

**A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY  
OF MAN, GOOD OR EVIL, AND SELF-ESTEEM**

---

**MARY M. BRANT**



A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY  
OF MAN, GOOD OR EVIL, AND SELF-ESTEEM

---

An Abstract  
Presented to the  
Graduate and Research Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science

---

by  
Mary M. Brant  
March 1987

## ABSTRACT

The present study was undertaken to determine the relationship between a personal philosophy of man (whether man is essentially good or evil) and an individual's self-esteem, as determined by the Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory and the self-esteem scale of the Jackson Personality Inventory. The sample was composed of undergraduate students enrolled during the fall quarter, 1986, at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee, and consisted of 40 students, 19 males and 21 females. Incidental correlations between age, sex and self-esteem were also investigated, as well as the correlation of the self-esteem indices.

The multivariate analysis of variance technique revealed that there was no significant relationship between the philosophy of man (good or evil) held by the students and their scores on the two measures of self-esteem. The correlations between age, sex and self-esteem were also not significant. The Coopersmith Self-esteem Inventory and the scores on the self-esteem scale of the Jackson Personality Inventory were significantly correlated ( $r = 0.59$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN A PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY  
OF MAN, GOOD OR EVIL, AND SELF-ESTEEM

---

A Thesis  
Presented to the  
Graduate and Research Council of  
Austin Peay State University

---


In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Science

---

By  
Mary M. Brant  
March 1987

To the Graduate and Research Council:

I am submitting herewith a Thesis written by Mary M. Brant entitled "A Study of the Relationship Between a Personal Philosophy of Man, Good or Evil, and Self-esteem." I have examined the final copy of this paper for form and content, and I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Science, with a major in guidance and counseling.

  
Major Professor

We have read this thesis and  
recommend its acceptance:

  
Second Committee Member

  
Third Committee Member

Accepted for the Graduate and  
Research Council:

  
Dean of the Graduate School

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to express my sincerest appreciation to Dr. John D. Martin, Professor of Psychology at Austin Peay State University, who so aptly suggested the problem, aided in its research and its composition, and acted as a caring friend and guide. Dr. Martin's adept instruction assisted me throughout my graduate endeavors enabling me to attain my educational aspirations.

My appreciation is also extended to Dr. Garland Blair whose comprehension of statistics broadened my own and to Dr. Bob Nevels whose ever helpful suggestions greatly added to my study of counseling and this research.

A special thanks to Dr. Jill Banks whose insight and friendship has proven to be a valuable part of my professional and personal growth.

My gratitude also to Martha Woodall for her practical assistance and illustrious typing skills.

To all the students who participated in this study, my appreciation for your patience in test-taking.

My deepest gratitude and love goes to my husband and my daughter who provided the reason and the respite during these two years.

God Bless!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
2. METHOD . . . . .	14
The Sample . . . . .	14
Description of the Instruments . . . . .	14
Administration and Scoring . . . . .	15
3. RESULTS . . . . .	16
4. DISCUSSION . . . . .	19
REFERENCES . . . . .	23
APPENDIX . . . . .	26

## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction to the Problem

Throughout this century a controversy has existed among psychological theorists concerning the innate or basic nature of man. Humanistic psychologists such as Maslow (1968) and Rogers (1980) have argued that man in and of himself is basically good. The opposing viewpoint has included theorists ranging from Freud (1913/1962) to May (1969) and has proposed that man is an evil creature whose basic impulses include destruction, hostility, and narcissism which are both curbed and augmented by socialization.

For many years some psychologists have tried to deny the existence of evil in man by dismissing it as an outmoded concept. James (1963) in his lectures on religious experience noted that the addition of internal evil as a part of man is what had "weighted down" religious thought, removing it from the scientific thought that man simply exists, while good and evil are only concepts created by man. Man, according to James, had invented a construct called evil which was not a necessary force in the world which could be exorcised at will.

Humanistic psychologists such as Carl Rogers and Abraham Maslow have also emphasized the ability of man to distance himself from evil by denying the necessity



of its existence. By concentrating on the positive aspects of human nature, the theories of Rogers and Maslow have erased the construct of evil and replaced it with ambiguous illusions to "entropy" (Rogers, 1980) and "regression" (Maslow, 1968). In this brand of humanistic psychology, man is a being worthwhile of himself, motivated by the potentiality within himself to growth.

