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CHAPTER 6
RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF THE SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

6.1. Introduction:
The procedure of construction of the scale has already been mentioned. Now it is necessary to examine whether the constructed scale will give the same result at different occasions. This can be checked through determining the reliability of the Spiritual Intelligence scale. It is compulsory to evaluate reliability for standardization of any scale. In this chapter reliability and validity of the scale are discussed.

6.2. Reliability:
Reliability is one of the essential characteristics of sound research tool. A scale must yield a reliable estimate of the activity. If a tool gives same result on different occasion, of the abilities of those whom it is applied, it is said to be reliable. Reliability hence means consistency of the result. According to Anastasi & Urbina\(^1\) (2002),

"Reliability refers to the consistency of scores obtained by the same persons when they are reexamined with the same test on different occasions, or with different sets of equivalent items, or under other variable examining conditions"

6.2.1. Methods of Determining Reliability:
Test reliability can be measured by various methods. Four procedures of estimating the same are given below:

1. Test-retest method
2. Internal Consistency Reliability
1. Test-Retest Method:

Reliability using this method is estimated as the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient between two administrations of the same measure. As per this method, estimation is based on the correlation between two or more administrations of the same item, same scale, or instrument for different times, location, or populations, when the administrations do not differ on other relevant variables.

2. Internal Consistency Reliability:

As per this method, estimation is based on the correlation of two equivalent forms scale. Spearman-Brown Split Half Reliability Coefficient, also called the Spearman-Brown Prophecy Coefficient, is a form of split halves reliability measure. The Spearman-Brown Prophecy Coefficient is used to estimate full test reliability based on split-half reliability measures. The Pearson correlation of split forms estimates the half-test reliability. The Spearman-Brown “Prophecy Formula” predicts what the full test reliability would be, based on the half test correlation. This coefficient will be higher than the half-test reliability coefficient.
Rulon / Guttman Split Half Reliability coefficient is an adaptation of the Spearman-Brown coefficient, but one which does not require equal variances between the two split forms. The best will be that in which each half contains highly inter-correlated items.

3. Parallel Forms Methods:

When parallel form of a test can be constructed, the correlation between Form A for, example and form B may be taken as a measure of the self correlation of the test. Under this condition, the reliability coefficient becomes an index of the equivalence of the two forms of the test. Parallel forms are usually available from standard psychological and educational achievement test.

The alternate form method is satisfactory when sufficient time has intervened between the administration of the two forms to waken or eliminate memory and practice effects. When form B of a test follows form A closely scores on the second form of the test will often be increased because of familiarity. If such increase are approximately constant, the reliability coefficient of the test will not be affected, since the paired A and B scores maintain the same relative positions in the two distributions. If the mean increases due to practise is know a constant may be subtracted from B scores to render them comparable to those of Form A.

In drawing up alternate test forms, care must be exercised to match test material for content, difficulty and form; and precaution must be taken not to have the items in the two forms too similar. When alternate forms are virtually identical, reliability will
be too high; whereas when parallel forms are not sufficiently alike, reliability will be too low. For well-made standard test, the parallel forms method is usually the most satisfactory way to determining reliability. If possible, an interval of at least two to four weeks should be allowed between administrations of the test.

4. Methods of Rational Equivalence:

Rational Equivalence is a concept where a given test of equivalent to a hypothetical parallel forms such that every item on each form is interchangeable. Kuder and Richardson (1973) devised a procedure for estimating the reliability of a test. It has become the standard for estimating reliability for single administration of a single for. Kuder-Richardson measure inter-item consistency. It is similar to doing a Split-Half Reliability on all combinations of items resulting from different splitting of the test.

When item level data or technological assistance is not available to assist in the computation of a large number of cases and items, the simpler, and sometimes less precise reliability estimate known as Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 is an acceptable general measure of internal consistency. The formula requires only the test mean, the variance and the number of items on the test. It assumes that all items are of approximately equal difficulty.

