

---

# A Social Psychology of Evangelism

---

DAVID G. MYERS and CHARLES W. GREEN

*"You are the salt of the earth . . . the light of the world . . .  
Go therefore and make disciples of all nations."*

(Matthew 5:13-14; 28:19)

But how? How can Christians most effectively persuade people to believe in, worship, and serve the God of the Bible?

"Man is by nature a social animal," observed Aristotle.<sup>1</sup> The implications of that fact of life are being delineated by the young science of social psychology. From its last three decades of research we have gleaned a dozen principles of social influence that seem applicable to evangelism. These principles describe factors at work at each stage in the persuasion process, as we analyze *who says what to whom in what context?*

## To Whom? The Audience

Every aspiring writer, every ambitious entrepreneur, every eager political canvasser, every determined advertising executive, every hopeful recruiter is trained to define an audience—a receptive target market. The church, too, can maximize its effectiveness by knowing which of its possible audiences will be most receptive to its message, most open to a life-forming change. A partial answer is provided by *Principle One: the teens and early twenties are formative years.*<sup>2</sup> When surveying and resurveying groups of younger and older people over several years, and when studying the extent to which younger and older people change after moving into new situations, researchers have found that older people are less changeable than younger people. Attitudes and world-views form and change during the teens and early twenties, and thereafter tend to persist.

The implication for churches is clear: *make youth a priority.* In many churches the most fertile field for evangelism is not outside but within the church, among its adolescents. The mainline denominations are shrinking not primarily because they are losing members to more conservative churches, but because they are dramatically failing to evangelize their own children, many of whom are abandoning organized religion.

The church's failure to evangelize contemporary youth can be blamed partly on secular influences that promote self-indulgent values, but also partly on its making the evangelism and disciplining of its youth one of its

lowest rather than highest priorities. This is understandable, for working with youth can be unrewarding. There are few strokes from youth for well-delivered messages, few words of praise for pastoral calls, and more than a few exasperated moments. Although the results may therefore not be immediately gratifying, the potential long-term impact of pastoral investment is greater for youth work than for any other domain of ministry. These are the years when values, convictions, and life directions tend to be formulated.

One wonders why, then, so many churches seem so indifferent to their most important audience. One can wonder why, for example, one affluent 725 member Reformed church could, during the last year, support a full and part-time staff of ten people and assign none of them to work directly on a week-to-week basis with the middle school or senior high youth groups. Is it because the five teenagers who attended the senior high group were so undemanding (and the other fifty who didn't so unimportant) compared to the adults who comprised the church's committees and consistory? Is it because our Reformed Church seminaries offer so little emphasis and training in youth ministry? If indeed the teens and early twenties are formative years then surely it is better for all the church to have tried and failed than never to have really tried at all. Better to give our best seminarians the vision and skills to evangelize in the church's number one market, better to create budgets and pastoral job descriptions that make youth a priority, better *not* to relegate youth solely to ill-equipped volunteers or temporary interns.

Regardless of the age of one's audience, it helps to know what factors influence their thoughts, feelings, and actions. Consider, then, two principles that describe the interplay between attitudes and actions. During the 1960s, dozens of research studies challenged the assumption that people's attitudes guide their actions. But studies since 1970 have revealed conditions under which our attitudes *do* influence our actions — namely, when we are keenly aware of our attitudes and when other influences on our behavior, such as social pressures, are minimized. If our attitudes toward cheating, or church going, or racial minorities are brought to mind in a pertinent situation — if something causes us to stop and remember who we are before we act — then we may indeed stand up for what we believe. C. S. Lewis recognized this in noting that “daily prayers and religious readings and churchgoing are necessary parts of the Christian life. We have to be continually reminded of what we believe.”<sup>3</sup> In such situations we can observe *Principle Two: attitudes influence behavior.*<sup>4</sup>

This principle parallels the familiar Christian idea that faith influences action. While hiding in a cave, Elijah is overwhelmed by the Almighty, whereupon he boldly leaves the cave to fulfill his mission in Damascus. Paul is transformed by God on the Damascus Road and soon begins

preaching the gospel to the Gentiles. Ezekiel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Amos likewise have powerful experiences with God calling them to prophetic action. In each case, an encounter with God provokes a new state of consciousness which is then acted upon. Faith influences action.

