

2015

Religious and Spiritual Diversity Training in Clinical Psychology Doctoral Programs: Do Explicitly Christian Programs Differ from Other Programs?

Mark R. McMinn

George Fox University, mmcminn@georgefox.edu

Michael J. Vogel

George Fox University

M Elizabeth Hall

Alexis D. Abernethy

Ryan Birch

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McMinn, Mark R.; Vogel, Michael J.; Hall, M Elizabeth; Abernethy, Alexis D.; Birch, Ryan; Galuza, Timofey; Rodriguez, Jacqi; and Putman, Kathryn, "Religious and Spiritual Diversity Training in Clinical Psychology Doctoral Programs: Do Explicitly Christian Programs Differ from Other Programs?" (2015). *Faculty Publications - Grad School of Clinical Psychology*. Paper 208.

http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/gscp_fac/208

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School of Clinical Psychology at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications - Grad School of Clinical Psychology by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

Authors

Mark R. McMinn, Michael J. Vogel, M Elizabeth Hall, Alexis D. Abernethy, Ryan Birch, Timofey Galuza, Jacqi Rodriguez, and Kathryn Putman

Religious and Spiritual Diversity Training in Clinical Psychology Doctoral Programs: Do Explicitly Christian Programs Differ from Other Programs?

Mark R. McMinn

George Fox University

Michael J. Vogel

Private Practice

M. Elizabeth Lewis Hall

Biola University

Alexis D. Abernethy

Fuller Theological Seminary

Ryan Birch, Timofey Galuza, and Jacqi Rodriguez

George Fox University

Kathryn Putman

Azusa Pacific University

The American Psychological Association (APA) accredits several explicitly Christian doctoral programs in clinical psychology. To what extent do these programs offer training in religious and spiritual diversity that students may not receive at other APA-accredited programs? A total of 353 students from 5 explicitly Christian programs were surveyed using the same questionnaire used in a more general national sample of APA-accredited doctoral programs a year previously. Students in explicitly Christian programs reported receiving more training in religious

and spiritual diversity and more training in advanced competencies regarding religious and spiritual issues in professional work than students in the general sample of APA-accredited programs. At the same time, students in explicitly Christian programs reported receiving less training in ethnic/racial and socioeconomic diversity than students in other programs. Diversity training implications are considered.

Author Note: Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Mark R. McMinn, Graduate Department of Clinical Psychology, George Fox University, 414 N. Meridian St., #V104, Newberg, OR 97132. Email: mmcminn@georgefox.edu.

The American Psychological Association's (APA) Commission on Accreditation accredits several explicitly Christian psychology doctoral programs that are housed within distinctively Christian institutions. Though the relationship between the APA and these programs has been marked with a degree of

tension (see Campbell, 2011, for a helpful overview), the APA's Commission on Accreditation has accredited several explicitly Christian programs and various reasons have been offered for why accreditation is appropriate (Johnson & McMinn, 2003). Among these reasons is that explicitly Christian programs are presumed to enhance diversity training related to religious and spiritual issues (e.g., McMinn et al., 2014). To date, this assumption has not been tested empirically.

The APA has demonstrated an enduring commitment to diversity training, including religious and spiritual diversity, through accreditation standards, ethics codes, and public statements. Still, it is increasingly clear that most psychology training programs do not devote adequate attention to religious and spiritual diversity (Brawer, Handal, Fabricatore, Roberts, & Wajda-Johnston, 2002; Hage, 2006; Hathaway, Scott, & Garver, 2004; Schafer, Handal, & Brawer, 2011; Schulte, Skinner, & Claiborn, 2002; Vogel, McMinn, Peterson, & Gathercoal, 2013). Doctoral programs housed in Christian institutions appeal to this need, but the argument begs the question as to whether explicitly Christian programs actually train students to deal with religious and spiritual diversity, per se, or to deal with committed Christian clients. Moreover, when explicitly Christian programs are reviewed for accreditation, it is not uncommon for questions to be raised regarding other forms of diversity training, especially those related to sexual orientation. The purpose of the current study is to compare perceptions of students at explicitly Christian doctoral programs with perceptions of students in a broad sample of APA-accredited doctoral programs in various areas of diversity training.