6.2.2. Reliability of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale:

As we discussed various types of reliability for the present study reliability of the spiritual intelligence scale calculated by following methods:

- Test-Retest Reliability
• Internal Consistency Reliability
  - Split Half Reliability
  - Spearman and Brown Formula
  - Rulon/Guttman’s Formula
  - Flanagan Formula
• Cronbach’s Alpha (α)

➤ Test-Retest Reliability:

This is the easiest method for finding the reliability of the test. In this method, the research administers the same test to the same sample on two separate occasions. Typically, the two separate administrations are conducted only a few days or a few weeks apart and then reliability coefficient between the two sets of the test scores is computed.

In the present research, to establish the reliability and to obtain the results, the test-retest method was used. For this purpose, the test was administered to the sample of 100 students of higher secondary schools and again the same test was administered to the same sample of the students after a week. Then the reliability was found on the basis of the students’ scores obtained by the two separate administrations. Details about the sample for colleges selected for the data collection are given Table-6.1

Table: 6.1
Data for Test Re-Test Reliability of higher secondary schools students after 15 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability Coefficient Using Scatter Diagram Method:

The reliability coefficient was also calculated with scatter diagram method. Scatter diagram scores on test and retest for Spiritual Intelligence Scale is shown in Table 6.2.

Table: 6.2
Test Re-Test Reliability of higher secondary schools students after 15 days

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>361-380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321-340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281-300</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261-280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241-260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the reliability score obtained by the test-retest for students of higher secondary school student after 15 days was \( r = 0.86 \) and slander error of coefficient \( SE_r = 0.026 \)

Internal Consistency Reliability:

Test-retest method reliability methods have the disadvantage that they are time consuming. In most cases the researcher wants to estimate the reliability from a single administration of a test. This requirement has led to the measuring of internal consistency, or homogeneity. Internal consistency measures consistency within the tool. Several internal consistency methods exist. All internal consistency measurements have one thing in common, namely that the measurement is based on the results of a single measurement. In the present study to estimate the internal Consistency Reliability the Spiritual Intelligence Scale was
administered on the sample of 100 students of higher secondary students.

In the present study Split-Half technique and Cronbach's Alpha method were used to estimate the internal consistency reliability. The statistical analysis for Split half reliability (Spearman and Brown formula and Guttmann's formula) and Cronbach's Alpha reliability, for the calculation Ms-Excel software was used.

Split Half Reliability:

In the Split-Half Reliability method, the Spiritual Intelligence Scale was first divided into two equivalent halves and the correlation coefficient between scores of these half-test was found. This correlation coefficient denotes the reliability of the half test. The self correlation coefficient of the whole test is estimated by different formulas. The measuring instrument can be divided into two halves in a number of ways. But the best way to divide the measuring instrument into two halves is to find the correlation coefficient between scores of odd numbered and even numbered items.

In the present study the correlation coefficient was calculated by using following formulas:

(A) Spearman and Brown Formula
(B) Rulon/Guttmann's Formula
(C) Flanagan Formula

(A) Spearman and Brown Formula:

Spearman-Brown Split Half Reliability is also called the Spearman Brown Prophecy Coefficient. The Spearman and Brown
formula was designed to estimate the reliability of a test one times as long as the one for which we know a self correlation. From the reliability of the half test, the self-correlation coefficient of the whole test is estimated by the following Spearman and Brown formula:

\[
\frac{2r_{hh}}{1 + r_{hh}}
\]

Where,
- \( r_n \) = reliability of the whole scale
- \( r_{hh} \) = self correlation of half test (Reliability coefficient of the half test)

The scale was administered over 3180 students and among them 100 respondent’s Spiritual Intelligence Scale were selected. The usual method of dividing the scale into two equivalent halves is to take odd items in one half and all even items in the other half to calculate the reliability by this method. In this case Spearman-Brown Prophecy formula mentioned above was applied to find out the reliability. Reliability of the half test was 0.90 and reliability of the whole scale is 0.95. The reliability of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale is quite high. Hence, it can be said that the Spiritual Intelligence Scale is reliable.