But if social psychology has taught us anything during the last three decades it is that the reverse also is true: we are as likely to act ourselves into a way of thinking as to think ourselves into action; we are as likely to believe in what we have stood up for as to stand up for what we believe. This can be expressed as *Principle Three: attitudes follow behavior*. Consider a few examples of the wide-ranging evidence:

- \* In the laboratory, and in everyday situations, evil acts shape the self. People induced to harm an innocent victim typically come to disparage the victim. Those induced to speak or write statements about which they have misgivings will often come to accept their little lies. Saying becomes believing.

- \* Positive actions — resisting temptation, giving help to someone, behaving amicably in desegregated situations — also shape the self. As social psychologists predicted, changes in racial behavior following desegregation rulings and civil rights legislation have been followed by positive changes in racial attitudes. Evil actions corrupt, but repentant actions renew.

- \* Many of today's therapy techniques make a constructive use of the self-persuasive effects of behavior. Behavior therapy, assertiveness training, and rational-emotive therapy all coax their clients to rehearse and then practice more productive ways of talking and acting, trusting that by so doing the person's inner disposition will gradually follow along.

The attitudes-follow-behavior principle, like the attitudes-influence-behavior principle, is especially valid under certain conditions — notably when people feel some choice and responsibility for their behavior rather than attributing it to coercion. But most behavior, even the pressured Nazi greeting, "Heil Hitler," involves some feeling of choice. Thus there often occur feelings of discomfort when one is influenced to behave in ways inconsistent with one's prior attitudes. Historian Richard Grunberger reports that when goaded into saying what they didn't believe, many Germans "tried to establish their psychic equilibrium by consciously making themselves believe what they said."<sup>5</sup>

This parallels the underappreciated biblical and theological idea that faith *follows* action. We come to know God by doing God's Word. *Knowing, loving, and hearing* are active verbs, something one does. Likewise, Jesus declared that whoever would do the will of God would know God, that he would come and dwell within those who heed what he said, and that we would find ourselves by actively losing ourselves as we take

up the cross. His call was not to believe but to *follow*. The power of the gospel is known only by living it out.

Faith therefore grows as we act on such faith as we have. Faith "is born of obedience," said John Calvin.<sup>6</sup> "The proof of Christianity really consists in 'following,'" declared Soren Kierkegaard.<sup>7</sup> Pascal was even more plainspoken: To attain faith, "follow the way by which [the committed] began; by acting as if they believed, taking the holy water, having masses said, etc. Even this will naturally make you believe."<sup>8</sup>

For evangelism this faith-follows-action principle implies the desirability of creating opportunities for people to enact their uncertain beliefs, thereby confirming and strengthening their Christian identity. Billy Graham recognizes this when asking people to enact a public commitment of their newfound faith: "Now I'm going to ask you to get up out of your seat."

Without imitating their creeds or social practices, we need to become as wise as some of the newer, nontraditional religions, many of which exploit the self-persuasive effects of public actions. Their new converts soon learn that membership is no peripheral matter. They are quickly made active members of the team, not mere spectators of religious theatre. Typically they start small — by getting people to attend a dinner, then a weekend of fellowship where they join in songs, activities and discussion. Gradually, the activities become more arduous — soliciting contributions and attempting to convert others. The result? Just as the participants in social psychological experiments often come to believe in those things for which they have suffered and witnessed, so do these new recruits. This illustrates the power of principles two and three; attitudes and behavior, like chicken and egg, generate one another in an endless spiral.

Note that the principle that attitudes follow behavior works for the evangelist as well as the evangelized. We, too, tend to believe what we say, to think how we act. It is important, therefore, to ponder the long-term implications of evangelistic efforts in two ways: What will be the impact on our audience? But also, what will be the impact on us? We should ask, "Is my evangelism making me more like the model I am asking others to accept?"

### Who Says? The Communicator

Social psychologists have found that who says something can make a big difference in how it is perceived. One recent experiment was conducted with the cooperation of the Socialist and Liberal leaders in the Dutch parliament. When the two men argued identical positions using the same words, each was most effective when the audience was his own party.<sup>9</sup> But what makes one communicator more persuasive than another?