Maslow's (1962, 1968) description of the "being" of man included certain characteristics called "values of being" or "B-Values." He stated that these are "characteristics of fully human people, the preferences of fully human people, the characteristics of selfhood (identity) in peak experiences . . ." (1962, p. 93). These characteristics are summarized and listed by Maslow as:

1. Truth
2. Goodness
3. Beauty
4. Wholeness
- 4a. Dichotomy-transcendence
5. Aliveness, Process
6. Uniqueness
7. Perfection
- 7a. Necessity
8. Completion
9. Justice
- 9a. Order

10. Simplicity
11. Richness
12. Effortlessness
13. Playfulness
14. Self-sufficiency

In his later work Maslow (1968) further connected the goodness of man to health of self and of mankind. Maslow proposed, "Another likely hypothesis is this: what healthy people choose is on the whole what is 'good for them' in biological terms certainly, but perhaps also in other senses ('good for them' here means 'conductive to their and others' self-actualization') . . ." (p. 169). Continuing his essay on the goodness of man, Maslow also stated, "To spell out only one implication here, these propositions affirm the highest values within human nature itself, to be discovered there. This is in sharp contradiction to the older and more customary beliefs that the highest values can only come from a supernatural God, or from some other source outside of human nature itself" (p. 169-170).

Maslow, then, formulated a theory characteristic of the humanistic psychology movement that man is good in and of himself, and that he will move toward goodness as a course of nature without the presence of internal evil. In fact, Maslow (1968) only spoke of evil in terms of a label imposed upon the instincts of man or his animalistic nature left from evolution. He stated in his 1968

work that the instinctual reactions of man are controlled by cultural institutions, which included psychologists. Maslow stated, "professional psychologists, as a matter of course, change and improve human nature, help people to become more strong, virtuous, creative, kind, loving, altruistic, serene" (p. 165). To Maslow's mind, evil was a curable regression of man, a treatable sickness or a reversion to the instincts of the past, whereas goodness represented health and a natural progression.

Carl Rogers is another humanistic psychologist who emphasized the intrinsic goodness of man while rejecting the evil aspects of personality. Man, as depicted by Rogers (1963), is a creature of free choice, something unique and individual. Rogers related that man existed, not mechanistically nor as a "puppet," but as a being striving against the grain of society to become a whole person. Rogers (1980), like Maslow, attributed to man the innate ability to choose the good. He stated, "We can say that there is in every organism, at whatever level, an underlying flow of movement toward constructive fulfillment of its inherent possibilities. In human beings, too, there is a natural tendency toward a more complex and complete development. The term that has been most often used for this is 'actualizing tendency' and it is present in all living organisms" (p. 117-118). Rogers, furthermore, emphasized that the "most trustworthy" function of the system of man which supplies his energy to live is this



tendency to inherent searching for the good, or the actualizing tendency.

Rogers (1980) thought evil merely to be "entropy" and he stressed the creative forces in the universe rather than the deterioration of the organism. Rogers avoided the topic of evil with the statement, "Thus, without ignoring the tendency toward deterioration, we need to recognize fully what Szent-Gyorgyi terms 'syntropy' and what Whyte calls the 'morphic tendency,' the ever operating trend toward increased order and interrelated complexity. . . ." (p. 126). Later, Rogers (1981) blamed societal factors for evil, stating "that it is cultural influences which are the major factor in our evil behaviors . . . so I see members of the human species . . . as essentially constructive in their fundamental nature, but damaged by their experience" (p. 16).

Humanistic psychology has been therefore identified as a psychology which focuses on the positive aspects of the individual. In summaries of humanistic psychological theory (Matson, 1973; Mahrer, 1978), a basic respect for the person is paramount, echoing Maslow and Rogers in the emphasis on the goodness of man. The humanistic psychologist has been characterized in these works as one who values the human being, his wholeness, his uniqueness, and his intrinsic merit.

The other side of the debate on the nature of man has argued that the inherent impulses of humanity are

evil ones and that it is extremely important to incorporate this point in psychological theory. From Freud's work (1913/1962) a conceptualization of the projection of evil was evident. He proposed, "Spirits and demons as I have shown in the last essay, are only projections of man's own emotional impulses. He turns his emotional cathexes into persons, he peoples the world with them and meets his internal mental processes again outside of himself" (p. 92). In his later work (1920/1962) Freud identified the hurtful impulses of man as "Thanatos" or the death instinct and emphasized its importance as an opposing force of the life instinct. Evil, to Freud, was a naturally occurring impulse, a part of the internal struggle by which man is driven.

