneer ancestors, so none of those skills have been passed down through my family. But I figured to be a good Mormon wife I had better learn how to quilt and bake bread and rolls, and make great pies and can fruit. These are all good things, but being too "careful and troubled" about them can trap us in the *Martha Syndrome*. Remember that *Patty Perfect* story that used to circulate in the eighties?

Patty Perfect would get up at five o'clock every day and zip her slim, vigorous body into a stylish sweatsuit. [I read that far and already hated this woman!] Then she would run five miles – eight miles on Saturday – wake each one of her twelve children with a smile and a kiss, and plan a good day. Soon classical music is wafting through Patty's home as the kids practice their instruments while she whips up a nourishing breakfast of whole wheat waffles and reconstituted dry milk (which of course her family just loves).

Patty's story continues in this nauseating fashion while she continues to do everything perfect, adding all of those Relief Society lessons into one wonderful day. All the baby books are up to date, she is making whole wheat bread, fellowshipping the neighbor into the church, doing her visiting teaching, writing up genealogical inquiries and supporting the ward missionaries! It was just one thing after another – and at the end of the day she and Paul Perfect go and do eight sessions in the temple. So then she is feeling really satisfied, but not quite challenged enough, so she volunteers to head up the family reunion, because it will help her boredom a little bit.

When we would hear the *Patty Perfect* story, my husband used to turn to me and say, "You know, Lili, I don't think you get it." "Of course I get it," I would protest, and he would insist, "No, I don't think you are getting it." So finally I asked, "Okay, what am I not getting?" He answered, "You still think you can be *Patty Perfect*." I said, "Well, yes, this year I am getting really close." And one year I did get close, really close: I even made matching Halloween costumes – theme costumes – all my kids were dressed as the signers of the Declaration of Independence and their wives (we have pictures; I can prove this). And they even knew who they were. We went to the library and read all about the signers. It was great.

These were very satisfying things. I am certainly not for a moment suggesting we should not do these good things. That is why terrestrial stress is so tricky – because these are not things that should be eliminated. The Savior was not telling Martha she should never cook or clean the kitchen again. He was warning her that she could get caught in the terrestrial realm, focusing so much on good things of the world to the exclusion of more important things – as Elder Paul H. Dunn has said, "getting caught up in the thick of thin things" (Dunn, 1979, p. 8).

Of course, men can get trapped in terrestrial stress too. Employment can certainly be a terrestrial concern, and of course husbands and fathers need to attend to financial support of the family. However, work can draw too much of their focus. Along with employment, there are dozens of other terrestrial concerns that call for attention: house maintenance and repair, a garden, landscaping and yardwork, keeping the cars running, and whatever other responsibilities you assume. In addition, church leadership meetings can be overdone and become way out of balance.

Terrestrial stress isn't just about women, but admittedly women have seemed to turn it into an art form. One day my husband had a great insight; he said, "I know why men preside in the church. It is because if the women were in charge, the entire church would be obsessive compulsive." He is on to something: it is rare to attend a women's meeting without a tablecloth, a centerpiece, and a magnet or a laminated bookmark gift for everyone to take home. Again, there is nothing wrong with doing nice things, but it can get out of balance. I have spoken at many Stake Women's Conferences where

a woman would come see me during the luncheon and tell me she wished she had been able to attend my presentation but because she was on the food committee she has been busy putting the garnish on the dessert. It is amazing that pictures of Mary and Martha have been in the Relief Society rooms for so many years, and we still do not get it!

Another woman came to me after hearing these ideas and said, "I thought when you said the *Martha Syndrome* you meant Martha Stewart." Well, if that helps deliver the message, that's OK too. It is the same mentality we're talking about – where everything has to be more elaborate, better than last year, better than last time; we've got to do more and be more and be all things to all people whether we're men or women, trying to meet every single person's needs. I knew a brother in the Stake Presidency in Oklahoma years ago who told me how his time had been taken up by members of his stake who wanted to talk to him about problems. This man wanted to help but he had a wife and eight children who were not getting a balanced part of his time and attention. So he talked to his family and they made a schedule of when he could meet with stake members. Many of those hours were during the day because he had some flex time at the college institute where he taught. People would call and say, "I'd like to see you" and he'd say, "Okay, I've got this time on Thursday," but they wouldn't want to take time off work. So, this brother would ask, "What do you do when you've got a toothache?" They would answer that they had to take off time to see a dentist. Then he would reply, "Well, when it hurts as much as a toothache, give me a call." He had been too "careful and troubled" about everybody else's concern, slipping into that Martha complex, of trying to be all things to everybody, all the time. The answer to terrestrial stress is to simplify, to not "run faster than you have strength" (Mosiah 4:27).

Occasionally, there are complaints that activity in the church is too costly, too demanding, and too consuming. But consider the warning found in section 58 of the Doctrine and Covenants: "I command, and men obey not; I revoke and they receive not the blessing" (D&C 58:32). Then after disobedience, they conclude "this is not the work of the Lord, for his promises are not fulfilled" (D&C 58:33).

There are at least two significant program changes the Church has made to help us simplify – and in many

ways we have circumvented both. One change was the consolidated schedule, which was designed to provide more family time during the week and on Sunday so we could focus on being good Christians at home and in the community. But, as Elder Boyd K. Packer (1990) put it, "nothing likes a vacuum" – and neither, apparently, do members of the church:

There will be ... fewer activities, fewer programs. That will leave a vacuum. Nothing likes a vacuum. We must resist, absolutely resist, the temptation to program that vacuum. That space belongs to families. When we cut down on Sundays to the block plan that consolidated our meetings and left some time open, you know what happened. Now brethren, it is their time. Let them use it as they feel to do – for better or for worse ... If we do, then that vacuum will be filled with prayer and work and study ... with faith and reverence. (Packer, 1990)

As soon as more time became available, we added more programs, more meetings, more interviews – often "enhancing" existing programs (Relief Society, Young Men's and Young Women's, Primary, choir, church athletics, girls camp, and so on) up to the next level of complexity – basically undoing the good that could be done by the consolidated schedule. Church leaders try to remind us and encourage us: in February of 1999, a letter from the First Presidency was read in Sacrament meetings which admonished us to eliminate all but the essential meetings on Sundays. Some wards may have made changes, but many did not.

A second significant change that the church instituted was revising the budget program. At the time many speeches were given explaining that this change was not just to alleviate the financial pressures on the members, but to alleviate the time demands. A reduction in time demands was partly accomplished through limiting the amount of money allocated to various programs – when we run out of money, we have to simplify the program, right? But this did not happen: because we are a pretty prosperous people now (at least collectively, if not individually), some generous but misguided people reach into their own pockets and say, "here, I can pay for that." Others ask the kids to bring materials, money, or refreshments for activities – thereby imposing a cost to the activity. But doing this traps us at the terrestrial level.

Unfortunately, excessive demands have caused some

to experience burn-out in church service (perhaps not surprising when we consider what we have done with programs like Girls' Camp). How tragic that some may blame the programs of the Lord's church (see D&C 58:33) instead of recognizing that the problem is a failure to obey.

But sometimes it is done right. For instance, at stake auxiliary training meeting not long ago, the brethren were in charge of the refreshments. After the closing prayer they invited us into the cultural hall where two men were setting up a table. There was no tablecloth, no decorations, no "theme." In the kitchen another brother was getting some brown cardboard boxes out of the freezer. A couple of guys brought those to the banquet table, ripped them open, put them on the table, and invited us to help ourselves to ice cream sandwiches. One fellow got one of those large garbage cans, set it right next to the table and said, "you can put your trash in here," and a very thoughtful brother got some of those coarse, brown paper towels from the restroom, set them on the table and said, "here – if you need a napkin." It was not elegant, but there was a treat for those who wanted one, and no one missed any part of the spiritually instructive and uplifting program because they had been "busy putting the garnish on the dessert." We could take lessons from some of the brethren on that!

At the age of twenty-two I was called to be Primary President. Our new presidency began to meet regularly and after a few weeks my husband asked how our meetings were going. I said, "Great! These are wonderful women!"

He asked, "How long are your meetings?"

I said, "Oh, two and a half or three hours sometimes."

He said, "Ouch!"

So I said, "OK, teach me."