A partial answer is provided by *Principle Four: credible and attractive communicators have more impact*. Credible communicators are those perceived as trustworthy and expert. People who are not promoting their own self-interest are perceived as trustworthy (as when candidate Jimmy Carter announced his support of amnesty for Vietnam draft resisters before, of all places, the American Legion convention). People who speak unhesitatingly, who talk fast, and who look their listeners straight in the eye are perceived as more expert. Attractive communicators are people whom their audiences find appealing; this can mean being physically appealing, but it also can mean being similar to one's audience—someone they can identify with. Ronald Reagan may at times have lacked expertise, but he nevertheless had enough perceived trustworthiness and attractiveness to become the "great persuader" among recent presidents.

What are the implications of this fourth principle for evangelism? Should we stand in front of the mirror, comb our hair, stare straight ahead, and practice talking fast? The trustworthiness and expertise that constitute credibility are rooted in more important things than just appearance and speaking style. We will be perceived as trustworthy if, in fact, we act in terms of another's interests and not our own. We will be judged to be expert if we inform ourselves, not only of matters of faith, but also of the concerns of those with whom we speak. The most effective and honest way to appear credible is to *be* credible.

In this age of the electronic church what is the place of personal evangelism? Are preachers more effective when on television? And is the credibility and attractiveness of TV evangelists so great that personal witnessing pales by comparison? Studies of persuasion have revealed *Principle Five: personal persuasion is more effective than media persuasion*. The media can effectively manipulate our opinions of things we don't care much about, such as which brand of aspirin we prefer. But when it comes to important matters, the major influence upon our attitudes and behavior is not the media but our direct contact with other people. (Jesus talking with the Samaritan woman at the well provides a biblical example.) This conclusion emerges from studies of political persuasion and health education, which generally reveal that face-to-face appeals have far more impact than mass mailings or media advertising.

The principle is powerful enough that most pastors need only be reminded of their own experience. No amount of posters, bulletin announcements, or newsletter mailings regarding an event is ever so effective as person-to-person invitations. Likewise, in evangelism outreach no amount of newspaper advertising and no expenditure on welcoming signs can compete with warm, direct, personal appeals and invitations. The church's most powerful evangelism tactic would therefore be to rekindle the spiritual vitality of its own people and to animate them as fishers of other people.

Imagine that the stage is set for an effective outreach. You have an opportunity to communicate personally with an open and receptive audience that finds you utterly credible and appealing. How then can you articulate a message that is memorable and persuasive?

The question is appropriate in view of *Principle Six: ineffective appeals can be worse than none at all*. Such is the implication of research on ways to enable people to resist persuasion. Social psychologist William McGuire reasoned that people might be inoculated against persuasion much as they are inoculated against a virus, by being subjected to a weak dose of the virus — enough to stimulate the body's defenses but not enough to be overwhelming. Sure enough, if people were "immunized" by receiving a small challenge to their existing beliefs and if they actively refuted the small challenge, they later were able to resist powerful persuasive appeals.

This "attitude inoculation" finding implies that Christian educators can prepare youngsters for later attacks on their beliefs and values by acknowledging contrary views and by engaging the youngsters in refuting them. It is one thing to nurture faith, and another to nurture a faith that will withstand a later secular onslaught. The finding also implies that ineffective evangelism can be worse (from the standpoint of the evangelist) than none at all. Though even an ineffective appeal may make the evangelist feel better, it can also serve as an inoculating agent, "hardening the heart" against subsequent cogent appeals. This should not paralyze evangelistic efforts, for if nothing is ventured nothing will surely be gained. But we should also bear in mind that a price is paid for simplistic evangelistic methods that trigger rejection by 99+ percent of the audience. For example, one problem with media evangelism is that any evangelist may be credible and attractive for only a small segment of viewers. If the evangelist persuades a few, but evokes chortles or rolling eyes from many more, is the result a net gain or loss? Is the evangelism offset by a subtle counterevangelism that makes it more difficult for people to take Christianity seriously? C. S. Lewis saw that it might well be: "To be forewarned and therefore forearmed . . . is eminently rational if our belief is true; but if our belief is a delusion, this same forewarning and forearming would obviously be the method whereby the delusion rendered itself incurable."<sup>10</sup>

So, what factors make for an effective message; One is *Principle Seven: vivid, concrete examples are more potent than abstract information*.<sup>11</sup> People are often more swayed by specific illustrations than by abstract assertions of general truth. One University of Michigan study found that a single vivid welfare case had more impact on opinions about welfare recipients than did factual information running contrary to the case. Another found that student impressions of potential teachers were influ-

enced more by a few personal testimonies concerning the teacher than by a comprehensive statistical summary of many students' evaluations. The reason seems to be that vivid, personalized anecdotes are memorable, and we use the ease with which we recall instances of something as a guide to what is generally true.