(B) **Rulon/Guttman's Formula:**

An alternate method for finding Split-Half Reliability was developed by Rulon. Rulo/Guttman Split Half Reliability Coefficient is an adaption of the Spearman-Brown Coefficient, but one which does not require equal variances between the two split forms. The best split will be that in which each half contains highly
inter-correlated items. This is an alternative split-half model which computes Rulon / Guttman’s lower bound for true reliability. Split-Half Reliability, which measure equivalence, is also called parallel form reliability or internal consistency reliability. The formula of Rulon is:

\[ r_{tt} = 1 - \frac{\sigma^2 d}{\sigma^2 x} \]

Where,

- \( r_{tt} \) = reliability value of whole test
- \( \sigma^2 d \) = variance between two halve of scores
- \( \sigma^2 x \) = Variance of whole test

The present Spiritual Intelligence Scale administered on 100 students for reliability. With the help of the MS- Excel software statistical calculation was done. Statistical values are given in Table-6.3.

Table: 6.3
Reliability Coefficient and Standard Error by Rulon Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD of difference</th>
<th>14.612</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD of total score</td>
<td>69.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{tt} )</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE( r )</td>
<td>± 0.0063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form above Table-6.4, it is clear that value of reliability determined by Rulon’s formula is 0.96 whereas the standard error is ± 0.0063 which is showing the moderately high value of reliability of the scale. Hence, it can be said that the Spiritual Intelligence Scale is reliable.
(C) Flanagan Formula:

Flanagan has given formula for finding reliability using split half method. In which standard deviation of the difference of scores on odd and even scores of the test and standard deviation of the scores on the test or scale used.

Flanagan's Formula for reliability is described below:

\[ r_{tt} = 2 \left[ 1 - \frac{\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2}{\sigma_t^2} \right] \]

Where,
- \( r_{tt} \) = Reliability of the test
- \( \sigma_1 \) = Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Scores of 1st Half
- \( \sigma_2 \) = Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Scores of 2nd Half
- \( \sigma_t \) = Standard Deviation (S.D.) of Scores of whole Test

The present Spiritual Intelligence Scale administered on 100 students for finding reliability. With the help of the MS-Excel software statistical calculation was done. Statistical values are given in Table-6.4.

Table: 6.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Coefficient and Standard Error by Flanagan’s Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD of odd nos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD of Even Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \sigma_t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{tt} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE_{r}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Form above Table-6.4, it is clear that value of reliability determined by Flanagan’s formula is 0.90 whereas the standard
error is ± 0.0142 which is showing the moderately high value of reliability of the scale. Hence, it can be said that the Spiritual Intelligence Scale is reliable.

❖ Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha$)

Cronbach's Alpha is mathematically equivalent to the average of all possible split-half estimates. A statistical analysis computer programme SPSSS 17 was used to calculate the Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha$). The value of $r_n$ for Spiritual Intelligence Scale is 0.68. Hence, as per the value of Cronbach's Alpha ($\alpha$), both the forms are reliable.

❖ Comprehensive view of the Reliability of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale:

In Table 6.5, reliability coefficients for different methods have been shown:

Table: 6.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No.</th>
<th>Methods of Reliability</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$r_{nt}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Test-Retest</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Split-Half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Spearmen and Brown Formula</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Rulon / Guttmann's formula</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Flanagan’s formula</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cronbach Alpha ($\alpha$)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table-6.5, the values of reliability using Test-Retest, Split-Half Methods and Cronbach Alpha ($\alpha$) are shown, which are
moderately high. Thus, it can be said that the reliability of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale is moderately high.

6.3. Validity:

The validity refers to the degree to which the test or scale actually measures what it claims to measure. Test or scale is also the extent to which inferences, conclusion and decisions made on the basis of test or scale scores are appropriate and meaningful.

Test validity is requisite to test reliability. If a scale or test is not valid, then reliability is moot. In other words, if a test is not valid there is no point in discussing reliability because test validity is required before reliability can be considered in any meaningful way. Likewise if a test is not reliable it is not valid. According to H.E. Guilford\(^2\) (1956),

"The validity of a test or of any measuring instrument depends upon the fidelity with which it measures what it propose to measure"

According to Lindquist\(^3\) (1971),

"The validity of a test is an estimate of the correlation between the raw test and 'true'(That is perfectly reliable) criterion score"

According to Charles Jackson\(^4\) (1960),

"Validity is the extent to which the test measures what it is intended to measure. Evidence to justify the way a test has been developed and is used."

The evaluation of the test does not end with the estimation of the stability and precision of its measurement. It only brings there. A highly reliable test may not measure what is intends to measure. Besides, it is necessary to know how or what is intended, is measured as well as to be sure that nothing else is measured. The question is fundamental with 'assessment' test but not with the
predictor test. Such tests are more concerned with which are termed as ‘concept’ or construct’ validity.

Validity establishment against an external criterion is of the sounded type, provided a suitable criterion measure is used. But that is the crux of the validity problem. The task of developing criterion measure appears to be almost insurmountable with regard to the measurement years of practice have establishment traditional and validation of test is not subjects of hot controversies. Though perfection in the matter is not to assumed to have been reached, one can undertake the work with a fair degree of confidence.

6.3.1. Methods of Validity:

Validity of a test or evaluation device can be defined as the degree to which the test measures what it is intended to measure. Validity is a relative term and has reference to particular purpose or situation. The question “Is the test valid?” can be answered only by replying to the question “Valid, for what?” Hence, there are different types of validity meant for different purposes.

• Types of Validity:
  - **Content Validity:**

    Content validity is evaluated by showing how well the content of the test samples the class of situations or subject matter about which conclusions are to be drawn. It is based on a comparison of the analysis of test content with the analysis of the course content and the instructional objectives. It is seen as to how well the former represents the latter. The analysis is done essentially through logical, rational and judgmental process. That is
why, sometimes the content validity may be referred to as ‘rational’ or ‘logical validity’.

Face Validity:

Face validity has something to do with mere appearance of a test. A test is said to have face validity when by appearance it ‘looks like’ measuring what it is meant to measure. The appearance of the reasonableness is spoken of as ‘face validity’.

Concurrent Validity:

Concurrent validity is evaluated by showing how well the test scores correspond to already accepted measure of performance or status made at the same time. For example a newly constructed test of intelligence may be validated by finding its correlation with another already existing well accepted test in this area. In these cases, a correlation coefficient between the two sets of measures is calculated as an index of validity. The main problem is to set up a criterion which is independent and reliable.

Criterion Related Validity:

In Concurrent Validity, the test is validated against a criterion at the same point of time. However, the researcher may be interested in using a test to predict some future outcome. For example a clerical aptitude test may be used to predict success on the jobs as clerks. The researcher is thus interested in prediction of success or performance in the future. This process is called Predictive Validity.

Construct Validity:

Sometimes questions like the following are asked, “What does this test mean or signify?” “What does the score tell us about
the individual?” “Does it correspond to some meaningful trait or construct that will help us in understanding him?” These questions are related with the construct validity of the test. For any test that presumes to measure a trait or quality, we can formulate a network of theory leading to definite predictions. In so as they are borne out, the validity of the test as a measure of the trait or construct is supported. In so far as the predictions fail to be verified, the researcher is led to doubt the validity of our test or our theorizing, or both. Evidence of construct validity is partly rational and partly empirical and judgement and evidence join together in the validation enterprise.

Factorial Validity:

Factorial validity is, in a way, extension of the construct validity. The inter correlations of a large number of tests are explained and if possible accounted for in terms of a much smaller number of more general ‘factors’ or trait categories. Sometimes 3 or 4 factors may account for the intercorrelations among 15 to 20 tests. The factorial validity of a test is defined by its correlation with a factor, called factor loading.

6.3.2. Validity of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale:

For estimating the validity of the present scale, concurrent validity method was used. To determine the concurrent validity, the correlation coefficient between other similar spiritual intelligence scale and the spiritual intelligence scale has been calculated.

• The Validity of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale was determined by using following methods:
Face Validity for the items constructed by the researcher was deliberated by sending the tool to the subject experts and by subsequent improvements suggested by the experts.

**Concurrent Validity:**

Concurrent Validity refers to the degree to which the operationalization correlates with other measures of the same construct that are measured at the same time. To determine the concurrent validity, the correlation coefficient between Spiritual Intelligence Scale prepared by the investigator and Spiritual Intelligence Scale prepared by Nishad B.Oza were administered on the sample mentioned in Table-6.6. Both the scales were administered with the gap of one period only.

Table: 6.6

Sample for Validity Estimation for Spiritual Intelligence Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; std.</th>
<th>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; std.</th>
<th>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; std.</th>
<th>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; std.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, Spiritual Intelligence Scale prepared by the researcher and Spiritual Intelligence Scale prepared by Nishad B.Oza were administered on total 100 students to establish the Validity of the Scale. Correlation coefficient between the scores of the both Spiritual Intelligence Scale was calculated. Scatter diagram given in the table-6.7 and formula given below:
According to table-6.7, Correlation coefficient between the scores of Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Spiritual Intelligence Scale prepared by Nishad B.Oza was 0.79. Authority letter for using Spiritual Intelligence Scale given by Nishad B.Oza D. Shah, Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Manual prepared by Nishad B.Oza Presented in Appendix.-

❖ Convergent Validity :

To estimate the Convergent Validity of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale the correlation coefficient between the scores of Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Verbal and Non verbal Intelligence Test Prepared by Dr. K.G. Desai and published by Institute of Psychological and Educational Research and Guidance, Ahmedabad was calculated. Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Verbal and Non verbal Intelligence Test were administered on the sample mentioned in Table-6.9. Both the tools were administered with the gap of one month period only.

Table: 6.8
Sample for Estimation of Convergent Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thus, Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Verbal and Non verbal Intelligence Test were administered on total 100 students to establish the Validity of the Scale. Correlation coefficient between the scores of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Verbal and Non verbal Intelligence Test was calculated. Scatter diagram given in the table-6.9.

Table: 6.9
Scatter diagram for Convergent Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>21-30</th>
<th>31-40</th>
<th>41-50</th>
<th>51-60</th>
<th>61-70</th>
<th>71-80</th>
<th>Fy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>341-360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321-340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301-320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281-300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261-280</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241-260</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fx</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlation coefficient between the scores of Spiritual Intelligence Scale and Verbal and Non verbal Intelligence Test was 0.72. Verbal and Non verbal Intelligence Test and manual Prepared by Dr. K.G. Desai and published by Institute of Psychological and Educational Research and Guidance, Ahmedabad attached in Appendix-.

The values of correlation coefficient are moderately high so that it can be said that the present Spiritual Intelligence Scale is valid.

❖ **Factor Validity:**

Factor analysis is a statistical method used to describe variability among observed variables in terms of a potentially lower number of unobserved variables called factors. Correlation between dimensions (Factors) of the Spiritual Intelligence Scale with help of Ms-Excel
Software was calculated. Table-6.10 shows the correlation matrix of the scores of Spiritual Intelligence Scale. It shows the Pearson Correlation Coefficient between all pairs of dimensions.

Table: 6.10
Correlation Matrix of various factors of Spiritual Intelligence Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>God and Religious</th>
<th>Self Awareness</th>
<th>Religious Concept</th>
<th>Spiritual Changes</th>
<th>Religious Experience</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Helping Behaviours</th>
<th>Social Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Maturity</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping Behaviours</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Experience</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Changes</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Concept</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God and Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. Conclusion:

In this chapter, reliability and validity have been discussed and the values for the same for the Spiritual Intelligence Scale that is constructed by the researcher have been measured by using different methods. The values show satisfactory values of reliability and validity of the constructed scale. In the Chapter-7 data analysis and Interpretations discussed in detail.
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