My husband quoted Elder J. Golden Kimball, that great and wise man, who once said "it has to be a damn good meeting to be better than no meeting at all" (Richards, 1966). Then he went on to teach me some great skills, including the making of an effective agenda and distributing that agenda a couple of days early so each person could be ready with assignments. He said, "Whatever you do, have your opening prayer on time and have your closing prayer sixty minutes later. If you can't do it in sixty minutes, it most likely doesn't need to be done that week." He was right. I became a more effective leader

and reduced the burden on those sisters. I felt their gratitude and I felt gratitude, too. It became clear to me that our meetings had taken up too much of their time.

Families, too, may occasionally pay a high a price for our callings. A counselor in a Young Women's presidency told me of a time when they planned special refreshments for *New Beginnings*. Eight women came to the president's house and spent about eight hours making patchwork sugar cookies from cookie dough, which they dyed in the seven *value colors*. Now do you think the girls ate those cookies any more spiritually (or even slower) than they would have eaten an Oreo? The many hours spent on those cookies could have been used for visiting, or reading the scriptures, or spending time with their own preschoolers – or even taking a nap.

One barrier to simplifying may be tradition. We tend to repeat rather elaborate activities because that is the way it always has been done. We justify ignoring the counsel to simplify by thinking of some of the good outcomes of previous years' programs – for instance, a less active youth who felt the spirit, or bore her testimony, or started coming to church (note that such good outcomes have nothing to do with the colors of the cookies). But it is so easy to forget the fact that God has always made lemonade out of lemons. Any positive outcome is usually not *because* we are ignoring guidelines, but *in spite* of it. It is true that God will bless any who are ready to feel the spirit, but just think what an outpouring of the spirit could happen if we would increase our obedience and simplify as our leaders have pled with us to do.

Elder Boyd K. Packer said on one occasion that the brethren sometimes feel they are "losing the ability to correct the course of the church" (Packer, 1990). They receive revelation and teach the will of the Lord and then, with the best intentions in the world, we trample all over it. Again, as the Lord has warned: "I command, and men obey not. I revoke and they receive not the blessing" (D&C 58:32).

CELESTIAL STRESS: "THE WILDERNESS SYNDROME"

Although celestial stress may seem a contradiction in terms, there is a need in the Plan of Happiness for a *wilderness experience*. In the scriptures are many examples of individuals and groups that were called into the wilderness before being led to the Promised Land:

Moses and the Israelites, Lehi and his family, the Jaredites, even our latter-day pioneers.

God calls each of us to enter a *spiritual wilderness* to prepare for the kingdom: "Come out from among them and be ye separate" (2 Cor. 6:17). "Go ye out from ... Babylon" (D&C 133:14). "Friendship of the world is enmity with God" (James 4:4). We need to spiritually leave the world and shed our worldly baggage in order to be prepared for his spirit and his kingdom and his promised land forever. This preparatory, refining stress awaits us in the spiritual wilderness.

The wilderness experience of celestial stress can include many different refining experiences and trials. In studying the lives of those who have successfully traversed the wilderness, however, two consistent outcomes seem to be a part of that experience: first, taking upon oneself the standard of Christ; and second, coming to know the Savior.

THE STANDARD OF CHRIST

Second Nephi, chapter 4, from verse 17 to the end of the chapter, has been referred to as *the psalm of Nephi*. It begins with these beautiful but painful words:

O wretched man that I am! Yea, my heart sorroweth because of my flesh; my soul grieveth because of mine iniquities. I am encompassed about because of the temptations and the sins which do so easily beset me. And when I desire to rejoice, my heart groaneth because of my sins ... (2 Ne. 4:17-19)

These words may, at first, sound like the pain of a sinful man, but this is certainly not the case with Nephi, particularly at this point in his life. What failing, then, is Nephi so concerned about? Nephi names the problem he is wrestling with in verse 27:

Why should I yield to sin because of my flesh? Yea, why should I give way to my temptation that the evil one have place in my heart to destroy my peace and afflict my soul? [And then, here it is – Nephi's problem:] Why am I angry because of *mine enemy*?" (2 Ne. 4:27).

Now, who were Nephi's enemies? Laman and Lemuel, his brothers. Why would Nephi be angry with them? Because they kept trying to kill him. Many people, perhaps even most, judging by the standard of the world,

might say Nephi was over-reacting; he was not a sinful man. Certainly, compared to the world, Nephi was indeed a front runner. Nephi, however, was not measuring his behavior by the standards of the world; his standard was Christ. Nephi saw where he was lacking in his efforts to become like the Savior and this gave him stress, *celestial stress*, because he wanted to close the gap. To truly acquire Christ's image in our countenance (see Alma 5:14), to be like him when he appears (see Moroni 7:48), requires a monumental and committed effort – *all* that we can do, in addition to the grace of Christ (see 2 Ne. 25:23). This effort may sometimes cause our souls to groan with the realization of our weaknesses. Nevertheless, this is the business of life – this is the purpose of the Great Plan of Happiness, to allow us to willingly enter the spiritual wilderness and to experience those spiritual growing pains.

A question which characterizes this effort to become Christlike is, "What lack I yet?" (Matt. 19:20) To become like the Savior, we have to focus on a celestial star and stop worrying about being measured by the world. We have to leave all worldly baggage along the way, determinedly breaking the chains that bind us to Babylon. This is entirely an individual journey. No one can push or pull us along this path. We must choose it.

COMING TO KNOW JESUS CHRIST

Think of the prophet Joseph Smith in the spiritual wilderness of Liberty Jail: "O God, where art thou?" (D&C 121:1). He cries out, doubtless wondering how long he will be in this terrible wilderness, suffering the stress which sanctifies, purifies and refines. God answers Joseph:

My son, peace be unto thy soul; thine adversity and thine afflictions shall be but a small moment [I love God's references to time – Joseph was four and a half months in Liberty Jail, but relative to eternity, it was indeed "but a small moment"]; and then, if thou endure it well, God shall exalt thee on high; thou shalt triumph over all thy foes. (D&C 121:7-8)

And then God speaks these words: "Thou art not yet as Job" (D&C 121:10). I can almost hear the prophet Joseph asking, "Did I say I wanted to be? Is my name on a list somewhere?" Well yes, his name was on a list – and our names are on that same list. We all signed up for the

whole course in the pre-earth life, and again when we were baptized. We wanted to become more like our Heavenly Father, and the only way to do so is to follow the Savior into a spiritual wilderness, where we will find him. Brothers and sisters, it is a demanding course! Further, a real challenge for many of us is that although we may be largely free of telestial stress and obedient to the basic commandments, we are so busy with terrestrial concerns that we do not ever move into the spiritual wilderness and get about the *true business* of life. What a tragedy that by concentrating so much on performing many “good” works, this prevents us from even being able to attempt the essential saving works.

We get caught up in the seemingly urgent – “If I do not put gas in the car, I’ll be in trouble; if I do not pay this bill on time, I’ll be in trouble; if I do not get the Christmas shopping done, I’ll be in trouble!” So many worldly tasks have deadlines attached, so too often these urgent tasks get in the way of the vital things, which generally have no clear deadlines attached. For example, “If I do not study the scriptures today, the house won’t fall down; if we do not have a good family home evening this week, we’ll get by; if I do not have meaningful prayer and learn to receive revelation – well, maybe I can work that in next week.”

WHEN COMES THE HARVEST?

Because the experience of celestial stress is a refining process, there is no “solution” or cure for this stress. Rather, the correct response is to endure to the end. Scriptural admonitions to endure are plentiful because many “faint in [their] minds” (Hebrews 12:3). Such “fainting” may be the result of doubt, of wondering if the difficult refining wilderness experience is really worth it. While Christ can be found in the spiritual wilderness, there are times when he seems to withdraw from us, as his Father withdrew from him during the performance of his great atoning trial (Matt. 27:46). Were it not for such a withdrawal, the essential stretching and the increase of our faith would not happen (as the prophet Joseph learned in Liberty Jail). Ironically, then, we may feel most abandoned when we are most spiritually diligent.

The sixth chapter of Galatians can offer insight and motivation to help us endure: “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap” (Galatians 6:7). This oft-repeated “Law of the Harvest” is familiar, but consider for a moment why the

Lord begins with the words, “Be not deceived.” Deceived about what? Isn’t it just “plant a carrot, get a carrot”? It seems to not be tricky – except that it really is tricky. It is so easy to be deceived; for example, whenever we say things like, “Why did I waste my time trying to help that person? Why did I bother to be friendly? Why did I make the effort when he did not respond?” If this refers to sincere efforts to do good, we are being deceived. We may not see any positive outcome or reward for our honest efforts, but remember the harvest has not yet come. Alma, chapter 12, explains, “There [is] a space granted unto man” (Alma 12:12), between action and consequence, to allow for repentance – repentance that we get credit for because it is not motivated by a jolt of lightning or some other fierce and immediate threat.