Though most religious expression in the United States (US) is Christian, a sizeable number identify with other religions, or identify as being spiritual without being religious (Gallup, 2009). An increasing number of US residents report having no religion (Gallup, 2010), which also must be considered when discussing religious and spiritual diversity. It is likely true that explicitly Christian programs help the US workforce by preparing psychologists who are able to deal well with Christian clients—an important goal given the gap between psychologists and the general public regarding religious values (Delaney, Miller, & Bisonó, 2007; McMinn, Hathaway, Woods, & Snow, 2009). Still, it seems somewhat disingenuous to argue for APA accreditation on the basis of diversity training if these programs are not, in fact, training students to deal with varied expressions of religious and spiritual diversity.

The impetus for training psychologists to address the particular needs of those individuals in the US

with religious or spiritual commitments is not merely practical; it also ought to be considered an ethical mandate for professional psychologists in the APA. The *Ethics Code* (APA, 2010) clearly outlines guidelines requiring psychologists to provide services that are both aware of and sensitive to the religious aspects of their clients' cultural worldviews. Psychologists almost certainly need professional training in these areas of diversity, otherwise they risk practicing outside of the boundaries of their competence, although it remains unclear as to whether explicitly Christian programs actually expand these boundaries vis-à-vis non-religious programs. In addition, research shows that in the absence of specific training in these areas, psychologists may employ religious or spiritual interventions in ways that are not thoughtfully incorporated into the therapeutic context (Sorenson & Hales, 2002).

A number of previous studies have investigated the extent to which doctoral students in psychology are trained in religious and spiritual issues (Brawer et al., 2002; Green, Callands, Radcliffe, Luebke, & Klonoff, 2009; Russell & Yarhouse, 2006; Schafer et al., 2011; Schulte et al., 2002). All of these studies suggest cause for concern as religious and spiritual issues receive relatively little emphasis in training. In the most recent published study on the topic, Vogel et al. (2013) gathered survey data from doctoral students, interns, faculty, directors of training, and internship directors and compared religious and spiritual diversity training with other forms of diversity training. In all, they collected data from 532 respondents from 50 doctoral programs and 60 internship sites and concluded that very little emphasis is being placed on religious and spiritual diversity training in doctoral psychology programs.

How do the Vogel et al. (2013) findings compare to the experience of doctoral students at explicitly Christian institutions? The current study is a replication of the Vogel et al. study, but at five explicitly Christian doctoral training programs in professional psychology. Comparing results from explicitly Christian programs with the broader sample collected by Vogel et al., we expected students at Christian institutions to report relatively greater training emphasis in religious and spiritual diversity issues than other programs in clinical psychology. We did not expect differences between samples in other areas of diversity training.

Methods

Procedure

To facilitate a multisite study, a team of collaborators at four explicitly Christian APA-accredited

psychology doctoral programs was assembled. A faculty member at an additional Christian APA-accredited psychology doctoral program agreed to help collect data but opted not to be a collaborator on the study. After review boards at the various institutions approved the study, students were invited to participate in the study. In most cases, the survey instrument was distributed in classrooms and then collected at a later time. No identifying information was collected from respondents, making their responses anonymous. In order to foster collaboration among programs, all co-investigators agreed that the data obtained would not be used to compare specific Christian programs with other programs. As such, all data are reported in the aggregate.

Participants

The four collaborators provided the number of students currently studying on campus in their doctoral clinical psychology program(s) (predoctoral interns were excluded), resulting in a total of 455 potential respondents. The number of potential students at each of these schools ranged from 90 to 160. In addition, a colleague at another Christian doctoral program in clinical psychology offered to distribute 50 survey packets to a subset of students studying at that institution, resulting in a total of 505 potential respondents. Completed questionnaires were obtained from 353 doctoral students, for an overall response rate of 70%.

Among the 353 respondents, 67.5% were female. Approximately two-thirds (67.6%) reported a European American ethnicity, with another 11.9% being Asian American, 4.3% African American, 7.7% Hispanic/Latino/a, 0.9% Native American, 4.5% Multiracial, and 3.0% Other. Just over half (57.3%) reported being trained in a practitioner-scholar model with most of the remaining respondents (34.2%) reporting a scientist-practitioner model. The distribution among years of training was quite even, with 25.8% of respondents being in the first year of training, 26.5% in the second year, 26.7% in the third year, and 19.9% in the fourth or fifth year. The average age of respondents was 27.25 years (standard deviation of 4.98), ranging from 21 to 54.

