SPIRITUALITY AND THE CALL TO SERVICE AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Dexter R. Freeman

Presented at:
NACSW Convention 2005
October, 2005
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Introduction

Remen (2004) and Koth (2003) concluded that most students pursued work in healthcare and human service organizations out of a spiritual commitment to serve and connect to others. Likewise, Faver (2004) discovered that foundational for those who nurtured and cared for others was a connection with a spiritual path that provides a connection with a transcendent source and all things. Faver (2004) also stated that many people enter helping fields like social work due to a sense of calling to nurture and advocate for others.

Thus, a primary objective of this study was to explore how spirituality or spiritual well-being influenced college students to serve others. Furthermore, this study was also designed to explore the possibility of utilizing non-religious means for incorporating spirituality into the treatment environment by identifying if there was a significant relationship between an individual's identification with archetypal energy and traditional indicators of spiritual well-being.

Study Variables

It has been seventy years since Jung (1933) theorized that archetypes, also called spiritual drives, were the key to personality development. Archetypes are powerful primordial tendencies that are universal, and expressed through socially constructed symbols, images, themes, and motifs. Washburn (1995), in his Dynamic-Dialectical Paradigm theory, postulated that archetypal (spiritual) energy emits from a dynamic ground; similar to what Jung referred to as the collective unconscious. Pearson (1991) built on Jung and Washburn's theories by identifying archetypal energy that is present throughout three phases of personality development: ego, soul, and self or spirit phases (see Table 1).

Spiritual well-being was measured using the Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS). The SWBS has two sub-scales: the Existential Well-Being Scale (EWBS), which measures an individual's recognized purpose and meaning in life, and the Religious Well-being Scale (RWBS), which measures an individual's relationship with God (Ellison, 1983).

The Pearson-Marr Archetypal Indicator (PMAI) was used to measure the extent the participants identified with archetypal energy at the ego, soul, and spirit or self phase of development (Pearson & Marr, 2003).

Study Methodology

This was a cross-sectional study that utilized a sample of 202 students from a wide array of undergraduate majors such as social work, sociology, criminal justice,

business, and psychology. The participants voluntarily agreed to anonymously complete self-reported questionnaires as a part of this study.

The researcher hypothesized that controlling for age, gender, and ethnicity, there would be a significant relationship between the participant's identification with archetypal energies at the ego, soul, and self or spirit phase of development and their level of spiritual well-being. Bi-variant correlation analyses were used to test the research hypotheses.

Findings

Demographic data: Of 202 students who participated in this study, 73% were female and 27 % were male. The sample was a diversified group in terms of academic status, ethnicity, and religious affiliation.

Scale means: Table 2 shows that the spirit level archetypes (See Table 1) were most active in lives of the participants. Therefore, the participants tended to be more focused on experiencing a sense of power and freedom in their lives. Nevertheless, this does not mean that the participants were less developed at the ego or soul level. Of all the archetypes (See Table 1), the Jester archetype was most active in the participant's lives and the Orphan archetype had the lowest score (See Table 2). The low score on the Orphan scale reflects that this is most likely repressed energy due to the negative impact it has upon the participants when they experience it (See Table 3). The majority of the PMAI scores were in the mid-range (18 - 23), suggesting that the participants were likely ambivalent about expressing these archetypes in their life (Pearson, 1991).

Bi-variant correlation results: Table 3 reflects that spiritual well-being was significant to the participants being able to embrace archetypal energy at the ego, soul, and spirit

levels of development. The more the participants identified with archetypal energy at the

ego level, the more satisfying their relationship was with God. On the other hand, the

greater their sense of purpose or meaning in life, the less they recognize the archetypal

energy at the soul level. Also, the more the participants identified and embraced

archetypal energy at the spirit or self level, the more satisfying their relationship with

God and the greater their sense of spiritual well-being.

Conclusion

Dalton (2001) said that the college years are a time of questioning and spiritual

searching in which there is a particular emphasis upon making a connection with one's

ultimate purpose and finding an inward home (p. 17). This study confirms Dalton's

conclusions about college students and also shows that spirituality is not only important

for individual development; it also is tantamount in the service of others. This study

showed that the greater college students' sense of spiritual well-being the more they were

able to trust and have faith; the less vulnerable they felt; the more they were able to

nurture others and themselves; the more they were able to advocate and confront

challenges; the more they were able to experience passion in their lives; and the more

they were able to experience power through a sense of connectedness and transformation

of pain. These results not only validates the value of spirituality, it also provides a non-

religious means for incorporating spirituality in the classroom and therapeutic

environment.