We are likewise deceived if we think that God has abandoned us. When life is particularly difficult, it sometimes seems that our prayers are not being heard. Elder Neal A. Maxwell wrote concerning such times:

Inwardly and anxiously we may worry, too, that an omniscient and loving God sees more stretch in us than we feel we have. Hence, when God is actually lifting us up, we may feel he is letting us down. (Maxwell, 1994, p.3)

Nevertheless, we must not be deceived. God does not abandon his people. A favorite hymn (“How Firm a Foundation,” Hymn #85, verse 7) reminds us:

The soul that on Jesus hath leaned for repose
I will not, I cannot, desert to his foes;
That soul, though all hell should endeavor to shake,
I’ll never, no never, no never forsake!

Galatians chapter 6 continues, “And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season” – again God talks about time – “we shall reap, if we faint not” (Galatians 6:9). Note that “in due season” is a code phrase for “not as soon as you’d like it to be.” It is not an easy course. Indeed, it cannot be an easy course and successfully build Zion people. But the promises are sure; the harvest is coming. As the Lord told Nephi:

I will also be your light in the wilderness ... wherefore, inasmuch as ye shall keep my commandments ye shall be led towards the promised land; and ye shall know that it is by me that ye are led. (1 Nephi 17:13)

It has been said (extrapolating from John 8:32), "the truth will set you free, but first it will make you miserable." This is so often true. This discussion is not about stress *elimination* – which would be a vain hope in a world designed to prove and refine – this is about stress *selection*. We do not have to be subject to every kind of stress there is. We can choose to waste our lives with telestial, or even terrestrial, stress. There are wasted lives all around, the lives of those who flout the commandments of God, and do so with impunity. Eventually, they will reap the whirlwind (Hosea 8:7). The ultimate outcome of telestial stress is destruction, tragedy, waste. And, many choose to struggle with terrestrial stress. Much temporal good may be accomplished by such people, but ultimately, they get lost in the "thick of thin things." Tragically, some individuals who remained trapped by terrestrial stress eventually burn out and then are too ready to "throw the baby out with the bath water," dismissing not only earthly concerns but often the Church as well; they mistakenly blame the Church for requiring too much of them.

Our last great choice is celestial stress. If we learn to appropriately balance terrestrial concerns, we can enter the celestial spiritual wilderness; following the admonitions of the prophets, we simplify and leave the world – worldliness – behind: "in the world but not of the world" (Widtsøe, 1942; Cullimore, 1974). Still in the world, but no longer of it (John 17:11-19), we come to know the Savior. This is a path of individual tutelage; only the Savior can teach us how to become like him. He can whisper through his spirit those precious communications concerning what we personally must do. It is too noisy in the rest of the world. Indeed, if we are caught up in the terrestrial, we won't hear that voice.

Isaiah (55:1-2), seeing our day and time, asks the very relevant question:

Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labor for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness. Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money [because what the Lord is offering is not a commodity of this world. Indeed, it is a trap to think we can buy ourselves out of stress; that if we had just a little more money, a little more income, a little more resource, we could be more stress-free – but it is not true] ... he that hath no money; come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.

Brothers and sisters, it is my testimony that the gospel of Jesus Christ does have the answers to our stressful lives, and that we can be a tremendous blessing to those around us – to ourselves, to our families, to those with whom we associate, to our clients, to those whom we serve in our callings – if we understand the particular kind of stress we are dealing with. It is my prayer that we will follow the prophet and get ourselves into that celestial spiritual wilderness, where the real work of life can begin. There we can fulfill the measure of our creation – ultimately, completely – and become *men and women of Christ*, a force for good, for building the kingdom. Whether we are here or not when Christ comes again, we are influencing the generations that will be here to receive him. Are we teaching them the principles of the gospel that apply now to their busy and stressful lives? I pray that we will do so. I know that we will find Christ in this journey; he will be our light and lead us to our Promised Land.

REFERENCES

- Adler, J. & McCormick, J. (1994, August 15). A week in the death of America. *Newsweek*, 123, 24-29.
- Anderson, L. (1994, February). The stresses of life. *Ensign*, 47-49.
- Cullimore, J. (1974, January). To be in the world but not of the world. *Ensign*, 119-122.
- De Hoyos, G. (1986). Telestial, terrestrial, and celestial therapy: A Mormon therapeutic model. *AMCAP Journal*, 12:2, 116-133.
- Dunn, P. (1979, May). Because I have a father. *Ensign*, pp. 7-9.
- Maxwell, N. (1994). *Lord, increase our faith*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft.
- Packer, B. (1992, May). Our moral environment. *Ensign*, pp. 66-68.
- Packer, B. (1990). Let them govern themselves. Address presented at the Regional Representative Seminar, Friday March 30, 1990.
- Richards, C. (1966). *J. Golden Kimball: The story of a unique personality*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft.
- Widtsøe, J. (1942, September). Why are the Latter-day Saints a peculiar people? *Improvement Era*, 577, 607. Reprinted in "I have a question," *Ensign* (1988, April), 50.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR - DECEMBER 10, 2001

Response to Foreknowledge vs. Free Will

LARRY W. LEWIS, M.A., LPC

LDS Family Services

I appreciated M. Ardell Broadbent's article in the Fall 2000 *AMCAP Journal*, "Factor Analysis of Theological Constructs Related to Fatalism and Free Will," which addressed the role of determinism in the lives and beliefs of Latter-day Saints. I am glad the LDS church encourages free discussion of God's nature and the nature of human existence. I agree that some members worry that their agency is compromised by God's omniscience, thinking that Heavenly Father's perfect foreknowledge of how we will choose somehow diminishes the reality that he stands back and lets us make the choices. I also agree with Sister Broadbent that such worries might tempt some of the same members to adopt either a debilitating sense of helplessness or perfectionism, which makes the question a legitimate clinical concern and a subject for the *AMCAP Journal*.

However, I think the conclusions of this study are based on the flawed premise that the two principles are mutually exclusive, that God's omniscience does in fact undermine free will, and that only the minority of church members who think more deeply see this fact. Sister Broadbent predicts cognitive dissonance (p. 21) when respondents first agree with the statement, "I would not serve a God that had not all wisdom and power," and then disagree with the statement, "I believe in hard-determinism: every action is determined, and there is no such thing as free will."

To me, these are not synonymous statements – just

because Heavenly Father could withhold agency does not mean he does so. The proffered solution to this non-paradox (see page 21) is to suggest that if clients accept that "opinion, rather than direct revelation, has at times been the foundation of common LDS beliefs on this topic, clients could then be free to develop a solution which seems logical and consistent with their beliefs" (Broadbent, 2000, p. 21).

Does this mean that clients who want to should ignore church teachings and make it up as they go?

I believe there is another explanation and another solution. The majority of members are not worried about God's omniscience because they perceive, correctly, that it does not diminish their agency. They know they enjoy an innate ability to choose, even when they might not like the options they have to choose from or when they might not have the means to effect the realization of their desire or even when they might not feel like making a choice at all. And they know that Heavenly Father's ability to see the end from the beginning makes him God, and not just a very efficient predictor or an extraordinarily good guesser.

I think Sister Broadbent (p. 24) too easily dismisses Elder Neal A. Maxwell's explanation: "the simultaneity of God's knowledge does not impinge on our free agency because we do not know what is to come." The only way foreknowledge could impact on our choices is if we ourselves possessed that foreknowledge. What could be simpler? Do we doubt that Heavenly Father has a perfect memory? Yet I don't blame my past choices on him just because he remembers so well how I chose, so why would I blame my future choices on him just because he perfectly foresees the choices I'm going to make? These worries result from faulty thinking, not from a faulty divine Plan of Happiness. And the question is easily resolved without losing faith in God's divinity.