The comparison group consisted of 129 students at 50 different APA-accredited doctoral programs in clinical or counseling psychology from a study reported by Vogel et al. (2013). Respondents in the current study completed the same questionnaire as was used for the comparison sample. Only one program in Vogel et al.'s sample was an explicitly Christian program. Only 11 students in the current study came from

the explicitly Christian program included in the Vogel et al. study. Though both studies used anonymous data collection methods, we can be quite confident that the samples were independent because the data for the two samples were collected two years apart (2011 and 2013) and because all of the 11 respondents from the school in question were in their second and third years of training for the current study. These students would have not been in the program yet, or in their first year of training during the Vogel et al. study (and very few first year students were surveyed in that study).

Though Vogel et al. (2013) collected data from doctoral students, faculty, training directors, and interns, only student respondents from that study were used in order to allow for a reasonably close comparison with the student data collected in the current study. Several differences were noted between the students sampled from explicitly Christian schools and the students in the comparison group. Students from explicitly Christian schools were younger (26.63 years) than students in the comparison group (28.91 years), $t(473) = 4.52$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.45$. Accordingly, students in explicitly Christian programs had been in their programs fewer years (2.25 years) than students in the comparison group (3.18 years), $t(470) = 7.84$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.78$. In addition, fewer students from explicitly Christian programs were female (64.1% as compared to 76.7% in the comparison group), $X^2(1, N = 477) = 6.88$, $p = .008$. Students in explicitly Christian programs were also less likely to be European American (62.8%, as compared to 80.5% in the comparison group), $X^2(1, N = 469) = 13.33$, $p < .001$. Finally, students in explicitly Christian programs were more likely to report being trained in a practitioner-scholar model (72.6%) whereas more students in the comparison group reported being trained in a scientist-practitioner model (69.8%), $X^2(1, N = 443) = 98.09$, $p < .001$. Because of these differences, demographic variables were used as covariates in subsequent analyses.

Instruments

The same survey instruments used by Vogel et al. (2013) were used for this study, with each respondent randomly selected to receive one of two forms of the questionnaire. Form A of the questionnaire asked about training in religious diversity whereas the Form B used the term spiritual diversity. The items were identical on the two forms except the words "religious" or "religion" in Form A were replaced with "spiritual" or "spirituality" in Form B. Vogel et al. found no distinction in how respondents answered questions on Form A and Form B and combined results on the two

forms for purposes of analysis. These two versions were included in case respondents were to perceive training in religion differently than training in spirituality.

Respondents answered a total of 28 items, which were divided into three sets of questions: Perceived Effectiveness of Diversity Training, Advanced Competencies in Religious/Spiritual Diversity, and Methods of Training in Religious/Spiritual Diversity. The Perceived Effectiveness of Diversity Training section was comprised of seven items on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *Strongly Disagree* to *Strongly Agree*. Respondents were asked to rate the extent to which their training program is equipping them with knowledge and skills in seven forms of diversity (gender, ethnic/racial, sexual orientation, age, disabilities, socioeconomic, religious/spiritual). The Advanced Competencies in Religious/Spiritual Diversity section was comprised of 12 items examining advanced competency in either religious or spiritual diversity (e.g., "case conceptualization in light of clients' religious values"), using the same Likert-type scale as was used in the first section. The Methods of Training in Religious/Spiritual Diversity section requested the information about how diversity training is accomplished in the respondents' doctoral training program. This section contained nine items (coursework; advisers and mentors; practicum experiences; peer interaction; personal therapy; didactics, seminars, and/or grand rounds; extracurricular pursuits; research; other) on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *Never* to *Always*.

Results

A number of tests were used to investigate differences both within the sample of students from explicitly Christian programs and between these students and the comparison group. To control for Type I error, and because the sample size was deemed large enough to have minimal risk of Type II error, a conservative alpha of .01 was used for all analyses.

Religious and Spiritual Diversity

Vogel et al. (2013) discovered that students responded in similar ways whether receiving the religious diversity or spiritual diversity version of the questionnaire, so they combined results for the two questionnaires in their analyses. Similarly, respondents in the current study responded similarly to the two versions of the questionnaire. This was determined by computing a mixed model multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with the two forms of the questionnaire as the between-groups factor and the seven items in the Perceived Effectiveness of Diversity Training

section as the repeated-measures factor. Repeated-measures differences were found, indicating that students reported being trained better in some forms of diversity than others, Wilks' λ (6, 469) = .48, $p < .001$, but no between-group differences were found, F (1, 474) = 0.37, $p = .54$. The same pattern emerged when the 12 items in the Advanced Competencies in Religious/Spiritual Diversity section were compared in a similar mixed model MANOVA. That is, significant repeated-measures differences were observed for the 12 items, Wilks' λ (11, 465) = .37, $p < .001$, but no between-groups differences were observed, F (1, 475) = 1.65, $p = .20$. Given that no differences were observed between those responding to religious diversity and those responding to spiritual diversity, all responses were combined for subsequent analyses.