Jung, in the manner of Freud, acknowledged the base nature of man but added the concept that man is capable of both good and evil. Jung (1933) spoke of the discovery of evil in one's self. He stated, "And yet it is almost a relief to come upon so much evil in the depths of our own minds. We are able to believe, at least, that we have discovered the root of evil in mankind. Even though we are shocked and disillusioned at first, we yet feel, because these things are manifestations of our own minds, that we hold them more or less in our own hands and can therefore correct them or at least effectively suppress them" (p. 205).

As an indication of Jung's belief in the balance

of good and evil, a great portion of his work (1933; 1965) reflects this dichotomy of the human condition. Jacobi (1965) quotes Jung: "Evil needs to be pondered just as much as good, for good and evil are ultimately nothing but ideal extensions and abstractions of doing, and both belong to the chiaroscuro of life. In the last resort there is no good that cannot produce evil and no evil that cannot produce good" (p. 209). Relative to the importance of the balance of good and evil, Jacobi (1965) cites Jung: "The difficulty lies in striking the dead centre. For this an awareness of the two sides of man's personality is essential, of their respective aims and origins. These two aspects must never be separated through arrogance or cowardice" (p. 218).

Fromm is another theorist who has identified man as containing both the potentiality for good and for evil. As an example of his belief, Fromm (1964, p. 149) wrote, "Man is inclined to regress and to move forward; this is another way of saying that he is inclined to good and to evil." Like Jung, Fromm emphasized the duality of human nature, with the two sides, the light and the shadow, forming a complete whole.

Although known as a modern existential psychologist, Rollo May is another proponent of the theory that man's nature is essentially a dark one. In May's earlier work (1969) he labeled evil as "daimonic" and emphatically insisted on its importance in modern psychological thought.



May proposed that the act of ignoring evil is itself evil, placing the ignorant on the side of a vast destructive force. May makes the example of the growth of the power and influence of Hitler, ignored by Americans who could not envision such an evil force because it did not fit into their view of the world.

Because of the ambiguity of May's use of the term "daimonic," he further clarified his position in a rebuttal (Reeves, 1977). May explained, "I need now to clarify the concept of the daimonic. My original reason for developing this concept was to enable readers to relate to the presence of evil . . . Especially in the American mood is there a lack of capacity and a lack of vocabulary to relate to evil . . . We confront this paradox: Evil is surely very prominent in our day and at the same time generally ignored by the American humanist systems. Carl Rogers has no place for it. Abraham Maslow has no clear statement of the relation to evil, although I am told at the end of his life he was studying evil extensively" (p. 304).

More recently, the argument on the nature of man developed into a debate between Rogers (1982) and May (1982). May (1982) quoted Rogers as stating that "man is basically good," whereas May retorted, "I propose the evil in our culture is also a reflection of evil in ourselves" and, "The culture is evil as well as good because we, the human beings who constitute it, are evil as well

as good . . . . The issue of evil--or rather, the issue of not confronting evil has profound, and to my mind adverse, effects on humanistic psychology. I believe it is the most important error in the humanistic movement" (p. 12-13). Many psychologists and scholars believe that May's arguments are the more credible, and that he has indeed presented the better case concerning the nature of man.

The debate of the inherent nature of man cannot be stilled at this time by research, but the debate does raise issues that may be investigated. One such issue that is explored in the present paper has its root in the perception of an individual's personal philosophy of man and the corresponding effect such a belief has on one's self-concept or self-esteem. Previous research (Lindauer, 1967/1969) has shown humanistic psychology to be more appealing to students because of its positive view of the nature of man, whereas conventional psychology was identified as less compelling due to its negativistic view of humanity. Such a situation suggests a study to determine whether believing in man's inherently evil or good nature (negative or positive, respectively) affects the student's self-concept or self-esteem. Humanistic psychologists would argue that their positivistic belief system would correspond to the "healthy" individual with a high level of self-esteem, whereas the conventional psychologist would argue that a belief that man is evil is realistic and would not adversely affect self-esteem.