However, Sister Broadbent quoted a number of church members who seemed to support the either-or approach to foreknowledge and agency; some of those quotes were even from authorized church leaders. Nevertheless, I believe an examination of those particular quotes will reveal that the church leaders were addressing a different question. They were not asking

Larry W. Lewis, MA, LPC, is the Agency Director of the North Carolina Agency of LDS Family Services, 5908 Sharon Rd., Charlotte NC 28210, (704) 535-2436, email: lewislk11@hotmail.com

if Divine Foreknowledge detracts from Moral Agency, they were asking if Divine Foreknowledge detracts from God's own Eternal Progression. How can God learn any new thing if he already knows everything? Both quotes (p. 20) defining the "limited omniscience" position (quotes from President Brigham Young and Elder Hugh B. Brown) focused exclusively on this question, and did not relate to the impact of God's foreknowledge on humanity's agency.

Sister Broadbent went on to address this quite different question seemingly without alerting the reader that she had changed the subject. She described how members disagree regarding whether God is "inside" or "outside" time. If LDS church leaders teach that God takes up a specific amount of space and occupies a particular spatial location just as we do, does that mean they are then willing to go on to say he also experiences time from moment to moment as we do? Eternal Progression does denote an unavoidable change over time, yet we certainly believe that God is the same yesterday, today, and forever (Hebrews 13:8; D&C 20:12, 35:1).

How do we resolve this (quite different) paradox? I believe Sister Broadbent too quickly dismissed Elder Bruce R. McConkie's explanation:

It should be realized that God is not progressing in knowledge, truth, virtue, wisdom, or any of the attributes of godliness. he has already gained these things in their fullness. But he is progressing in the sense that his creations increase, his dominions expand, his spirit offspring multiply, and more kingdoms are added to his domains (quoted in Broadbent, 2000, pp. 22-23)

That is, God's nature is not changing over time, even if there is change over time in other areas of his experience.

If two church leaders seem to concentrate on one aspect of eternal life at the apparent expense of another aspect, it does not mean that one of these leaders is right and the other wrong — or that no one really understands. I imagine we can find other quotes from the same authorities which support the other side of the

doctrine. Although President Brigham Young was cited as supporting "limited omniscience," he clearly taught (*Journal of Discourses* 6: 291) that there is no real conflict between the doctrines under consideration:

Foreordination, for instance, and free grace are both true doctrines; but they must be properly coupled together and correctly classified, so as to produce harmony between these two apparently opposite doctrines.

We might disagree over what President Young was saying, but clearly he was not saying that foreknowledge negates agency.

I don't believe "soft-determinism" is the answer. It would not help clients to say that since Heavenly Father doesn't really know what is to come, that we are not really accountable for the choices we make. So many clients are already struggling with the doubt that anyone, even God, can understand what they are going through or can release them from the chains that bind them. What a disservice to them to suggest that the God of Heaven is really no more than a very good guesser! Nothing we say as therapists should ever diminish faith in an omniscient God who has the knowledge and power needed to save his children. Of course that leaves therapists with greater accountability. But I would personally rather admit the willful misuse of my agency to a merciful Heavenly Father than to try to convince him that knowing he was watching me somehow made me less accountable. That's a pretty weak alibi!

If our clients are literally obsessing over such questions, the best we can do is identify it as maladaptive behavior—and treat the obsessional disorder. On the other hand, if they are prayerfully seeking a better understanding of eternal life, we should encourage them in their quest and testify that the truth can be comprehended, and that it is taught by the Church. We should recommend the words of living prophets, who without exception have preached the omniscience of God and the accountability of man. There is a reason for that.

AUTHOR RESPONSE

Larry Lewis' comments on Foreknowledge vs. Free Will

M. ARDELL BROADBENT, B.S.

Pepperdine University

To address these comments, it is important to first establish a common vocabulary. By doing so, some of the apparent disagreements may thus be resolved. Some definitions used in the field of philosophy relate to the discussion:

- The position of God having *exhaustive definite foreknowledge* allows that God sees what we regard as the future in complete detail, so there is no future action or outcome that can happen different from that which God knows will happen (whether he sees it in the present or future according to his frame of reference).
- The position of having *limited foreknowledge* allows that God predicts the future in superb detail, though it is possible for him to be surprised as events unfold, and thus to learn.
- *Determinism* (sometimes called *hard-determinism*) is the doctrine that everything that happens is entirely determined by prior causes.
- *Free will* is the position that one's choices are not determined by prior causes nor by divine intervention.
- *Fatalism* is the doctrine that events are fixed in advance so that human beings are powerless to change them.
- *Soft-determinism* is the doctrine that free will is compatible with determinism. Soft-determinists, or *compatibilists*, argue that free will is not the freedom to

choose to do otherwise than you do, rather free will indicates that you caused the actions rather than someone else.

- *Incompatibilists* will argue that free will is not compatible with determinism. Incompatibilists may believe in free will or in determinism, but not both.

The behavioral psychologist B. F. Skinner is an example of a believer in determinism. He argued that within the core of our genetic makeup we carry the seeds which will determine all future reactions to our environment (Skinner, 1971). Hence, if the environment of an individual (including physical laws and the actions of others) could be perfectly understood, the individual's actions could be predicted with complete accuracy. Thus B. F. Skinner could arguably be called a fatalist and an incompatibilist.

John Calvin, the theologian, is another example of a believer in determinism, in that God is one of the prior causes that determines events (Weber, 1980). He argued that within the core of our God-created being, we carry the seeds which will determine all future reactions to our environment. He further argued that because of God's exhaustive definitive foreknowledge, one's choices lead one toward an inevitable future which is certainly known by God. John Calvin could arguably be called a fatalist and an incompatibilist (Halsall, 1998).

Elder Neal A. Maxwell's statements appear to support soft-determinism. LDS doctrine uniquely offers a premise for soft-determinism in that it states the essential core of our being was not "created" by God but always existed (D&C 93:29, Abr. 3:21-22). Therefore, within that core we may very well carry the seeds which will determine all future reactions. Elder Maxwell obviously believes in agency (i.e., power and choice) and responsibility for one's choices. He does not necessarily accept the definition of free will as

EDITOR'S NOTE: by mistake, the following was left out of M. Ardell Broadbent's "Fatalism and Free Will" article published in volume 25 (2000): M. Ardell Broadbent is a graduate of Brigham Young University. This study received IRB approval from BYU. The author thanks Diane Spangler PhD of the BYU Psychology Department for helpful comments on the manuscript and assistance both in suggesting the instrument used for statistical analysis and in interpreting the results. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: M. Ardell Broadbent, email: ardell_broadbent@hotmail.com

defined above, because this definition eschews prior causes (such as the essential core of our eternal being) which may determine our choices. Thus he could arguably be termed a compatibilist.

Elder B. H. Roberts argued (Roberts, 1903) that God is omniscient, but that omniscience is the ability to know at a particular time all that is possible to know at that time (presupposing that God exists within time). He argued that some things about the future are impossible to know. Thus God would be omniscient yet not have absolute definite exact foreknowledge.

These four represent separate interpretations, though the first three by definition compromise the definition of free will to some extent. Nevertheless, only the interpretations attributed to Elder Maxwell and Elder Roberts are consistent with LDS doctrine.

Considering the doctrine of free will, which is also consistent with LDS doctrine, William Hasker (2002) argues that exhaustive definite foreknowledge and free will as defined above are incompatible. [See also the logical proof (from Potter, 2001) presented below.] To one who believes in God's exhaustive definite foreknowledge, soft-determinism differs only from hard-determinism in that one's free choices lead toward the inevitable future that is certainly and specifically known by God. If God has absolute definite foreknowledge, then he not only knows what we will do, but he knows that we will do it freely. Moreover, he knows exactly each detail that leads up to every event. These facts make it impossible to actually have free will in the defined sense that we can choose anything other than our destined choices.

Philosophers of religion disagree on whether or not God has such absolute exhaustive definite foreknowledge. They also disagree on whether or not exhaustive definite foreknowledge is compatible with free will. Brother Lewis' first objection is valid in that the article (Broadbent, 2000) did not acknowledge sufficiently that the latter point is a matter of contention among philosophers. However the article did state that it would not focus on logical proofs from a philosophical perspective but would instead examine scripture and statements by LDS authorities.