No experienced writer will be surprised by this principle. As William Strunk and E. B. White asserted in their classic *The Elements of Style*, "If those who have studied the art of writing are in accord on any one point, it is on this: the surest way to arouse and hold the attention of the reader is by being specific, definite, and concrete."

However, a sermon or evangelistic message is never just a string of unrelated examples; the preacher aims to communicate a basic point. We might say that theological concepts are to a good sermon what the base of an iceberg is to its tip. Jesus, for example, embodied basic truths in memorable pictures: "Indeed he said nothing to them without a parable" (Matthew 13:34). And what pastor has not received compliments from adults for a simple but concrete children's sermon? The children may not have grasped the analogy, but the adults understood and remembered it. This illustrates the persuasive power of vivid, concrete examples.

The problem of poor memory for sermons—which the few available studies suggest definitely is a problem—can also be addressed by keeping in mind *Principle Eight: messages that relate to what people know or have experienced are better remembered*. Public speaking experts have long supposed this to be true. Aristotle urged speakers to adapt their messages to their audiences. Experimental psychologists have confirmed the point; messages that are unrelated to people's existing ideas or experiences are difficult to comprehend and quickly forgotten, as with this paragraph from an experiment by John Bransford and Marcia Johnson:

The procedure is actually quite simple. First you arrange things into different groups. Of course, one pile may be sufficient depending on how much there is to do . . . . After the procedure is completed, one arranges the materials into different groups again. Then they can be put into their proper places. Eventually they will be used once more and the whole cycle will then have to be repeated. However, that is a part of life.<sup>12</sup>

When Bransford and Johnson had people read this paragraph as you just did, without connecting it to anything they already knew about, little of it was remembered. When people were told that the paragraph was about sorting laundry, something familiar to them, they remembered much more of it—as you probably could if you now reread it.

A message that is hooked to some cue—something we will think about or experience again—is especially likely to come to mind in the

future. When the cue pops up, it may call to mind the message associated with it. One memorable sermon likened American religion to waiting room Muzak—bland and soothing. A year after this “Sound of Muzak” sermon was preached, several of us who heard it found ourselves eating dinner in a room with music softly playing in the background. Someone noticed the music—and recalled the sermon.

Retention of messages also can be boosted by an application of *Principle Nine: spaced repetition aids memory*. As every student of human learning knows well, we remember information much better if it is presented to us repeatedly, especially if the repetitions are spaced over time rather than grouped together. Experimental psychologist Lynn Hasher has found that repeated information is also more credible.<sup>13</sup> When statements such as “The largest museum in the world is the Louvre in Paris” were repeatedly flashed on the screen, people rated them as more likely to be true than when the statements had been shown infrequently. Social psychologists have uncovered a parallel phenomenon: repeated presentation of a neutral stimulus—whether a human face, a Chinese character or a piece of unfamiliar music—generally increases people’s liking of it.

Preachers can capitalize on this finding that repetition, especially spaced repetition, makes messages more memorable and appealing. When preparing a sermon they might ask themselves, What do I most want people to remember from this? They can then repeat that one key idea numerous times. (We suspect that a little informal testing of parishioners’ recall would reveal that few people can recall the main points of the last three-point sermon they heard.) Given the limitations of human memory, the advice of Henry Grady Davis appears sound: A sermon should be “the embodiment of one vigorous idea.” Perhaps this could even be taken a step further: that idea should be embodied in the whole worship service—the Scriptures, music, prayers, and closing charge.

Better yet, if the key idea can be captured in a single statement or pithy saying that becomes the trunk of a talk or sermon, unifying the illustrative branches which grow from it. What listener can forget the refrain in Martin Luther King, Jr.’s “I Have a Dream” sermon? Principle nine therefore bears repeating: spaced repetition aids memory.

What’s crucial for evangelistic persuasion is actually not the sermon itself but what responses it evokes in the audience’s mind. Messages that trigger many concurring thoughts and a few counterarguments will be most persuasive, partly because people are more likely to remember their own ideas than the information that prompts them. (That’s one reason why credible and attractive communicators are more persuasive—they stimulate less counterarguing and more agreeing.)