Investigators of the past have not explored individual belief systems of a philosophy of man as they related to self-esteem; however, investigators have examined the relationship of religiosity (personal beliefs in God) and self-esteem with inconsistent findings. The studies of religiosity and its connection to self-esteem are relevant to the topic of the present paper in that religions provide a philosophical view of man that is similar to conventional psychology, that man is essentially evil (a sinner). As the Apostle Paul stated, to succinctly outline the Christian philosophy of human nature, "We naturally love to do evil things that are the opposite from the things that the Holy Spirit tells us to do; and the good things that we do . . . are just the opposite of our natural desires" (Gal. 6:17).

The investigators who examined the relationship of religiosity to self-esteem reasoned that conventional religions' view of man as basically evil was essentially negative and that such a view would adversely affect the self-concept or self-esteem of those who subscribed to it. Strunk (1958) summarized this position that those who hold less intense religious beliefs have higher self-esteem as he stated, ". . . this finding seems reasonable, since very often theologies have placed great emphasis on the sinfulness of man and the general depravity of all" (p. 683). However, a review of the literature reveals no consensus relative to the relationship between high or low self-esteem and religiosity.



Cowen (1954) was among the first to explore the relationship of religiosity to self-esteem, and his results indicated that self-esteem was negatively correlated with intense religious beliefs. Cowen administered both the Brownfair Self-Rating Inventory and the Bills, Vance, and McLean Index of Adjustment and Values to subjects to determine the relationship between self-esteem and religious beliefs. His findings indicated that those who scored high on the self-concept scale tended "not to have as strong a belief in the existence of God, and do not rely as strongly on the church for an ethical code" (p. 141). Those with conventional philosophies, then, were found by Cowen to be lower in self-esteem.

As a response to Cowen's investigation, Strunk (1958) again tested the relationship of self-esteem and religiosity but with contradictory findings. Strunk administered the Brownfair Self-Rating Inventory and the Religiosity Index to subjects and discovered a significant positive correlation between religiosity and high self-esteem. Strunk, however, explains these findings to be a function of change in religious philosophies. He stated, "Practically all of the classical studies on adolescent religious experience were conducted during the early part of the century when a theology of self-abasement and a negative emphasis were dominant. It may be that with the contemporary theological trend toward liberality has come, either directly or indirectly, a propensity toward enhancement of the self-picture"

(p. 685). Strunk relates his results of the correlation between high self-esteem and religiosity, not to the conventional philosophical belief system but to the change of religious views of man to a more positive position.

In two more recent studies by Heintzelman and Fehr, a nonsignificant correlation between religiosity and self-esteem was again demonstrated. By using the Thouless Test of Religious Orthodoxy and the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory, Heintzelman and Fehr, (1977) concluded that, regardless of past research, religiosity was not found to be significantly related to a lowered self-esteem. Again, Heintzelman and Fehr (1976) implied that "society has had a liberalizing effect on doctrine" (p. 757) and the negative aspects of religious beliefs are not as prevalent and, therefore, do not affect self-esteem.

Further and more peripheral research (Benson & Spilka, 1973; Chartier & Geohner, 1976; Ellison, 1983) has related self-esteem to God-image and spiritual well-being. According to these studies, a positive view of God, man and self led to higher ratings of self-esteem. Those subjects with more negative philosophies of God and spirit were correlated with lower levels of reported self-acceptance and self-esteem.

In summary, past research has circuitously investigated the effects of a personal philosophy of man on an individual's self-esteem with indeterminate results. The present investigation examines this point directly by first ascertaining the subject's view of man, whether man is basically

good or evil, without the means of deducing it through religious affiliation. The subjects' philosophy of man is then correlated with two measures of self-esteem to determine whether the positive or negative view of human nature is correlated with any variation of self-esteem in the individual.



## CHAPTER 2

### Method

#### The Sample

The sample consisted of 40 undergraduate students enrolled in introductory and adolescent psychology courses during the Fall Quarter, 1986, at Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee. There were 19 males and 21 females who participated in the present research, and they all did so voluntarily. The sample consisted of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The subjects ranged in age from 17 to 43 with a mean age of 21.85.

#### Description of the Instruments

The survey used to separate the groups was an instrument developed by Dr. R. Nevels of Austin Peay State University to overtly measure personal attitudes of campus life while covertly measuring personal beliefs. The attitude survey consists of seven categories, the most pertinent to this study being the category of "Religion." The questions embedded in this section which determined the groups to be studied were (a) I believe man to be basically good and (b) I believe man to be basically evil (see Appendix).

The Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (SEI) was developed by Stanley Coopersmith (1981). The Adult Form (Form C) is recommended for the ages 16 and above. It consists of 25 items which are short statements to which the subject answers from a choice of "like me" or unlike me."

The Jackson Personality Inventory (JPI) was constructed by Douglas N. Jackson (1971). It is normed for adults and consists of 16 scales: anxiety, breadth of interest, complexity, conformity, energy level, innovation, interpersonal affect, organization, responsibility, risk taking, self-esteem, social adroitness, social participation, tolerance, value orthodoxy, and infrequency. The respondent answers short statements as either true or false statements of self. Individual scores on each of the 16 scales were obtained but only the scores of the self-esteem scale were utilized in this study.

#### Administration and Scoring

On the attitude survey subjects were allowed to answer each question by numbering from a continuum of 1--strongly disagree, 2--disagree, 3--undecided, 4--agree, and 5--strongly agree. Only those subjects who selected a clear view of the nature of man by answering one of the philosophy of man questions with an agree or a strongly agree answer, while also disagreeing with the opposing philosophy were selected for the groups. This division of the groups resulted in the selection of thirteen females and seven males for the group that professed that man is basically evil. The group that agreed that man is basically good consisted of eight females and twelve males.

The SEI and the JPI were administered to the subjects in groups. All tests were hand scored in accordance to the procedures outlined in the direction manuals and scoring guides.

## CHAPTER 3

### Results

The data were analyzed with both a multivariate analysis of variance and the Pearson product moment technique. The multivariate analysis of variance revealed that the relationship between the philosophy of man (good or evil) held by the students and their scores on the SEI and the JPI was not significant at the .05 level ( $F$ -Ratio = 0.88,  $p = 0.533$ ). Tables 1 and 2 contain the multivariate analysis with the standard deviations and the means of the groups, respectively.

The variables were also correlated with each other to determine any incidental relationships. The SEI and the JPI were significantly correlated ( $r = 0.59$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The relationships between age and sex and self-esteem were not significant, however, and these results are indicated in Table 3.



Table 1

Multivariate Analysis of the Relationship Between the Groups  
Good and Evil and Self-esteem Reports

Variable	F-Ratio	ETA Square	Probability
SEI	0.81	0.021	0.376 (N.S.)
JPI	1.78	0.045	0.188 (N.S.)

Wilks Lamda = 0.955.

Generalized correlation ratio, ETA square = 0.045.

F-Ratio for overall discrimination = 0.88 with 2 and 37  
 degrees of freedom.

$p = 0.533$  (N.S.)

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations

Variable	Mean	SD
Group 1 "Evil"		23.78
SEI	44.67	11.92
JPI	40.88	
Group 2 "Good"		23.78
SEI	40.47	11.78
JPI	42.38	
Total Sample		23.33
SEI	42.57	11.38
JPI	41.97	

Table 3

Correlations Between Variables

Variables	r
SEI x JPI	0.590*
SEI x Age	0.236
SEI x Sex	0.114
JPI x Age	-0.037
JPI x Sex	0.140

\*p &lt; .01

## CHAPTER 4

### Discussion

The results of the present study indicate that the philosophy of the nature of man held by the subjects, whether that philosophy is that man is inherently good or evil, is not significantly correlated with the self-esteem of the subjects. This finding contradicts the assumptions in past studies (Strunk, 1958; Heintzelman & Fehr, 1976) that lowered self-esteem in individuals of high religiosity was due to their negative philosophy of man. It is not possible to infer from these findings that self-esteem is not affected to some extent by religiosity. However, the "negative" overtones of conventional religion and psychology that view the nature of man as essentially evil do not significantly adversely affect the self-esteem of the believer.

Those individuals who hold that man is basically good do not manifest higher or more positive self-concepts or self-esteem than those who hold that man is basically evil. For the sake of emphasis, the other side of the coin dictates that those individuals who hold that man is basically evil do not suffer from lower or more negative self-concepts or self-esteem than those who hold man to be basically good. It follows that one is not likely to boost one's self-concept or self-esteem by simplistically subscribing to a so-called positive view of man. It may well be that

those who maintain that man is basically good (in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary) are employing the ego defense mechanism of denial. It is a well established fact that ego defense mechanisms are self-deceptive, a point well worth pondering.