The author finds the statements of Brigham Young, Truman Madsen, James E. Talmage, and B. H. Roberts more compelling and consistent with the whole of scriptural statements on the topic. These authorities, as seen by the quotes included in the article (Broadbent, 2000, p. 20), support the view that God does not have exhaustive

definite foreknowledge. It is assumed that the quoted authorities on both sides of the argument were not necessarily intending their statements on this topic to be seen as direct revelation. Indeed, the *Encyclopedia of Mormonism* (Ludlow, 1992) states that there is no official Mormon belief regarding God's foreknowledge; one may believe either way and be in line with LDS doctrine:

Anyone seeking to understand divine foreknowledge must begin by recognizing that scripture does not directly address the question as it has been formulated in philosophy and theology, where the emphasis is on the content and logic of knowledge. The scriptures are explicit that God knows all and that we can trust him. They have not been explicit about what that means philosophically or theologically. Consequently, short of new revelation, any answer to the theological question of God's foreknowledge can be only speculative. (Faulconer, 1992, p. 521)

The article (Broadbent, 2000) was written more for the benefit of those who agree with Hasker (2002), whether they have thought deeply on the subject or not. In my experience, those who promote this view are often disparaged by other church members. The conclusions of the study are based on the premise that for church members who believe with Hasker that God's omniscience is incompatible with free will – that they may preserve a sense of free will by defining omniscience different from it being exhaustive definite foreknowledge. But even those who disagree with Hasker may still support this article's purpose, which is to promote belief in free will, whether it is arrived at by one logical explanation or another.

According to Hasker's (2002) view, belief in both exhaustive definite foreknowledge and free will at the same time constitutes cognitive dissonance. This is discussed in the article within the section titled "Fatalism as a Logical Corollary of Unlimited Omniscience" (also see the Logical Proof presented below). Hyrum Smith's statement, "I would not serve a God that had not all wisdom and power" (cited in McConkie, 1954) seems to be in line with exhaustive definite foreknowledge. Although Hyrum Smith may not have originally intended it to be so, this article has interpreted it as such.

Turning toward a slightly different topic, Brother Lewis asked about the meaning of the statement, "clients could then be free to develop a solution which seems logical and consistent with their beliefs" (Broadbent, 2000, p. 21). Note

that this statement was not intended to suggest, as Brother Lewis postulates, that “clients who want to should ignore church teachings and make it up as they go.” Not at all. The statement was intended to mean only that we must discern between prophetic statements and non-doctrinal Mormon ideology. The author’s intent is to promote a tolerance of varied opinion on this sensitive topic, a tolerance that has at times been lacking. Members who agree with Hasker may not be aware that they are not out of line with LDS doctrine. This article seeks to promote that awareness.

This author does not doubt that God has a perfect memory. In agreement with Brother Lewis, there is indeed no logic in blaming one’s future choices on God because of a belief that he perfectly foresees every choice. And it is true, as Brother Lewis points out, that “to say that God’s foreknowledge is incompatible with free will is not to say that God is responsible for our actions.” There is no statement to the contrary in the article. This author does sympathize with those who believe that because of God’s exhaustive definite foreknowledge, one’s free choices lead one toward the inevitable future that is certainty known by God. For some, this issue not easily resolved. Sorenson’s (1982), Smith’s (1988) and Robson’s concerns (1983, 1989), quoted in the article, present complex and pressing questions which certainly deserve a respectful answer. Their questioning does not necessarily constitute a lack in thinking ability nor maladaptive behavior.

In an effort to be concise, the article included section headers intended to alert readers to a change in subject, such as the transition to the topic of whether God is “inside” or “outside” time. It was hoped that the connection of this specific topic with the main topic would be clear and not in need of elaboration. Specifically, the topic of God’s relation to time directly relates to whether “all things are present ... as things placed before him” (Halsall, 1998), as suggested by John Calvin, which is often explained by interpreting God as being outside time – or whether God exists in time as suggested by Abraham 5:13, which would imply that temporal limits are imposed on God, or that he is constrained to work within such limits. Some LDS leaders have said God experiences time from moment to moment, though his moments may be significantly quantitatively different from ours.

Further, it is not necessarily a contradiction to say that eternal progression denotes an unavoidable progressive change over time despite the fact that God is the same yesterday, today, and forever (2 Ne. 27:23). When the

scriptures emphasize God’s unchanging nature, the emphasis is that God will always be God and that the “rules” will not change – that God is not fickle nor will he be persuaded to bend from a course which is just and perfect. Elder Bruce R. McConkie (1966) stated that God’s nature is not changing over time, even if there is change over time in other areas of his experience. But, if areas of his experience do change, this would imply that God is within time, since non-temporal things cannot by definition change – change requires a “before” and an “after.”

This author agrees with Brother Lewis’ statement that “if two church leaders each seem to concentrate on one aspect of doctrine at the apparent expense of another aspect, it doesn’t mean that one of those leaders is right and the other wrong, or that no one really understands.” The article (Broadbent, 2000) makes this point on page 22, quoting President Brigham Young’s concept of “spheres of influence” – which he used to explain how from our perspective and in relation to our sphere of experience God has all knowledge, though in another sphere he still increases in knowledge.

Regarding the reference to the excerpt from *Journal of Discourses* 6:291, Dennis Potter (of the Utah Valley State College philosophy faculty) has pointed out:

Brigham Young was talking about *foreordination* and not *foreknowledge*. They are two different things. Foreordination merely says that God has given us some callings before this life. We might or might not fulfill them. This is perfectly compatible with the view that God does not specifically know whether or not we will fulfill our callings. Brigham Young clearly denied foreknowledge. Joseph F. Smith clearly affirmed it. They cannot both be right. (Potter, 2001)

This article (Broadbent, 2000) was certainly not intended to promote the idea that people are not accountable for their choices, or to detract from anyone’s faith in or reverence for God’s divinity. But there is no evidence that belief in a God who does not possess absolute unlimited foreknowledge is spiritually or psychologically detrimental. This author believes that the truth can be comprehended, and that it is indeed taught by the Church.

LOGICAL PROOF

The following is a philosophical argument (Potter, 2001) to the effect that God’s absolute definite foreknowledge and free will are incompatible. If God knows at time

T that event X will occur at T+n, then at time T it must already be true that X will occur at T+n. But if X is the supposed result of a free action on the part of some agent A and if A is supposed to be free with respect to X at T, then it must still be possible at T that X not occur. However, if it is true at T that X will occur at T+n, then it is no longer possible at T that X not occur at T+n. So, if God knows at T that X will occur at T+n, then A is not free at T with respect to X's occurrence at T+n.

The doctrine of *Divine Providence*: everything that happens is according to God's plan, it was meant to happen all along. This doesn't mean that God causes everything to happen; God can intend certain things to happen without directly causing them, by knowing the precise nature of every aspect of his creations and being able to predict exactly what will occur.

This entails that God knows everything that will happen before it will happen. For example, God knows the precise time and date of your eventual death. This is referred to as *Absolute Foreknowledge*. It is important to distinguish Absolute Foreknowledge from the claim that God knows everything that can possibly happen. The latter does not entail that God necessarily knows which possibility will become actual.

Second, Divine Providence claims that God takes his foreknowledge and makes a plan for each and every event in the history of the world. He knows what can happen, he knows what he wants to happen, and so he plans it to happen that way. This is referred to as *Divine Correlation*.

Third, Divine Providence also states that whatever will happen does happen according to God's plan. It is God's will and plan, for example, that you choose to visit the washroom precisely when you do. There is no deviation from God's plan. This is referred to as *Divine Governance*. These are not entirely separate claims; they are intertwined. They emphasize different aspects of the doctrine of Divine Providence.

The doctrine of *Free Will* states that with respect to some things that we do, we have a choice (i.e. it is possible for us to choose otherwise than we do).

The doctrine of *Prophecy* states that God uses his knowledge of what will happen to inform us through prophets what will happen with the idea of changing what we will do. And the doctrine of *Petitionary Prayer* is that our prayers can make a difference.

These doctrines of Free Will, Prophecy and of Petitionary Prayer are inconsistent with Divine Providence (Potter, 2001).

REFERENCES

- Broadbent, M. A. (2000). Factor Analysis of Theological Constructs Related to Fatalism and Free Will. *AMCAP Journal*, 25(1), 17-26.
- Faulconer, J.E. (1992). Foreknowledge of God. In D.H. Ludlow, *Encyclopedia of Mormonism*, pp. 521-522. NY: Macmillan.
- Hasker, W. (2002). The absence of a timeless God. In G. E. Ganssle & D. M. Woodruff (eds.) *God and time: Essays on the divine nature*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Maxwell, N. A. (1979). *All these things shall give thee experience*. Salt Lake City: Deseret Book.
- McConkie, B. R. (Ed)(1954). *Doctrines of salvation: Sermons and writings of Joseph Fielding Smith*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft.
- McConkie, B. R. (1966). *Mormon Doctrine*. Salt Lake City: Bookcraft.
- Halsall, P. (compiler) (1998). Modern history sourcebook: John Calvin on predestination. retrieved 20 Sept. 2002 from <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/calvin-predest.html>
- Potter, D. (2001). What does God write in his Franklin planner? Unpublished manuscript, Utah Valley State College, Dept. of Philosophy, Orem Utah.
- Roberts, B. H. (1903). *The Mormon doctrine of deity*. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Press.
- Robson, K. E. (1983). Omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience in Mormon theology. *Sunstone*, 10(4), 21-23.
- Robson, K. E., & Bergera, G. J. (1989). *Line upon line: Essays on Mormon doctrine*. Salt Lake City: Signature Books.
- Skinner, B.F. (1971). *Beyond freedom and dignity*. Westminister, MD: Random House.
- Smith, S. S. (1988). Reader's forum. *Sunstone*. 12:1/2.
- Sorenson, M. L. (1982). Reader's forum. *Sunstone*. 7:4/3.
- Weber, M. (1980). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. NY: Scribners.

Book Review

Religion, Mental Health, and the Latter-day Saints, edited by Daniel K. Judd. Volume 14 in the Religious Studies Center Specialized Monograph Series. Provo, Utah: Religious Studies Center, Brigham Young University, 1999. xv+318 pages, index. ISBN 1-57008-631-1, hardback, \$24.95.

REVIEWED BY: ERIC G. SWEDIN, PhD

Weber State University

Do religious people enjoy greater mental health than non-religious people? This question has vexed relations between psychologists and religious communities for the past century. The question becomes more sophisticated when transmuted: Do people who internalize their religious beliefs and practices (intrinsic as opposed to external or extrinsic religious practice) enjoy better mental health than the average person? As Latter-day Saints, we must answer to the affirmative, but what about using the tools of psychology to provide a more rigorous answer? Allen E. Bergin and other Latter-day Saint psychologists have tried to answer this question, conducting studies, writing articles and books, and tirelessly promoting this point of view (Bergin, 1983; Richards & Bergin, 1997, 2000).

Daniel K. Judd of Brigham Young University has collected fourteen papers and studies as part of an extended argument for the positive effect of internalized religion on mental health. Only two of the fourteen chapters are previously unpublished. Three other chapters came from our own *AMCAP Journal*, with the remainder coming from other peer-reviewed professional sources, such as the two from the *Review of Religious Research*. An Appendix lists 58 studies from 1960 to 1996 and rates the studies on the basis of whether they found a positive or negative relationship between religiosity and mental

health. Most of the authors are faculty at BYU.

Among the topics covered are drug use, suicide, youth issues, homosexuality, racism, women's employment, and family formation (marriage, divorce and remarriage patterns, as well as the number of children created). For example, emotional stability is found to be associated with internalized religion in "Family, Religion, and Delinquency among LDS Youth," where the authors discovered that "the internalization of religion, private religious behavior, the importance attached to one's relationship with Heavenly Father, and feeling the Spirit were most important in predicting delinquency" (p. 166).

A common view held by non-Mormons is that LDS women are more inclined to suffer depression than non-LDS women. Two studies refuting this untrue notion are included in this book: "Risk Factors and the Prevalence of Depression in Mormon Women" and "Family Attitudes and Perfectionism As Related to Depression in Latter-day Saint and Protestant Women."

Latter-day Saints believe that faith in Jesus Christ and practicing the principles of the Gospel will lead to eternal life. We also believe that our testimony and behavior will lead to physical and mental health. Part of a definition of mental health offered in the book is that a person must have an "accurate perception of reality which includes seeing what is really there in spite of pressures from the environment to distort" (p. 246). The irony here is that at the basic foundation of the Gospel is a different way of perceiving reality that non-believers do not share.

Judd's book lends scientific support to our convictions that the Gospel leads to better mental health. Overall, this book is a useful collection, though scholars who have been following this issue probably have already read many of the articles.

Eric G. Swedin PhD is a historian and computer scientist at Weber State University in Ogden Utah. He is the author of *Healing Souls: A History of Psychotherapy in the Modern Latter-day Saint Community*, to be published in 2003 by the University of Illinois Press. email: EricSwedin@mail.weber.edu

REFERENCES

- Bergin, A (1983). Religiosity and mental health: A critical reevaluation and meta-analysis. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 14, 170-184.
- Richards, P. S. & Bergin, A. (1997). *A Spiritual Strategy for counseling*

and psychotherapy. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Richards, P. S. & Bergin, A. (eds.) (2000). *Handbook of psychotherapy and religious diversity*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.



2002 Fall Convention
October 3-4, 2002
Joseph Smith Memorial Building in S.L.C.

***Turning the Hearts of the Children to the Fathers and
the Hearts of the Fathers to the Children***

Gospel-Centered Workshops and Research Presentations
CE Credits Available

**Keynote Speakers: Douglas E. Brinley PhD and Gary & Joy Lundberg
- and -
Elder Lance B. Wickman of the First Quorum of the Seventy**

Chris Anderson LCSW • Lili Anderson PhD LCSW • Roger Belisle MA • Paul Birch LMFT
Mark Chamberlain PhD • Thom Curtis PhD • James Daniels USAF Chaplain
Susan Ericksen RN MS LMFT • Shawn Evans LCSW • Noel C. Gill PhD • Robert Gleave PhD
Colleen Harrison MA • Rick Hawks PhD • Lin Huish PhD MFCC • R.Vernon Kirk PsyD
Michael Lambert PhD • John Livingstone EdD • Max Park MFT • Dale Pearson PhD LCSW MFT
Madison Thomas MD • LaNae Valentine PhD • Ron Wilkinson JD

***Distinguished Service to Humanity Award* presented to:
Elder Vaughn J. Featherstone at awards banquet on Thursday evening**

<u>Convention Fees*:</u>	<u>both days</u>	<u>one day</u>
Professional members	\$120.00	\$ 85.00
Spouses, Retired members	\$100.00	\$ 70.00
Non-AMCAP members	\$150.00	\$100.00
Students	\$60.00	\$30.00
Awards Banquet		\$ 25.00 each

AMCAP membership:

Professional \$50.00 annually
Students \$25.00 annually

*Price includes lunch—Pre-Registration is due by September 27, 2002. Registration at the door is \$20.00 extra

AMCAP's mission is to provide information and support for the LDS mental health professional in four areas:
1. Spiritual Focus 2. Clinical Application 3. Networking and Outreach 4. Research, Theory and Publication
As AMCAP members we strive to center our personal and professional lives upon Jesus Christ
by serving our brothers and sisters in need.

**For a registration form, convention schedule, AMCAP information or
register online**

please visit our website: www.amcap.net

For more information, email: mail@amcap.net or call 801-583-6227

Turning Hearts Homeward



800 678-3445
www.anasazi.org

When parents have tried everything, ANASAZI Foundation offers, with remarkable results, a 42-day intervention for youth 12-17 and young adults 18-25 with substance abuse and/or emotional concerns.

ANASAZI is a non-profit and nationally accredited level II behavioral healthcare provider.

Guidelines for Book and Media Reviewers

Book and media reviews (books, audiovisuals, internet resources) are an important part of professional journals. Reviews alert busy clinicians and academicians to resources that may help them and their patients/students, and also keep them current with the world of ideas relating to their profession and responsibilities.

CONTENT

Reviews should include a synopsis of the book's content and a critical assessment of its value for the field—both strengths and weaknesses. The reviewer should also state what types of readers would most benefit (or not benefit). Because book reviewing is an art as well as a scholarly activity, you are encouraged to express your individuality. The first person may be used, which is often livelier and more interesting to read than the more formal passive voice (for example, "I found this concept intriguing" as opposed to "This concept was found to be intriguing"). As appropriate, do make comparisons with other works on the topic and specifically comment on the preface, bibliography, glossary, or index. Note that book titles are not always devised by the authors so may at times be misleading.

FORMAT

On the top of the first page, indicate title, author(s), and publication information as follows:

Current Psychotherapies, 6th edition. Edited by Raymond J. Corsini & Danny Wedding. Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 2000. xii+491 pages, illus., photo., gloss., index. ISBN 0-87581-430-1, paper, \$60.00.