Not only do we better remember information we produce ourselves, but our attitudes are also more likely to be changed by self-generated in-



formation. When people actively discuss ideas or restate them in their own terms, they are more likely to remember and be persuaded by them. This implies *Principle Ten: active processing boosts persuasion*.

Preachers and even parents may fail to recognize that their spoken words are more prominent to them (as active speakers) than to their passive audience. We are therefore amazed at our children's capacities to ignore us. If, instead of constant harping, we gently ask the child to restate the request ("Aaron, what did I ask you to do?"), the child's act of verbalizing the request will heighten awareness of it. Mr. Rogers, the television friend of preschoolers, applies this principle by asking a question and then saying nothing for a few moments, allowing his young listeners to answer for themselves. Preachers can do likewise, by pausing after raising a thought-provoking question. This is what candidate Ronald Reagan did so effectively at the end of his debate with President Carter and in the closing days of the campaign, by asking repeatedly, "Are you better off than you were four years ago? Is it easier for you to go and buy things in the stores than it was four years ago?" William James recognized the principle ninety years ago: "No reception without reaction, no impression without correlative expression — this is the great maxim which the teacher ought never to forget."<sup>14</sup> But beware: experimental techniques for stimulating active thinking — using rhetorical questions, asking people to evaluate the message, getting people's undistracted attention — not only tend to make strong messages even more persuasive but also (because of counter-arguing) weak messages less persuasive.

### The Social Context

Being social creatures, people are also influenced by their social interactions, many of which occur in small informal groups. Among several types of group influences studied by social psychologists is one we can state as *Principle Eleven: group discussion generally strengthens shared convictions*. This principle emerges from hundreds of experiments (conducted in our own Hope College laboratory and elsewhere) indicating that group interaction tends to strengthen the group's preexisting attitudes, whether for or against a position. Social psychologists have noted parallels to this "group polarization" principle in many everyday situations, ranging from the emergence of terrorist activity to the accentuation of initial differences among college-student groups with time in college.

Among the parallels is the magnification of religious identity that can result from religious fellowship. As Thomas a Kempis advised in *The Imitation of Christ*, "a devout communing on spiritual things sometimes greatly helps the health of the soul, especially when men of one mind and spirit in God meet and speak and commune together." Although the power

of isolation and interaction is again dramatically evident from the typical process of cult indoctrination, it also is evident from church history. The apostles Peter and Paul, freed from jail, met with their fellow believers and then went out to proclaim their message with even greater boldness. During the eighteenth century, John Wesley's Methodist movement drew power from the mutual edification and commitment that were intensified in small fellowship groups called "classes" and "bands." Whether the religious group consists of born-again Christians or members of a Catholic religious order, the ardor and devoutness of the group often enhance those same qualities in its individual members. The Young Life organization recognizes this in its evangelism outreach, much of which is directed to recruiting youth to attend their week-long summer retreats.

Another way in which the group influences the individual is by altering our conceptions of who we are. Our basic understanding of our social world is derived from categorizing others into those who are like us and those who are not. That sense of who we are is derived from many sources, but knowledge of our group membership is one of its most important components. List the things about yourself that define who you are. If you are like most people, several of those things pertain to groups to which you belong—your age group, ethnic background, occupational affiliation, and others. We are all motivated to have a positive view of ourselves, and our group memberships are a vital part of our self-concept. The result is *Principle Twelve: we join groups, in part, to enhance our self-image.*

A religious conversion is a decision to join a group. After matters of belief and doubt, perhaps the next most important question potential converts ask themselves is, "How will I feel about myself if I join this group with these people?" In the context of such a question, evangelism must follow Paul's admonition to the church at Philippi: "Let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ." We cannot separate evangelism from exemplifying Christ-like living.

### The Ethics of Social Influence

This discussion of tactics of influence—and the additional principles to be found in books on the subject (such as Robert Cialdini's delightful and captivating *Influence: How and Why People Agree to Do Things*)—may leave some readers feeling a bit uneasy. Just as any effort to explain one's motives can make them sound selfish, so any effort to explain the weapons of influence can make them sound manipulative. Should Christians really be in the business of propagandizing, pressuring, and proselytizing?

Surely the means as well as the ends of evangelism *should* be true to the gospel. Princeton Seminary evangelism professor Richard Armstrong reminds us “that the witness must first be a listener, that the task is not to browbeat but to share faith, not to win an argument but to make a friend, not to force but to offer.”<sup>15</sup>

But lest we feel intimidated into passivity, for fear of manipulating people, we ought to remember first that if we don’t attempt to influence people they will not therefore be uninfluenced. Parents who choose not to guide their children’s religious development (because they do not want to “force their religion” upon them) do not thereby make their children any freer; they simply give them up to the other influences. The question is not should people be influenced—that’s inevitable for us social animals. The question is what should be the influences? Nor it is unseemly to be influenced. “Remember that to change thy mind and to follow him that sets thee right, is to be none the less a free agent,” noted Marcus Aurelius Antonius in his *Meditations*. Jonathan Swift echoed the thought in his *Thoughts on Various Subjects*: “A man should never be ashamed to own that he has been in the wrong, which is but saying, in other words, that he is wiser today than he was yesterday.”

We ought also to appreciate how enigmatic is the distinction between propaganda and education. In principle, education is more factually based and less coercive than mere propaganda. In practice, we call social influence “education” when we believe it, “propaganda” when we don’t. When the Boy Scouts promote American virtues we call it values education. When the Red Guard promote Russian virtues we call it propaganda.

As this last example hints, the power of social influence is like other powers—neither intrinsically good nor bad. Nuclear power can be used to light up homes or to blacken cities. Sexual power can be used to express and celebrate love or to use and abuse people for selfish gratification. Persuasive power can be used to enlighten or to deceive. That these powers can be exploited by cults and others for evil purposes should warn us about their immoral potential. But the powers themselves are neither inherently evil nor good. It’s how we use them—whether to promote truth or falsehood, to enhance or to exploit, to proclaim the gospel or to deceive—that determines whether they are evil or good.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle, *Politics*, c. 328 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Documentation for this and the other principles can be found in David G. Myers, *Social Psychology*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987).

<sup>3</sup> C. S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, Book III, Ch. 11. (New York: Macmillan, 1952).

- <sup>4</sup> These descriptions of Principles Two and Three are adapted from David G. Myers, "Yin and Yang in Psychological Research and Christian Belief," published jointly by *Faith and Thought*, 13 (1987), 33-52, and *Perspectives on Science and the Christian Faith*, 1987, in press.
- <sup>5</sup> R. Grunberger, *The 12-Year Reich: A Social History of Nazi Germany 1933-1945* (New York: Holt, Reinhart & Winston, 1971), p. 27.
- <sup>6</sup> John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, I, VI, 2 (J. T. McNeil, ed., F. L. Battles, trans.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975).
- <sup>7</sup> Soren Kierkegaard, *For Self-Examination and Judge for Yourselves* (W. Lowrie, trans.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944), p. 88.
- <sup>8</sup> Blaise Pascal, *Thoughts*, 233 (W. F. Trotter, trans.) in M. Mack (ed.), *World Masterpieces*, vol. 2 (New York: Norton, 1965), p. 38.
- <sup>9</sup> O. Weigman, "Two Politicians in a Realistic Experiment: Attraction, Discrepancy, Intensity of Delivery, and Attitude Change," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 15 (1985), 673-686.
- <sup>10</sup> C. S. Lewis, *Screwtape Proposes a Toast* (Glasgow: Collins/Fount Paperbacks, 1965), p. 72.
- <sup>11</sup> Principles Six through Nine are adapted from essays on preaching by David Myers and John Shaughnessy appearing in the *Church Herald*, *Christian Ministry*, *Military Chaplain's Review*, *The Human Connection* (by M. Bolt & D.G. Myers, Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984), and *Psychology Through the Eyes of Faith* (by D.G. Myers & M.A. Jeeves, San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987).
- <sup>12</sup> John D. Bransford and Marcia K. Johnson, "Consideration of Some Problems of Comprehension," in W. Chase (ed.), *Visual Information Processing* (New York: Academic Press, 1973), pp. 383-483.
- <sup>13</sup> Lynn Hasher, David Goldstein, and Thomas Toppino, "Frequency and the Conference of Referential Validity," *Journal of Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 16 (1977), 107-112.
- <sup>14</sup> William James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology: And to Students on Some of Life's Ideals* (New York: Holt, 1922), p. 33 (originally published, 1899). Cited by W. J. McKeachie, "Psychology in America's Bicentennial Year," *American Psychologist*, 31 (1976), pp. 819-833.
- <sup>15</sup> Richard Stoll Armstrong, *The Pastor as Evangelist* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1984), p. 37.