In light of the debate on the true nature of man between humanistic and conventional psychologists, the non-significant findings of this research make a significant statement about the nature of belief systems. It can be deduced from this study that one can feel positively about mankind but still feel negatively about one's self and, conversely, that negative beliefs about mankind do not affect one's positive feelings about one's self. Humanistic psychologists, then, cannot argue that the "positive" feelings about man, that he is inherently good, arise out of a high self-regard. That position may entail self-deception. The conventional psychologist and, also, religionist do not necessarily have a sagging self-image to account for their "negative" view that man's nature is essentially evil. Indeed, these individuals may simply be motivated to face and accept reality with no need to engage in self-deception.

The question of the nature of man is a debate that is not settled by this present research. Its quandary is only made more compelling by the addition of the data on self-esteem. It is interesting, indeed, that an individual can believe that mankind is evil but still have a high degree of self-esteem.



Assuming that the results of the present study are valid, they suggest that a personal belief in "worm theology" (man is basically a sinner) does not eventuate in a low self-concept or self-esteem. It follows that those who believe that "worm theology" results in a low self-concept or self-esteem hold to a position that is logically untenable, and, therefore, qualifies as unadulterated nonsense.

For many years, even centuries, many scholars have been saying that "man has a propensity for believing the lie." The precedent for that dates back to Adam and Eve. Perhaps the philosophy that man is basically good is just another one of the many lies for which man has a proclivity. Denial of man's basic sinfulness may be nothing more than another example of man's basic sinfulness! Or stated differently, denial of man's basic sinfulness is itself a manifestation of man's basic sinfulness.

Moreover, there may even be advantages that accrue to those persons who accept the reality of sin. The well-known psychologist, O. H. Mowrer, discusses the psychological necessity of accepting sin. Mowrer, then, describes the advantages of the acceptance of sin. He aptly avers: "Recovery (constructive change, redemption) is most assuredly attained, not by helping a person reject and rise above his sins, but by helping him accept them. This is a paradox which we have not at all understood and which is the very crux of the problem. Just so long as a person lives under the shadow of real, unacknowledged, and unexpiated guilt,

he cannot (if he has any character at all) 'accept himself'; and all our efforts to reassure and accept him will avail nothing. He will continue to hate himself and to suffer the inevitable consequences or self-hatred. But the moment he (with or without 'assistance') begins to accept his guilt and sinfulness, the possibility of radical reformation opens up; and with this, the individual may legitimately, though not without pain and effort, pass from deep, pervasive self-rejection and self-torture to a new freedom, of self-respect and peace" (1960, p. 301-304).

The highly respected contemporary psychiatrist and author, M. Scott Peck (1983) further differentiates evil and ordinary sin. He states, "It is not their sins per se that characterize evil people, rather it is the subtlety and persistence and consistency of their sins. This is because the central defect of the evil is not the sin but the refusal to acknowledge it" (p. 69). Peck proposes that we are "blessed by guilt" and that this "sense of personal sin is precisely that which keeps our sin from getting out of hand. It is quite painful at times, but it is a very great blessing because it is our one and only effective safe guard against our own proclivity for evil" (p. 71). Touche'.

## REFERENCES

- Benson, P. & Spilka, B. (1973). God image as a function of self-esteem locus of control. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, 297-310.
- The Book. (1985). Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, Inc.
- Chartier, M. R. & Goehner, L. A. (1976). A study of the relationship of parent-adolescent communication, self-esteem, and God-image. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 4, 227-323.
- Coopersmith, S. (1981). Self-esteem inventories (manual), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Cowen, E. C. (1954). The "negative self-concept" as a personality measure. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18, 138-142.
- Ellison, C. W. (1983). Spiritual well-being: conceptualization and measurement. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 11, 330-340.
- Fehr, L. A. & Heintzelman, M. E. (1977). Personality and attitude correlates of religiosity: A source of controversy. The Journal of Psychology, 95, 63-66.
- Freud, S. (1962). Totem and taboo. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud. (Vol. 13, pp. 1-162). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1913).
- Freud, S. (1962). Beyond the pleasure principle. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), The standard edition of the

complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud. (Vol. 18, pp. 7-64). London: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1920).