Importance of Religion and Spirituality

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of religion to them on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all important; I have none*) to 5 (*Extremely important; It is the center of my life*). Similarly, participants were asked to rate the importance of spirituality in their life, using a similar scale. An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to compare samples on both importance of religion and spirituality. Covariates included the demographic variables where the two samples differed. In the case of the ethnicity and training model variables, the nominal data collected were transformed into binary dummy variables so that they could meet the assumptions of ANCOVA. Respondents in explicitly Christian doctoral programs were substantially higher on both ratings than respondents in the more general sample from Vogel et al. (2013). Among students in explicitly Christian programs the average importance of religion was 4.26 ($SD = 0.82$) as compared to the comparison sample where the importance of religion was 2.60 ($SD = 1.41$), F (1, 426) = 127.32, $p < .001$, $d = 1.44$. No covariate effects were observed. Students in explicitly Christian programs rated the importance of spirituality as 4.23 ($SD = 0.96$) whereas the general sample averaged 3.38 ($SD = 1.25$), F (1, 426) = 33.32, $p < .001$, $d = 0.76$. A covariate effect was observed, with reported importance of spirituality increasing slightly with age, F (1, 426) = 10.53, $p = .001$, $r = .075$.

Perceived Effectiveness of Diversity Training

To determine if perceived differences in diversity training exist both within types of diversity training and between the two samples of students, a mixed model multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA)

was computed with the seven types of diversity as the repeated-measures variable and the two samples as the between-groups variable. The same covariates as described previously were used. Though overall differences were not observed between the two samples, $F(1, 424) = 0.61, p = .44$, a significant interaction effect was found, Wilks' $\lambda (6, 419) = .84, p < .001$. This suggests that students in both the explicitly Christian and general samples perceive a similar amount of overall diversity training, but the specific diversities in which they are best trained vary between the samples. These differences justified a profile analysis where the mean ratings of the seven diversities were rank ordered and then each mean was compared with the adjacent mean. Results of the profile analysis are reported in Table 1. Based on these overall MANOVA results, we followed up with a series of independent samples t -tests to compare the two samples on the seven areas of diversity. Results are reported in Table 1.

Two covariate by repeated-measures interactions were also observed. Reported exposure to different forms of diversity was different among students in different years of training, Wilks' $\lambda (6, 419) = .95, p = .002$. It makes intuitive sense that diversity training would vary with years of training, which may or may not be

related to the hypothesis of this study. To test this we computed a 2 x 4 analysis of variance (ANOVA) with the sample and the year of training as independent variables and religious diversity training as the dependent variable. As expected, a main effect was found for the sample, $F(1, 462) = 58.22, p < .001$. No main effect was found for year in training, and no interaction effect was found. Also, reported diversity training differed by training model, Wilks' $\lambda (6, 419) = 2.87, p = .009$. A 2 x 2 ANOVA was computed to see if this is relevant to religious diversity training. The sample and the training model were used as independent variables and religious diversity training as the dependent variable. The expected main effect was found for the sample, $F(1, 437) = 29.75, p < .001$. No main effect was found for training model, and no interaction effect was observed.

Advanced Competencies in Religious/Spiritual Diversity

A similar procedure was followed for the 12 advanced religion/spirituality competencies. As with areas of diversity, differences were observed in the repeated-measures by sample interaction, Wilks' $\lambda (11, 415) = .85, p < .001$, justifying a profile analysis (see Table 2). Overall differences were observed between

TABLE 1
Perceived Effectiveness of Diversity Training by Sample

My training institution has equipped doctoral students with knowledge of and skills for issues related to...	Explicitly Christian Programs (N = 348)	General Sample (Vogel et al., 2013) (n = 129)	Group Differences ^a
religious/spiritual diversity	4.06	3.26	$t = 7.81, p < .001$ $d = 0.81$
ethnic and racial diversity	3.99	4.32	$t = 4.16, p < .001$ $d = 0.45$
gender diversity	3.67*	3.73	No differences
socioeconomic diversity	3.66	4.03	$t = 3.94, p < .001$ $d = 0.41$
sexual orientation diversity	3.45*	3.66	No differences
age diversity	3.25*	3.32	No differences
diversity pertaining to disabilities	3.13*	3.36	No differences