At the end of the review, give your name, degree, exact title and professional affiliation; for example:

Victor B. Cline, PhD	Robert H. Coombs, PhD, MFT
Clinical Psychology	Professor
Private Practice	UCLA School of Medicine
Salt Lake City, UT	Los Angeles, CA

Double-space EVERYTHING in the manuscript. Use a 12-point font if possible. Please consult the Journal "Instructions for Contributors," found in each issue. Beyond guidelines in these instructions, which

take precedence, the style for text and references should follow the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th edition.

Your review will be edited for clarity and format. Changes may also be suggested; this is more likely if a review is overwhelmingly negative or positive without supporting information. Any other than routine editorial corrections will be sent back to you for approval.

LENGTH

Reviews should run from 250 to 1000 words, longer if agreed upon in advance. We welcome concise reviews as well as comparative reviews of several works (which can of course be longer).

DEADLINE

When invited to review a book, please return the review within 6 weeks (or by another agreed-upon date). Please let us know in advance if you need more time.

SUBMISSION FORMAT

It is preferred that you e-mail your review, both as part of your message and as an attachment (in Rich Text format). Please include with all reviews your address, phone number, fax, and e-mail.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

If the Journal sends you the book to review, it is yours to keep. Reviews may be solicited (we and you agree in advance) or unsolicited (you sent in your review without querying first), but we reserve the right to reject or heavily edit unsolicited reviews. Please let us know about forthcoming (and already published) books and media which you suggest be reviewed (and whether you are willing to review them or not). Thank you.

—Richard G. Ellsworth, PhD
Editor, AMCAP Journal

Richard G. Ellsworth, Editor
1672 West Avenue J
Suite 207
Lancaster CA 93534
< amcapjournal@byu.edu >

JOURNAL OF THE ASSOCIATION OF MORMON COUNSELORS & PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

Instructions for Contributors

The *AMCAP Journal* seeks manuscripts of interest to the broad interdisciplinary membership of the Association. The *AMCAP Journal* is a peer-reviewed journal addressing the interface between revealed religion and psychology; specifically, issues of spirituality and the influence of LDS church doctrine in psychotherapy, including the study of counseling in a spiritual context. It is devoted to influencing the field of counseling and psychotherapy through the study of related scholarship in religion, LDS doctrine, spirituality and ethics throughout the world. Appropriate manuscripts may be literature reviews, clinical case reviews, research reports, educational program reports, media reviews (books, audiovisuals, internet resources), scholarly commentary, theoretical or descriptive clinical practice articles, reports of AMCAP Convention presentations, interviews, or letters to the editor. Articles may relate to theories of counseling and psychotherapy, family therapy or social work; or may deal with the application of spirituality or church doctrine to understanding psychological processes or questions of ethical practice.

Manuscripts submitted to the *AMCAP Journal* are accepted for consideration with the understanding that they represent original material, have not been published elsewhere, and are not being considered for publication elsewhere. All manuscripts should be submitted via e-mail to the Editor:

R. G. Ellsworth <amcapjournal@byu.edu>

Please e-mail the manuscript, including any tables/charts or graphics, as an attachment. Also please mail a copy of the complete manuscript on computer disk. The e-mail attachment and disk copy should be in Rich Text Format (RTF). Disks and/or printed manuscripts should be mailed to:

Richard G. Ellsworth, Editor	The AMCAP Journal
1672 West Avenue J	or 2540 East 1700 South
Suite 207	Salt Lake City UT 84108
Lancaster CA 93534	

Cover Letter - copyright information: Please include in the cover letter a mailing address for the corresponding author, a daytime telephone number, a fax number, and

an e-mail address. A transmittal letter must accompany the manuscript, signed by all authors, which contains the following:

"In consideration of the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists (AMCAP) taking action in reviewing and editing my(our) submission, the undersigned author(s) hereby transfers, assigns, or otherwise conveys to AMCAP all copyright ownership rights in the manuscript, and all rights subsumed thereunder under the copyright laws of the United States and all foreign countries, in the event the manuscript is published by the *AMCAP Journal*. Author(s) represents and warrants that Author(s) is the sole author of the manuscript, that the manuscript is original except for necessary quotations or paraphrases for which the source has been credited, and that the manuscript does not infringe upon the copyright or other ownership rights of any other person or entity, or contain any matter that may be libelous or otherwise actionable; and Author(s) agrees to defend, save harmless and indemnify AMCAP and its *Journal* Editors, officers, directors, agents and employees, and each of them, from and against any and all claims, losses, liability, damages, and expenses for breach of these warranties."

If there are extensive quotations (over 500 words) in the manuscript, authors must obtain letters of permission for their use. A copy of the permission-granting letter should accompany the manuscript.

Review Process: the Editor and two or more members of the Editorial Board will review all papers submitted. Reviewers' comments will be sent to the authors at the Editor's discretion. Reviewers will remain anonymous. Manuscripts will be acknowledged by the Editor or Associate Editor upon receipt. Every effort is made to inform authors of publication decisions within three months. If revisions are required, the Editor may choose either to accept revisions without additional review, or to put the revised manuscript through the entire review process again. Once a manuscript is accepted for publication, three to six months will elapse before the article appears in published form in the *AMCAP Journal*.

Style Specifications: Unless contradicted by instructions on this page, manuscripts should be prepared according to the style guidelines given in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*, 5th edition, 2001. The entire manuscript should be double-spaced with separate pages for each of the following: title page, abstract, references, footnotes, tables, figures and figure captions.

Author information: All information identifying the author(s) must only be on the title page.

Title page: The title page must include:

- (1) the number of words in the text of the paper
- (2) title of the article - usually approximately 10 - 14 words
- (3) author(s) name(s), degree(s), and institutional affiliation(s). If the author(s) is not affiliated with an institution, please list city and state.
- (4) running head (i.e., an abbreviated title of less than 50 characters, including spaces)
- (5) a brief statement describing the author's affiliation, acknowledgements, and which author should receive correspondence (with a permanent address, including e-mail address). For example: John Smith PhD is Professor of Psychology at McGill University in Montreal. Jane Jones MD is a psychiatrist in private practice in Buffalo, New York. This study was supported by Health Canada NHRDP Grant #8888-8888-888, and a grant by Pfizer Inc. to Dr. Jones. The authors thank Jane Doe for her helpful comments on the manuscript. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to John Smith PhD, Dept. of Psychology, McGill University, 300 Penfield Ave., Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3H1B1. e-mail: <jsmith@mcgill.edu.ca>

Abstract: The abstract should summarize the paper in 75 to 300 words.

Text: Use the active voice as much as possible and use the first person only when referring to the author.

Patient Anonymity: Both ethical and legal considerations make it necessary to protect a patient's anonymity in reports. Identifying information (including the use of initials) should be avoided, and any identifying information in the discussion of the personal history should be adequately disguised.

Headings: First-level headings should be centered with upper and lower case letters. Second-level headings should be at the left margin with upper and lower case letters. Third-level headings should be in italics and indented with upper and lower case letters.

Text Citations: Use the author-date citation method; i.e., author surname and year of publication. For example: (Jones, 1998). If there is more than one author, use an ampersand [&] in citations. When a work has more than two authors, cite all authors the first time the reference occurs; in subsequent citations only cite the surname of the first author, followed by "et al." For example: (Smith, Johnson & Jones, 1999) then (Smith, et al., 1999).

Reference List: Every work cited should be listed in alphabetical order, by author surname, on a separate page titled "References." Use an ampersand [&] when there are two or more authors. See the *APA Publication Manual* for specific details regarding citation styles for books, journals, and other materials.

TYPES OF ARTICLES AND USUAL LENGTHS

Special Articles are overview articles that bring together information on a topic related to the Journal's mission (as outlined in the first paragraph, above). Such articles are usually no more than 7000 words in length (excluding tables and references). It is advisable to check with the Editor before submitting this type of article to be sure that a similar one is not already being processed.

Regular Articles describing research, multiple related case reports, theoretical papers and so forth, usually contain no more than 4000 words (excluding tables and references).

Case Reports are often quite interesting, and a report of a series of cases can be especially important and useful. Even single-case reports warrant publication if they illustrate new insights or are in some way unique. Single-case reports should contain no more than 2000 words. The organization of a case report includes: a brief introduction with a literature review, the case history, a concise description of the treatment intervention, a report of results with follow-up, and a discussion of the significance of the case.

Interviews: Please query the Editor before submitting an interview article.

Book and Media Reviews (including audiovisual and internet resources): The *Journal* actively solicits media reviews from qualified reviewers. Media review manuscripts should follow the guidelines on this page and in the journal's Guidelines for Book and Media Reviewers.

Letters to the Editor should include a notation that the letter is for publication. The letter must be signed by all authors. Any letter discussing an article in the *AMCAP Journal* will be sent to the author of the article. All letters will be edited before publication.



2003 SPRING CONVENTION

April 3-4, 2003

Joseph Smith Memorial Building
15 East South Temple - 9th Floor; Salt Lake City, Utah

Strengthening Relationships Across the Lifespan

Gospel-Centered Workshops and Research Presentations
CE Credits Available

Keynote Speakers: C. Terry Warner PhD, Sister Sharon Larsen, James Harper, PhD

- Travis Adams, PhD • Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, PhD • Dean Bender, MBA, MA • Lynne A. Bennion, PhD
- David W. Bush, PhD • Mark Butler, PhD • A. Dean Byrd, PhD • Vern A. Cox, PhD • Linda Feinhaur, PhD
- Steve Fife, MSc • E. Jeffrey Hill, PhD • Edward Martinelli, MEd • Jean Ranck Pedersen, MA, LMHC
- John M. Rector, PhD • Kirsten N. Rector • Janet S. Scharman, PhD • Russ Seigenberg, PhD • Jonathan D. Sherman
- Timothy B. Smith, PhD • Diane L. Spangler, PhD • Robert Stahmann, PhD • Jennifer Vigil • Wendy Watson, PhD
- Brad Wilcox, PhD • Marleen Williams, PhD • Robert F. Williams, PhD • Spencer T. Zitzman

with Student Poster Session

Convention Fees*:	both days	one day
Professional & Associate members	\$120.00	\$ 85.00
Spouses, International Retired members	\$100.00	\$ 70.00
Non-AMCAP members	\$150.00	\$100.00
Students	\$ 60.00	\$ 30.00

AMCAP membership:	
Professional	\$60.00 annually
Students	\$30.00 annually

* Price includes lunch—Pre-Registration is due by March 28, 2003

AMCAP's mission is to provide information and support for the LDS mental health professional in four areas:

1. *Spiritual Focus*
 2. *Clinical Application*
 3. *Networking and Outreach*
 4. *Research, Theory and Publication*
- As AMCAP members we strive to center our personal and professional lives upon Jesus Christ by serving our brothers and sisters in need.*

**For a registration form, convention schedule, AMCAP information or to register online
please visit our website: www.amcap.net**

For more information, email: mail@amcap.net or call (801) 583-6227



visit www.amcap.net

A New Resource for a New Century

We invite you to explore AMCAP's new website, www.amcap.net. In conjunction with AMCAP's 25th anniversary celebration in October 2000, the Governing Board launched this effort to substantially upgrade AMCAP's website, to achieve the following purposes:

- *To serve* our members, by providing information and support on a level that has not been possible before – even to those in our most distant outlying areas.
- *To celebrate* 25 years of faith and fellowship, scholarship and professional service.
- *To share* the treasures AMCAP has acquired over this quarter-century with all our members, as well as with others including students, researchers, Church leaders, and Church members seeking gospel-based psychological information.

***Features at this newly
upgraded website include:***

- *The AMCAP Journal Online:* 27 years of the AMCAP Journal, provided in searchable format. In addition, this issue and future issues will also be provided in PDF format.
- *The AMCAP Networker Online:* AMCAP's news and networking publication is provided in PDF format, beginning with the Spring 2000 issue.
- *Convention information*, including schedules, presenter information, call for proposals, and registration forms. A searchable directory of past Convention tapes and a tape order form are also available.
- *Membership Information:* application/renewal forms, information about membership types and benefits of membership.

- *Searchable Directory of AMCAP Members* (accessible to members only – get password from the AMCAP office at email@amcap.net)
- *AMCAP Bylaws* provided in indexed electronic format for easy reference.
- *AMCAP Leadership:* a listing of AMCAP's leaders from 1975 to the present.
- *About AMCAP and its Mission:* Descriptive information to orient new and potential members and others to the organization.

***We hope you will
enjoy and utilize this
new resource!***

AMCAP 2000 Website Design Team:
David Malmstrom (Webmaster; overall functional design)
Matt Maxwell (Graphic design and layout)
Andrew Enat (AMCAP Journal online; searchable areas)
Carrie Wrigley, AMCAP Governing Board (Website Coordinator; content writer & editor)
BJ Fullmer, AMCAP Executive Secretary

AMCAP
Association of
Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists

The Mission of The Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists is to provide information and support for the LDS mental health professional.

AMCAP carries out this mission through four dimensions, represented by the AMCAP logo with four arrows converging at the center:

***Spiritual
Focus***

***Clinical
Application***

***Networking
and Outreach***

***Research, Theory,
and Publication***

What is the center upon which those arrows converge?
It is The Living Christ –
Christ whom we serve by serving our brothers and sisters in need,
Christ whom we approach by our own spiritual strivings.



*The Mission of the Association of Mormon Counselors
and Psychotherapists is to provide information and support
for the LDS mental health professional*

THE ASSOCIATION OF MORMON COUNSELORS AND PSYCHOTHERAPISTS

B. J. Fullmer, Executive Secretary

2540 East 1700 South, Salt Lake City UT 84108 - (801)583-6227 fax 801-583-1305

e-mail mail@amcap.net web site: <http://www.amcap.net>

Duane M. Laws EdD - President

P. Scott Richards PhD - Vice-President

Marleen S. Williams PhD - President Elect

Noel Gill PhD - Fall 2002 Convention & Vice-President Elect

Dean Bender MBA CPA - Treasurer

Burton Kelly PhD - Historian

Richard G. Ellsworth PhD - Journal Editor

Carrie Maxwell Wrigley LCSW - Journal Associate Editor

Garison L. Jeppesen LCSW - Journal Associate Editor

Julie B. Shiffler PhD - Networker Editor

Timothy B. Smith PhD - Website Coordinator & Spring 2003 Convention

John P. Livingstone EdD & Mark D. Chamberlain PhD - Continuing Education & Ethics

Gwena Couillard PhD - Bylaws

Brent Scharman PhD - Fellows Chair

Eileen DeGruccio MS MFT - Volunteers/Election/ Convention

Jennie Murdock Gwilliam LCSW - Fall 2002 & Spring 2003 Convention

T. Brent Price PhD - Recruitment/ Convention

Susan Ericksen RN LMFT - Student Recruitment

Dana Templeman MSW - LDSFS Representative

Doug Craig PhD - Area Coordinator Supervisor

Larry W. Lewis MA CSW-ASP - Area Coordinator Eastern USA & Europe

Russ Seigenberg PhD - Area Coordinator Western U.S. Pacific & Asia

AMCAP Bylaws, Article 1, Section 2, as amended Sept. 30, 1981: "The purpose of the Association shall be: (a) 'To promote fellowship, foster communication, enhance personal and professional development, and provide a forum for counselors and psychotherapists whose common bond is membership in and adherence to the principles and standards of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, both in their personal lives and professional practice. (b) 'To encourage and support members' efforts actively to promote within their other professional organizations and society at large, the adoption and maintenance of moral standards and practices that are consistent with gospel principles."

AMCAP supports the principles and standards of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; however, it is an independent professional organization which is not sponsored by, nor does it speak for, the Church or its leaders.

Disclaimer: All methods, techniques, procedures, applications, theories, research findings and other information described in this Journal, and the views and opinions expressed by the authors, are their own and do not necessarily represent those of the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists, nor does their publication in the AMCAP Journal represent or constitute endorsement or promotion of the methods, techniques, procedures, applications, theories, treatments, research or findings by the Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists. The Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychotherapists expressly disclaims any warranties or guaranties, express or implied, and shall not be liable for damages of any kind in connection with the methods, techniques, procedures, applications, theories, treatments, research findings and other information described or the views and opinions expressed.



Association of Mormon
Counselors and Psychotherapists
2540 East 1700 South
Salt Lake City, UT, 84108
<http://www.wamcap.net>

PRESORTED
STANDARD
U.S. POSTAGE PAID
PERMIT NO. 49
PROVO UT 84601