Fromm, Eric. (1964). The heart of man, its genius for good & evil. New York: Harper & Row.

Heintzelman, M. E. & Fehr, L. A. (1976). Relationship between religious orthodoxy and three personality variables. Psychological Reports, 38, 756-758.

Jackson, D. N. (1971). Jackson personality inventory. (Manual. Pt. Huron, MI: Research Psychologists Press.

Jacobi, J. (Ed.). (1965). An anthology of the writings of C. G. Jung. New York: Harper & Row.

James, W. (1963). The varieties of religious experience. (3rd edition). New York: University Books, Inc.

Jung, C. G. (1933). Modern man in search of a soul. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Lindauer, M. S. (1969). Student views of humanistic vs. conventional conceptions of psychology in the first psychology course. In A. J. Slicht and M. A. Slicht (eds.), Readings in humanistic psychology, pp. 102-111. New York: Free Press. (Original work published in 1967).

Mahrer, A. R. (1978). Experiencing: The basic principles of humanistic theory. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Maslow, A. H. (1962). Notes on being-psychology. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1, 47-71.



- Maslow, A. H. (1968). Toward a psychology of being. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Matson, F. W. (1973). Without/within: Behaviorism and humanism. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- May, R. (1969). Love and will. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc.
- May, R. (1982). The problem of evil: An open letter to Carl Rogers. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 22, 10-21.
- Mowrer, O. H. (1960). Sin, the lesser of two evils. American Psychologist, 25, 301-304.
- Peck, M. S. (1983). People of the lie. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Reeves, Clement (1977). The psychology of Rollo May. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Rogers, C. R. (1963). Toward a science of the person. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 3, 72-92.
- Rogers, C. R. (1980). A way of being. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rogers, C. R. (1981). Notes on Rollo May. Perspectives, 2(1), p. 12-18.
- Rogers, C. R. (1982). Reply to Rollo May's letter to Carl Rogers. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 22(4), 85-89.
- Strunk, O., Jr. (1958). Relationship between self-reports and adolescent religiosity. Psychological Reports, 4, 683-686.

## APPENDIX

## APSU ATTITUDE SURVEY

The following is part of a research project being conducted at Austin Peay State University. Your participation in this research is greatly appreciated and totally voluntary. Please indicate, as closely as possible, your opinions concerning each area discussed. Following each set of questions is an item asking you for any additional opinions you have about the area explored in the four preceding items. Fill this in at your option. Your answers to these questions will be kept completely confidential.

---

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements using the scale below. Please place your response in the blank space to the left of each statement. Fill in the "additional remarks" in the space provided.

1 - strongly disagree

2 - disagree

3 - undecided

4 - agree

5 - strongly agree

### Dorm Life

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. All freshman students who do not live at home should be required to live in dorms.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Dorm life is one of the best experiences college has to offer.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I prefer co-educational living arrangements.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Resident advisors serve an important function in the dorms.

Additional Remarks:

### Fraternity - Sorority System

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. The fraternity - sorority system is outmoded and ought to be abolished.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I would like to join or have joined a fraternity or sorority.

- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Individuals in sororities and fraternities can be easily stereotyped.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. Fraternities and sororities are a very important part of the social-life at APSU.

Additional Remarks:

### Drugs - Alcohol

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Marijuana should be legalized.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I have not nor do I intend to ever smoke pot.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I believe drugs of any form (including alcohol) are harmful.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I often drink alcoholic beverages.

Additional Remarks:

### Marriage - Divorce

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I believe people should live together before marriage.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Marriage is an outmoded institution.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. If a couple are unhappy together, they should not feel obligated to remain married.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I see marriage as a life-long commitment and do not consider divorce an option.

Additional Remarks:

### Religion

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I believe in a personal God.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. I believe in Jesus as my Savior.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. I believe that man is basically good.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I believe that man is basically evil (a sinner).



Sex

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. It is not important for a person to be a virgin until marriage.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. In general it is best to wait until after marriage to engage in sexual intercourse.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. My views on sex are similar to those of my parents.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I do not believe I will wait until I am married to have sexual intercourse.

Additional Remarks:

Social Issues

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. I am in favor of the ERA.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Capital punishment should be reinstituted in all 50 states.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Abortion on demand is morally wrong.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. I am in favor of the Gay rights movement.

Additional Remarks: