CHAPTER 5
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

In the present chapter, the results derived from the analysis of the data in the previous chapter are given and discussed.

5.1 Findings

1. Teaching competence of student-teachers with high level of general intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with average and low level of general intelligence. Teaching competence of student-teachers with average level of general intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with low level of general intelligence.

2. Student-teachers with high level of general intelligence were significantly higher on planning, presentation, classroom control, evaluation, management dimensions of teaching competence than student-teachers with average and low level of general intelligence. On same dimensions student-teachers with average level of general intelligence were significantly higher than student-teachers with low level of general intelligence.

3. Student-teachers with high level of intelligence were significantly higher on planning and presentation dimensions of teaching competence than student-teachers with average and low level of emotional intelligence on same dimensions. Student-teachers with average level of emotional intelligence were significantly higher than student-teachers with low level of emotional intelligence.

4. Classroom control of student-teachers with high level of emotional intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with average and low level of emotional intelligence.

5. Teaching competence of student-teachers with high level of emotional intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with average and low level of emotional intelligence. Teaching competence of student-teachers with average level of emotional intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with low level of emotional intelligence.

6. There was no significant difference in Teaching competence and its dimensions at different levels of spiritual intelligence.

7. Teaching competence and its dimensions presentation, and management of student-teachers studying in science stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in social sciences and languages stream. Teaching competence and dimensions
presentation and management of student-teachers studying in social sciences stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream.

8. Classroom control and evaluation dimensions of teaching competence of student-teachers studying in science stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream. Student-teachers studying in social sciences stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream on same dimensions of teaching competence.

9. General intelligence of student-teachers studying in science stream was significantly higher than student-teachers studying in social sciences and language stream. General intelligence of student-teachers studying in social sciences stream was equal to student-teachers studying in languages stream.

10. Spiritual intelligence of student-teachers studying in languages stream was significantly higher than student-teachers studying in social science stream. Spiritual intelligence of student-teachers studying in social sciences stream was significantly higher than student-teachers studying in science stream. Spiritual intelligence of student-teachers studying in languages stream was significantly higher than student-teachers studying in science stream.

11. Female student-teachers on evaluation dimension of teaching competence was significantly higher than male students-teachers.

12. Male student-teachers on general intelligence was significantly higher than female students-teachers.

13. Student-teachers residing in urban area on planning, presentation, classroom control and management dimensions of teaching competence were significantly higher than student-teachers residing in rural area.

14. Student-teachers residing in urban area on general intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers residing in rural area.

15. Student-teachers residing in urban area on emotional intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers residing in rural area.

16. There was positive and significant correlation between planning and general intelligence; presentation and general intelligence; classroom control and general intelligence; evaluation and general intelligence; management dimension and general intelligence; and teaching competence and general intelligence of student-teachers.

17. There was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and self-regard; teaching competence and interpersonal relationship; teaching competence and
impulse control; teaching competence and problem solving; teaching competence and emotional self-awareness; teaching competence and flexibility; teaching competence and reality; teaching competence and stress tolerance; teaching competence and assertiveness; teaching competence and empathy dimension of emotional intelligence of student-teachers.

18. There was positive and significant correlation between planning and emotional intelligence; presentation and emotional intelligence; classroom control and emotional intelligence; evaluation and emotional intelligence; management dimension of teaching competence and emotional intelligence; and between (total) teaching competence and (total) emotional intelligence of student-teachers.

19. There was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and virtuous; teaching competence and vision and insight; teaching competence and commitment; teaching competence and divinity; teaching competence and compassion; and teaching competence and flexibility dimension of spiritual intelligence.

20. There was no significant correlation between teaching competence and gratitude; teaching competence and being holistic; teaching competence and intuition; teaching competence and self-awareness; teaching competence and inquisitive; teaching competence and resilient; teaching competence and mission and servant-leader; teaching competence and servant-leader value; teaching competence and inner peace dimension of spiritual intelligence of student-teachers. Whereas there was negative significant correlation between teaching competence and field independent dimension of spiritual intelligence of student-teachers. On the other hand for total (irrespective to dimensions) there was no significant correlation between teaching competence and spiritual intelligence of student-teachers.