If a teacher desires to incorporate spirituality in the classroom, one must first

realize that no one uses spirituality, all one needs to do is recognize its presence, because

it is already there. These are examples of some activities that can be utilized to recognize

the presence of spiritual energy:

- Denounce a hierarchy in the classroom (use student work teams, circle seating, etc…) (Innocent, Orphan, and Magician)
- Students actively participate in establishing class goals (Innocent, Creator, Ruler, and Sage)
- Students determine knowledge assessment techniques (Sage)
- Journal writings
  - Reflect on people, situations, beliefs they trust and feel secure with (Innocent)
  - Reflect on times, situations, beliefs that have let them down (Orphan)
  - Reflect on times, situations, when they have nurtured themselves (Caregiver)
  - Reflect on times they felt challenged or needed to stand up for a cause (Warrior)
- Nature walks that allow students to experience oneness with environment to experience Seeker, Lover, Creator, Innocent, and other archetypes.
- Use student selected service projects to embrace Caregiver, Sage, Warrior, Innocent, and other archetypes
- Reflective readings
- Collages (identifying archetypal energy symbolically)
  - Experiences that have lead to your career choice (Creator, Seeker, Sage, Magician)
  - Things that are most important in your life (Seeker & Lover)
  - Your childhood experiences (Innocent & Orphan)
  - Your current life (Soul & Spirit level archetypes)
  - Your hopes for your future (Seeker & Creator)
    - Have students complete the Pearson & Marr Archetypal Index

References

Faver, C. (2004). Relational spirituality and social caregiving. *Social Work, 49*(2), 241-49.

Jung, C.G. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Koth, K. (January-February 2003). Deepening the commitment to serve: Spiritual reflection in service-learning. *About Campus*.

Pearson, C. (1991). *Awakening the heroes within: Twelve archetypes to help us find ourselves and transform our world*. New York: HarperCollins Publishing.

Pearson, C. & Marr, H. (2003). *A guide to interpreting the Pearson-Marr Archetypal Indicator instrument*. Gainesville, FL:CAPT

Remen, R. (July/August 2004). Clueing doctors in on the art of healing. *Science & Theology News*, pp. 32-33.

Washburn, M. (1995). *The ego and the dynamic ground* (2nd ed.). New York: State University of New York Press.

Table 1: Archetypes: Gifts and Goals

_____

Archetype	Goal	Fear	Gift
Ego (Preparation) level			
Innocent remain	safe	abandonment	trust, hope, loyalty, commitment
Orphan	regain safety	exploitation	realism, independence, vulnerability
Warrior	win	flaw	courage, discipline, challenge
Caregiver	help others	selfishness	compassion, nurture, generosity
Soul level			
Seeker	better life	traditionalism	ambition, self improvement
Lover	harmony	addiction	aliveness, passion, sensuality
Destroyer	transmutation	deterioration	humility, mortality, powerless
Creator	true self	counterfeit	individuality, fulfillment
Self (Spirit) level			
Ruler	order	disarray	resourcefulness, empowering
Magician	transforms	rigidity	healing, broadens reality
Sage	find truth	deception	wisdom, detachment
Jester	enjoyment	overly serious	freedom, joy, without restraint

_____

Note. The source for this information is Pearson, C. (1991) and Pearson, C & Marr, H. (2003).

Table 2 Mean, Internal Consistency. and Standard Deviations

Scale	n	Mean	SD	Alpha	Stan. Item Alpha
RWBS	194	47	11.2	.94	.94
EWBS	200	49	6.6	.82	.83
SWBS	193	96	15.4	.92	.92
Innocent	201	20	3.5	.65	.67
Orphan	201	16	4	.60	.61
Caregiver	201	24	3.1	.66	.68
Warrior	201	23	3.6	.69	.69
Seeker	201	21	3.7	.43	.55
Lover	201	24	3.5	.71	.70
Creator	198	23	3	.51	.53
Destroyer	198	18	4.6	.70	.71
Magician	198	22	3.2	.61	.63
Ruler	198	23	3.6	.79	.79
Sage	198	24	3	.69	.69
Jester	198	25	3.2	.74	.76

Note. The Existential Well-Being Scale (EWBS) and Religious Well-Being Scale (RWBS) combine to make the Ellison's (1983) Spiritual Well-Being Scale (SWBS). The Pearson-Marr Archetypal Indicator has the following scales: Innocent, Orphan, Warrior, Caregiver, Seeker, Lover, Creator, Destroyer, Magician, Ruler, Sage, and Jester (Pearson & Marr, 2003).

Table 3: Bi-variant correlation analyses

Variables	EWBS	RWBS	SWBS
Age	.03	.06	.06
Gender	.14	.17*	.19**
Black students	.1	.2**	.2**
White students	-.05	-.15*	-.13
Hispanic students	.03	.02	.03
Innocent	.4**	.21**	.33**
Orphan	-.5**	-.22**	-.4**
Warrior	.22**	.18*	.23**
Caregiver	.11	.16*	.17*
Seeker	-.32**	-.06	-.18**
Lover	.21**	.14*	.2**
Destroyer	-.42**	-.08	-24**
Creator	.03	-.01	.003
Ruler	.16*	.03	.09
Magician	.09	.35**	.3**
Sage	.1	.08	.1
Jester	-.04	.1	.06
Ego level archetypes	.110	.19**	.06
Soul level archetypes	-.22**	-.003	-.1
Self level archetypes	.1	.2*	.2*

Note. (*) indicates significant at .05 level and (**) indicates significant at .01 level.