Note. Possible scale responses for each item range from 1 to 5, with 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Agree*, and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Items arranged in descending order based on ratings of students in explicitly Christian programs.
^aCompares students from explicitly Christian programs with students from the general sample using an independent samples t -test. Both the within-group and between-groups tests were conducted with a conservative alpha of 0.01 to control for Type I error.
* $p < .01$. Item rating is significantly lower than the preceding item, using a paired-samples t -test.

TABLE 2
Advanced Competencies in Religious/Spiritual Diversity

My training institution has equipped doctoral students with knowledge of and skills for issues related to...	Explicitly Christian Programs (N = 348)	General Sample (Vogel et al., 2013) (n = 129)	Group Differences ^a
ethical guidelines and professional standards for religion.	4.15	3.05	$t = 12.60, p < .001$ $d = 1.18$
case conceptualization in light of clients' religious values.	4.02*	3.24	$t = 8.63, p < .001$ $d = 0.85$
considering religion when determining if behavior is abnormal.	3.87*	3.69	No differences
countertransference issues with religiously committed clients.	3.75	2.48	$t = 12.98, p < .001$ $d = 1.30$
self-reflective practices during work with religious clients.	3.73	2.72	$t = 10.65, p < .001$ $d = 1.06$
assessment methods that consider religion in clients' lives.	3.66	2.68	$t = 9.60, p < .001$ $d = 1.01$
implementing religious interventions in clinical work.	3.59	2.24	$t = 13.24, p < .001$ $d = 1.36$
conducting research that is sensitive to religious diversity.	3.56	2.94	$t = 5.96, p < .001$ $d = 0.59$
views of personhood from the perspectives of major religions.	3.38*	2.74	$t = 6.12, p < .001$ $d = 0.63$
consultation skills related to religious diversity.	3.30	2.56	$t = 7.45, p < .001$ $d = 0.77$
interdisciplinary collaboration with religious leaders.	3.02	2.18	$t = 8.25, p < .001$ $d = 0.86$
understanding the major world religions.	2.98	2.43	$t = 5.38, p < .001$ $d = 0.56$

Note. Possible scale responses for each item range from 1 to 5, with 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Agree*, and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Items arranged in descending order based on ratings of students in explicitly Christian programs.
^aCompares students from explicitly Christian programs with students from the general sample using an independent samples *t*-test. Both the within-group and between-groups tests were conducted with a conservative alpha of 0.01 to control for Type I error.
 * $p < .01$. Item rating is significantly lower than the preceding item, using a paired-samples *t*-test.

samples, $F(1, 425) = 115.57, p < .001$. As seen in Table 2, many of the items show very large effect sizes between the two samples. Overall, students in explicitly Christian programs report receiving more training in these advanced competency areas than students in the general sample of APA-accredited programs. A covariate by repeated-measures interaction was observed for year in training, Wilks' $\lambda (6, 415) = .94, p = .007$, indicating that some forms of advanced training in religious issues occur earlier in training than other forms of advanced training.

Methods of Training in Religious/Spiritual Diversity
 Finally, a similar MANOVA was computed for the first eight methods of diversity-training questions. The final question in this section was titled, "Other" and required respondents to write in an additional method of training not covered in the other eight items. Because only 49 participants provided a response to this item, and because their responses were not uniform, this final item was omitted from the MANOVA. Differences were observed in the repeated-measures by

sample interaction, Wilks' λ (7, 355) = .81, $p < .001$, justifying a profile analysis (see Table 3). Overall differences were observed between samples, $F(1, 361) = 64.18, p < .001$. As seen in Table 3, many of the items show very large effect sizes between the two samples. Overall, students in explicitly Christian programs report receiving more training in religious and spiritual diversity than students in the general sample of APA-accredited programs. No covariate effects were observed.

Discussion

Based on student report, it appears that explicitly Christian programs provide diversity training in religious and spiritual issues that surpasses other APA-accredited doctoral programs. This is a consistent finding seen in overall diversity training ratings, advanced competencies in religious and spiritual issues, and reported methods of training. Based on student report, this religious and diversity training appears to apply

across religious traditions, and not just with Christian clients. At the same time, students in explicitly Christian training programs report receiving relatively less diversity training than other APA-accredited programs in areas of ethnic/racial diversity and socioeconomic diversity. No differences were reported in diversity training related to gender, sexual orientation, age, or disabilities.

Training Implications

Throughout the past decade a number of researchers have been calling for greater attention to religious and spiritual issues in APA-accredited doctoral programs (Brawer et al., 2002; Hage, 2006; Hathaway et al., 2004; Schulte et al., 2002; Vogel et al., 2013). The APA now has many training resources available, including published books and videos, but religious and spiritual diversity training still appears to be lagging behind other forms of diversity training (Vogel et al., 2013). Perhaps the best news from the current study

TABLE 3
Methods of Training in Religious/Spiritual Diversity

At your training institution, please indicate how frequently you believe the following sources of learning are used to prepare doctoral students for professional work with respect to religious/spiritual diversity	Explicitly Christian Programs (N = 348)	General Sample (Vogel et al., 2013) (n = 129)	Group Differences ^a
Coursework (e.g., assigned readings, class projects)	3.98	2.73	$t = 13.56, p < .001$ $d = 1.30$
Advisers and Mentors	3.79*	2.78	$t = 10.03, p < .001$ $d = 1.01$
Peer Interaction (e.g., student-led dialogue, peer feedback)	3.72	3.00	$t = 7.80, p < .001$ $d = 0.75$
Practicum Experiences (e.g., supervision, client contact)	3.49*	3.17	$t = 2.94, p = .003$ $d = 0.30$
Didactics, Seminars, and/or Grand Rounds	3.44	2.48	$t = 9.89, p < .001$ $d = 1.05$
Extracurricular Pursuits (e.g., conferences, voluntary readings)	3.40	2.81	$t = 5.97, p < .001$ $d = 0.59$
Personal Therapy	3.34	2.04	$t = 10.36, p < .001$ $d = 1.16$
Research (e.g., peer-reviewed articles)	3.32	2.81	$t = 5.38, p < .001$ $d = 0.55$

Note. Possible scale responses for each item range from 1 to 5, with 1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 2 = *Disagree*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Agree*, and 5 = *Strongly Agree*. Items arranged in descending order based on ratings of students in explicitly Christian programs.
^aCompares students from explicitly Christian programs with students from the general sample using an independent samples *t*-test. Both the within-group and between-groups tests were conducted with a conservative alpha of 0.01 to control for Type I error.
* $p < .01$. Item rating is significantly lower than the preceding item, using a paired-samples *t*-test.

is that some programs seem to have accomplished this relatively well. The large effect sizes are especially worth noting. In areas such as considering professional ethics and countertransference in relation to religious and spiritual issues, and implementing religious or spiritual interventions in psychotherapy (Aten, McMin, & Worthington, 2011), the differences between explicitly Christian programs and other APA-accredited programs are striking. One area of professional service for faculty and students within explicitly Christian programs is to make their training methods known through presentations at APA conventions and publications (e.g., McMin et al., 2014). From the present study, it appears that coursework, didactics, and advising/mentoring related to religious and spiritual issues are perceived very differently at explicitly Christian programs than at other APA-accredited programs (all have effect sizes greater than 1).

Vogel et al. (2013) observed that the most frequent advanced competency observed among their respondents in areas of religion and spirituality pertains to understanding religious issues related to abnormal behavior. Interestingly, this advanced competency is the only one where a difference was not observed between students in explicitly Christian programs and students in other APA-accredited programs. This supports the concern raised by Vogel et al. that considering psychopathology may be the primary way that students in many APA-accredited doctoral programs are exposed to religion and spirituality. This would be unfortunate for many reasons, including the failure to see the adaptive and health-promoting dimensions of religion and spirituality (Koenig, King, & Carson, 2012).

Another training implication from this study is that explicitly Christian programs appear to be exposing students to relatively less diversity training in areas of ethnic/racial diversity and socioeconomic diversity. It is important to note that these programs were considered in aggregate for purposes of this study, so it is possible that some individual programs are doing better than others in these areas of diversity training. Also, it is important to note that racial/ethnic diversity remains among the highest rated diversity training areas for students in explicitly Christian programs. This area of training is not being overlooked. It is worth noting that respondents from explicitly Christian programs were reporting at an earlier point in training than students in the comparison sample. It is likely that some students early in training had not yet taken courses in multicultural diversity. Socioeconomic diversity training receives a moderate degree of attention in explicitly Christian programs—less than spiritual, racial/ethnic,

and gender diversity, but more than sexual orientation, age, and disabilities. In contrast, it was the among the highest rated forms of diversity training in Vogel et al.'s study, second only to ethnic/racial diversity. Reasons for the disparity in socioeconomic diversity training are less clear, and worthy of further investigation. We hope these findings serve as reminders to faculty in explicitly Christian programs to monitor and maintain excellence in all area of diversity training, including racial/ethnic and socioeconomic diversity. Diversity training requires a degree of creativity and ongoing innovation. Having an active diversity committee comprised of both faculty and students is one way to keep various forms of diversity training central in program planning and implementation.

Limitations and Future Research

Perhaps the most unsettling limitation of this study is the reliance on student self-report. Student perceptions of training are presumably good markers, or at least ubiquitous markers insofar as most programs rely on student evaluations to assess faculty competency. Previous research has demonstrated that alumni and faculty perceptions of training tend to be somewhat more favorable than student perceptions (McMin, Bearse, Heyne, & Staley, 2011; McMin, Hill, & Griffin, 2004; Vogel et al., 2013). In future studies it may be best to determine training acumen by including external markers such as the type of research being published at explicitly Christian programs or the type of patient care being provided by faculty, students, and alumni of these programs.

The explicitly Christian sample had more diversity than the comparison sample, both in terms of ethnic diversity and gender diversity. Students in the explicitly Christian programs were also earlier in training than students in the comparison group. Though these variables were used as covariates in the analyses, it would be optimal to have more balanced samples for future studies.

It would also be helpful to study the extent to which diversity training is a zero-sum endeavor. Does excellence in one form of diversity training necessarily result in less training among other forms of diversity? If not, can exemplary programs be identified that train students well in all forms of diversity, including religious and spiritual diversity?

Conclusion

Based on self-report information from current students in explicitly Christian programs, it appears that these programs are succeeding in providing a training

environment that considers religious and spiritual diversity as well as providing advanced competencies in working with religious and spiritual issues in clinical psychology. This is being accomplished through coursework, mentoring, didactics, and other supplementary training opportunities.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2010). *Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct*. Retrieved from <http://apa.org/ethics/code/index.aspx>
- Aten, J. D., McMinn, M. R., & Worthington, E. D., Jr. (2011). *Spiritually oriented interventions in psychotherapy*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Brawer, P. A., Handal, P. J., Fabricatore, A. N., Roberts, R., & Wajda-Johnston, V. A. (2002). Training and education in religion/spirituality within APA-accredited clinical psychology programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 33, 203–206.
- Campbell, C. D. (2011). APA accreditation of doctoral psychology programs in Christian universities. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 39, 59–67.
- Delaney, H. D., Miller, W. R., & Bisonó, A. M. (2007). Religiosity and spirituality among psychologists: A survey of clinician members of the American Psychological Association. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38, 538–546.
- Gallup Polls, Inc. (2009). *Religion*. Retrieved February 4, 2010, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/1690/religion.aspx>
- Gallup Polls, Inc. (2010). *In U.S., increasing number have no religious identity*. Retrieved December 12, 2011, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/128276/Increasing-Number-No-Religious-Identity.aspx>
- Green, D., Callands, T. A., Radcliffe, A. M., Luebke, A. M., & Klonoff, E. A. (2009). Clinical psychology students' perceptions of diversity training: A study of exposure and satisfaction. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 65, 1056–1070.
- Hage, S. M. (2006). A closer look at the role of spirituality in psychology training programs. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37, 303–310.
- Hathaway, W. L., Scott, S. Y., & Garver, S. A. (2004). Assessing religious/spiritual functioning: A neglected domain in clinical practice? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35, 97–104.
- Johnson, W. B., & McMinn, M. R. (2003). Thirty years of integrative doctoral training: Historic developments, assessment of outcomes, and recommendations for the future. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 31, 83–96.
- Koenig, H. G., King, D., & Carson, V. B. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of religion and health* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McMinn, M. R., Barse, J. L., Heyne, L. K., & Staley, R. C. (2011). Satisfaction with clinical training in Christian psychology doctoral programs: Survey findings and implications. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 30, 156–162.
- McMinn, M. R., Bufford, R. K., Vogel, M. J., Gerdin, T., Goetsch, B., Block, M. M., . . . Wiarda, N. R. (2014). Religious and spiritual diversity training in professional psychology: A case study. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 8(1), 51–57.
- McMinn, M. R., Hathaway, W. L., Woods, S. W., & Snow, K. N. (2009). What American Psychological Association leaders have to say about *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*. *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 1, 3–13.
- McMinn, M. R., Hill, P. C., & Griffin, J. W. (2004). Satisfaction with research training in Christian psychology doctoral programs: Survey findings and implications. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 23, 305–312.
- Russell, S. R., & Yarhouse, M. A. (2006). Training in religion/spirituality within APA-accredited psychology predoctoral internships. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 37, 430–436.
- Schafer, R. M., Handal, P. J., & Brawer, P. A. (2011). Training and education in religion/spirituality within APA-accredited clinical psychology programs: 8 years later. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 50, 232–239. doi: 10.1007/s10943-009-9272-8
- Schulte, D. L., Skinner, T. A., & Claiborn, C. D. (2002). Religious and spiritual issues in counseling psychology training. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 30, 118–134.
- Sorenson, R. L., & Hales, S. (2002). Comparing evangelical protestant psychologists trained at secular versus religiously affiliated programs. *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/Practice/Training*, 2, 163–170.
- Vogel, M. J., McMinn, M. R., Peterson, M. A., & Gathercoal, K. A. (2013). Examining religion and spirituality as diversity training: A multidimensional study of doctoral training in the American Psychological Association. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 44, 158–167.

Author Information

McMINN, MARK R. PhD. *Address*: Graduate Department of Clinical Psychology, George Fox University, 414 N Meridian Street, #V104, Newberg, OR 97132. *Title*: Professor of Psychology. *Degrees*: PhD (Vanderbilt University). *Specializations*: Church-psychology collaboration, integration of psychology and Christianity, positive psychology.

VOGEL, MICHAEL J. PsyD. *Address*: Private Practice, 1408 Poyntz Avenue, Manhattan, KS 66502. *Title*: Clinical Psychologist. *Degrees*: PsyD (George Fox University). *Specializations*: Integration of psychology and Christianity, psychodynamic psychotherapy, religious and spiritual diversity.

HALL, M. ELIZABETH LEWIS. PhD. *Address*: Biola University, Rosemead School of Psychology, 13800 Biola Avenue, La Mirada, CA 90639. *Title*: Professor of psychology. *Degrees*: PhD (Biola University). *Specializations*: Women's issues, integration of psychology and Christianity, mental health and missions.

ABERNETHY, ALEXIS D. PhD. *Address*: Graduate School of Psychology, Fuller Theological Seminary, 180 North Oakland Avenue, Pasadena, CA 91101. *Title*: Professor of Psychology. *Degrees*: PhD (University of California, Berkeley), CGP (Certified Group Psychotherapist), FAGPA (Fellow of the American Group Psychotherapy Association). *Specializations*: Spirituality and health.

BIRCH, RYAN F. MA. *Address*: Graduate Department of Clinical Psychology, George Fox University, 414 N Meridian Street, Newberg, OR 97132. *Title*: Doctoral candidate in clinical psychology. *Degrees*: BA (Christian Ministry) Azusa Pacific University, MA (Clinical Psychology) George Fox University. *Specializations*: Psychoanalysis, integration of psychology and Christianity.

GALUZA, TIMOFEY S. MA. *Address:* Graduate Department of Clinical Psychology, George Fox University, 414 N Meridian Street, Newberg, OR 97132. *Title:* Doctoral candidate in clinical psychology. *Degrees:* BA (Psychology) University of Portland, MA (Clinical Psychology) George Fox University. *Specializations:* Psychological assessment.

RODRIGUEZ, JACQI M. MA. *Address:* Graduate Department of Clinical Psychology, George Fox University, 414 N Meridian Street, Newberg, OR 97132. *Title:* Pre-doctoral psychology intern. *Degrees:* MA (Clinical Psychology) George Fox University.

PUTMAN, KATHERINE M. PsyD. *Address:* Graduate School of Psychology, Azusa Pacific University, 901 E. Alosta Avenue, P.O. Box 7000, Azusa, CA 91702. *Title:* Associate Professor of Psychology. *Degrees:* PsyD (Wheaton College). *Specializations:* Cross-cultural psychology, child and adolescent trauma, spiritual outcomes of therapy.