21. There was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and general intelligence of student-teachers, when emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence are partialled out (statistically controlled).

22. There was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and emotional intelligence; and teaching competence and spiritual intelligence of student-teachers, when general and spiritual intelligences are partialled out (statistically controlled).

23. 29% variance was explained by dimensions of emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence. General intelligence, compassion, field independent, self-regard and interpersonal relationship are the significant predictors of teaching competence. Teaching
Competence = 0.87 + 1.90 x General Intelligence + 1.71 x Compassion – 0.57 x Field Independent + 0.90 x Self-Regard – 0.60 x Interpersonal Relationship. 61.95 % of variance was explained by these eight factors.

24. Strongest path to teaching competence exists from general intelligence and weakest path from spiritual intelligence.

25. Eight factors were formulated containing the variables as A (Commitment, Divinity, Compassion, Flexibility, Gratitude, Being Holistic, Self-awareness, Inquisitive, Mission and Servant-Leader and Value); B (Planning, Presentation, Classroom Control, Evaluation and Management); C (Self-Regard, Inter personal relationship, Problem solving and Stress Tolerance); D (Virtuous, Vision and Insight, Resilient, Field Independent and Inner Peace and Contentment); E (Impulse control, Flexibility and Reality testing); F (General Intelligence); G (Emotional self-awareness and Assertiveness) and H (Empathy and Intuition).

5.2 Discussion on the basis of ANOVA

5.2.1 Differences on the bases of General Intelligence

The findings of teaching competence are discussed on the basis of high, average and low levels of general intelligence. It was found that teaching competence of student-teachers with high level of general intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with average and low level of general intelligence. Teaching competence of student-teachers with average level of general intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with low level of general intelligence. (Vide table no. 4.2)

From findings it is clear that the General Intelligence contributes for Teaching Competence of Student teachers. The reason of this is obvious. General Intelligence contributes in all activities hence it contribute teaching and it’s all components i.e. Planning, Presentation, Closing, Evaluation, and Managerial aspects of teaching of student-teachers. It indicates the need of cognitive abilities, without which a student teacher cannot perform better on dimensions of teaching competence. A student teacher having high level of General Intelligence is able to organize the content in a logical sequence which is a requirement of best lesson planning for effective presentation. Such a student teacher is capable to choose appropriate audio visual aids and to use them effectively. Teaching demand intelligence to solve various class room problems also. Various skills and strategies are used in class room for effective teaching. A teacher having General Intelligence can use these effectively.

It was observed that student teachers with low General Intelligence were not able to communicate knowledge to learners in comparison to student teachers with high and average
level of General Intelligence. Moreover they were not well equipped with concepts, principles and theories of specific content which they have to present or transfer to their students. Whereas the student teachers with high level of General Intelligence were very clear about the content that they were teaching. They were successful to correlate the topic with life situations. Student teachers with average level of general intelligence were also correlating their topics with day to day life situations at some extent.

Student-teachers with high general intelligence show higher score on teaching competence. Previous researches such as Suresh et al. Clay (1993), Verma et al. (1999), Varma (2003), Jahan (2004), Perry et al. (2005), Panigrahi (2005), Sood (2005), Grigorenko et al. (2006), Kelly (2008), Paltasingh (2008) and Dhall et al. (2009) have clearly shown that getting knowledge or academic/achievement is positively related with General intelligence. Hence, in this way higher General Intelligence contributes for better teaching in classroom.

5.2.2 Differences on the basis of Emotional Intelligence

Teaching competence of student-teachers with high level of Emotional Intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with average and low level of Emotional Intelligence. Teaching competence of student-teachers with average level of emotional intelligence was significantly higher than student-teachers with low level of emotional intelligence. (Vide table no. 4.9)

It was observed that emotionally intelligent student teachers were able to motivate their learners. They were looking enthusiastic and optimistic. These characteristic plays a lot for teaching competence. They were capable to sensitize learners for sensitive content related to any environmental, social or political issues. They were get students to feel what they wanted them to feel. Student teachers with high and average level of Emotional Intelligence were giving praise to learners, having empathy and accepting ideas and feelings of learners. Further regulation of negative emotions save classroom environment as well as teaching from cognitive disturbance. Student teachers with low Emotional Intelligence were showing aggression, or hurt feelings of learners, this was causing disturbance of cognitive process (i.e. communication of knowledge). It indicates that giving respect to learner in the classroom was making the teaching smooth, social, and psychological. These are nothing but positive components of Emotional Intelligence. That is why in present study student teachers with low Emotional Intelligence shown low teaching competence. The present study reveals that ‘Impulse control’ dimension of emotional intelligence is positively and significantly correlated with planning, presentation, classroom control, evaluation, and management dimensions of teaching competence.
It was observed that student teacher with low emotional intelligence were seems in stress while presenting the topic before examiner or researcher. They were not comfortable with questions asked by their students. Effective interaction demands using positive emotions such as love, joy, empathy etc. and regulating negative emotions particularly aggression and fear. It was perceived that an emotionally intelligent student teacher had understanding of self and of environment. Such teachers were managing class room in better way. They knew to modify wrong or partial correct answers and giving verbal and nonverbal reinforcement. Hence, this regulation of emotions becomes the cause of present finding. That is why in present study student teachers with higher level of Emotional Intelligence demonstrated better teaching competence than student teachers with average and low Emotional Intelligence.


5.2.3 Differences on the basis of Spiritual Intelligence (ANOVA followed by t-test)

Table no. 4.13 exhibit that there is no significant difference in teaching competence and its dimensions at different levels of spiritual intelligence. Reason of this finding may be the ignorance of spirituality in present days teaching learning process.

This may be due to non-spiritual attitude of people in this age of information technology, materialization, commercialization, and industrialization. People now a day have become self-centered. They are focusing upon spending a luxury life. They are not bothering socio-economic values. Definitely this environment has its impact on teacher community also. There is degradation of ethics and values in teaching profession. There is lack of having qualities like divinity, virtue, being holistic, inner peace etc. among teachers. These are qualities of a spiritual person which are expected from Indian teachers also. Now a days teachers are able to fulfill materialistic aspirations of learners or society without having spiritual base.

Classroom teaching is largely a cognitive emotional and social process. That is why, in present study General intelligence and Emotional intelligence significantly influence the
various dimensions and total teaching competence. But in planning, presentation, class control, evaluation and management there is almost no role of spirituality. It is also notable that previous literature shows no correlation between Spiritual intelligence or spiritual related variables with cognitive variables such as general intelligence and academic Achievement (Singh, 2012). Hence it may be accepted that spiritual intelligence does not directly contribute for classroom teaching.

5.2.4 Stream and Teaching Competence

Teaching competence of student-teachers studying in science stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in social sciences and languages stream. Teaching competence of student-teachers studying in social sciences stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream.

It may be due to the basic nature of science which is having rational and practical nature. Students belonging to science stream have to devote more time. They are more committed, more disciplined, regular, and having due depth knowledge of their subject matter. Even because of nature of their subject, the science student-teachers were found more confident in preparing and using teaching aids. They were assertive while presentation. This may be the reason that student teachers of science stream have scored high in teaching competence. Whereas the students of social sciences and languages are more casual in their studies in comparison to science students. The students having social sciences are not devoting much time to their studies as per the nature of their subject in comparison of students of science stream. Most of the student teachers from social science stream were not much prepared and their teaching aids were not up to the mark in comparison to science stream. This may be the cause of less scores of student teachers belongs to social science stream on teaching competence than scores of student teachers belongs to science stream.

Teaching competence of student-teachers studying in social science stream were significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream (vide table no. 4.15 to 4.19). It was observed that student-teachers of language stream were comparatively less competent. It may be due to nature of their subject which demands interest rather than work hard and it is not as rational as compare to social science. The stream social science is integration of many subjects. The subjects like geography, history, psychology etc. demand more concentration on study than language stream.

Another reason may be the trend in Indian social and education system that Sciences are preferred over Social Sciences, and Social Sciences, economics, commerce are more preferred than languages like Punjabi and Hindi which are least preferred. This preference is
based on professional value of the subject. Hence Student teachers with higher General intelligence give first preference to opt. Sciences then social sciences and Student teachers with low General intelligence prefer languages. These are the main reasons behind present finding.

5.2.5 Stream and intelligences

Table 4.20 and 4.21 depicts the difference in general intelligence of student-teachers from science, social science and language streams. General intelligence of student-teachers of science stream was higher than mean scores of student-teachers of social science and language stream. General intelligence of student-teachers studying in science stream was significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream. General intelligence of student-teachers studying in social science stream is not significantly higher than student-teachers studying in languages stream. Reasons discussed in previous finding (Stream and teaching competence) can be explained for this finding also because teaching competence and General Intelligence are positively correlated. Again science is a subject based on reasoning and practical by nature. Students belonging to science stream have to devote more time to study because of high difficulty level of subject. Science students are more committed, more disciplined and regular in study. Students of social science stream are casual in study in comparison to science stream students. It may be due to the nature and objectives of subjects. Nature of Science is highly rational as compared to Social Sciences and languages. Student teachers with higher General intelligence give first preference to opt. Sciences then social sciences and Student teachers with low General intelligence prefer languages. This preference is based on the professional value of subject. In the present study under Sciences teaching of Sciences and maths student teachers were taken. It is fact that maths is a way to settle down in the mind a habit of reasoning. The objectives and function of maths is to develop reasoning. The Geometry part of maths is closely related to non-verbal designs of Ravens SPM. Due to these in the present findings, general intelligence of Science Student teachers is significantly higher than Social sciences and languages Student teachers. Hence, it is fact that on cognitive domain Science student teachers score higher than Social Sciences and languages. Further, there is no significant difference in General intelligence of Social Sciences and Languages students. It is due to similarity between difficulty level and nature of subjects.

Figure 4.7 explored the Emotional intelligence of student-teachers from science stream has not significantly different than mean scores of student-teachers of social science stream. Whereas Emotional intelligence of student-teachers of language stream is
significantly higher than mean scores of student-teachers of science stream. Emotional intelligence of student-teachers of languages stream is significantly higher than mean scores of student-teachers of social science stream. The reason behind these findings is again the nature of subjects. Whole literature is based on emotions which are defined as ‘rasa’. It contain poems, dramas, prose etc. everything arouse one or another emotion. On the other hand science stream is not based upon feelings, but it is based upon logics and reasoning. Subjects of Social sciences involve fewer emotions than languages. Due to this, students who study literature become more emotionally intelligent than students of science and social sciences stream.

Figure 4.16 explored the significance of difference in spiritual intelligence in student-teachers of science, social sciences and language streams. Spiritual intelligence of student-teachers studying in social sciences stream is significantly higher than mean scores of student-teachers studying in science stream. Spiritual intelligence of student-teachers studying in languages stream is significantly higher than mean scores of student-teachers studying in science stream. Spiritual intelligence of student-teachers studying in languages stream is significantly higher than mean scores of student-teachers studying in social science stream.

It is because spiritual intelligence is independent from cognitive domain. Previous studies too shown no relationship between spiritual intelligence/spirituality and general intelligence/cognitive variables.

It is justifiable same as on cognitive domain Science stream is higher than Social Sciences and Social Sciences is higher than languages due to nature and functioning of subject. Nature of languages and literature has similarity with many dimensions of Spiritual intelligence such as examined Virtuous, Vision & Insight, Divinity, Compassion, Flexibility, Gratitude, Being Holistic, Mission & Servant-Leader, Value, Peace and Contentment. The literature teach readers (Students) to live value filled life. Satayam shivam sunderam is the base of good literature. Further the function of literature is to make better man who would know the meaning and purpose of life and to act for the same. In this way languages and literature contribute to enhance Spiritual intelligence. It is also notable that spiritual literature teaches students many lessons of Spiritual intelligence. Due to these reasons language Student teachers has higher Spiritual intelligence than Social Sciences and Sciences.

There is significant difference in Spiritual intelligence of Student of social science stream teachers and Science stream Student teachers with indication of higher Spiritual intelligence in Social Sciences Students. Reason of present finding may be the difference
between subjects. As mentioned earlier subjects of science stream are based on empirical findings. Social sciences is a subject which arouses social values. Various social values are indirectly related to dimensions of spiritual values. Comparing nature of three streams it is found that Social Sciences deals with social relations of man and social values but in languages and literature all types of values are emphasized i.e. social, moral spiritual aesthetic etc. whereas in Sciences, reasoning dominate. Due to these differences present finding comes out.

5.2.6 Gender and teaching competence

Gender is taken as independent variable to see its influence on teaching competence of student-teachers. Table 4.22 shows that scores of male student-teachers on teaching competence does not differ significantly than female students-teachers.

Large number of studies reported finding in tune with present finding. Even studies related with teacher effectiveness also revealed no significant gender difference such as Digumarti and Darla (2004), Adegbile and Adeyemi (2008), Mohalik (2008), Dhillon and Kaur (2009), Kaur and Raji (2013) and Vannessa et al. (2013).

5.2.7 Gender and intelligences

Table 4.24 shows that scores of male student-teachers on general intelligence is significantly more than female students-teachers. In the present study most of males were from Govt. and Govt. aided institutions. In private institutions, number of males were very less. Students-teachers having high rank join govt. colleges. So may be this is a reason of having high scores of general intelligence of these male students than female students-teachers. Another reason is male students are practical and reasoned based as compared to female learners who are more sensitive. That is why, males exhibited higher general intelligence than females. In this way it may consider as one of the limitation of study which investigator could not control. Jit (1985) reported that there were significant sex differences in performance on verbal and spatial tasks, and moderate sex differences in performance on numerical tasks. Singh (1984) revealed that intelligence seemed to be influenced by certain factors such as sex. Boys were superior in intelligence to girls. Yuen et al. (2005) disclosed that male adolescents participants gave higher scores in logical (mathematical), spatial, musical, body-kinesthetic, intelligences self-estimates except for verbal and interpersonal than female participants. Haq (1988) divulged that male over-achievers in Hindi had higher intelligence and emotional stability than female over-achievers. Kar (1961) reported that in the pass along test the school boys were superior to the men, and both these groups were superior to the women. In the block design test there was no significant difference between
school boys and men, but both the groups were superior to the women. In the Porteus Maze test there was no significant difference between the school boys and the men, but both the group were superior to the women. Males tend to score somewhat higher than females on visual spatial tasks such as mental rotation or tracking a moving object through space (Law, Pallegrino and Hunt, 1993). Silverman et al. (1992) suggested that men were better at tasks such as rotating objects in their mind, while women were better at noticing and remembering specific objects and their location Nagamani (2012).

No significant difference between emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence of male student teachers than female student teacher was found.

5.2.8 Location of residence and Teaching Competence

Location of residence shows difference in teaching competence of student-teachers. Teaching competence of student-teachers residing in urban area is significantly higher than student-teachers residing in rural area vide table no. 4.25. Reason of this finding may be the difference in quality of schools located in urban and rural area. Quality of school education and higher education is better in urban areas. In such areas people get education from private institutes where variety of exposure are given to learners such as learning resources, material and human resources as compare to rural area in which govt. and low quality private schools are available for learner. Parents of learners who are resident of urban area are educated as compared to parents of learners belonging to rural area. It may be the reason for above said results that student teachers belonging to urban areas were more confident in their teaching than student teachers of rural area. They were presenting topic by using appropriate and well prepared teaching aids as in comparison of student teachers from rural areas. It was observed that communication skills of student teachers resident of urban areas were better than student teachers of rural areas. This might be the cause of present finding.

5.2.9 Location of Residence and Intelligences

Location of residence shows significant difference in general intelligence. The general intelligence of student teachers residence of urban areas are more than student teachers living in rural areas. The reason for this result may be that the parents of learners who are resident of urban area are educated as compared to parents of learners belonging to rural area. Educated parents give more attention to the study of their children. Learners of urban areas get more exposures, resources, and quality of education as compare to rural area learners. Location of residence influence the emotional intelligence of student-teachers vides table no. 4.27. Student-teachers residing in urban area in emotional intelligence were significantly higher than student-teachers residing in rural area. It is notable that student teachers residing
in urban areas were higher in interpersonal relation, impulse control, flexibility, reality testing dimension of emotional intelligence. On other dimensions student teachers residing in rural and urban area showed equal level. Further correlation between general intelligence and emotional intelligence in present study is significant and positive (i.e. .233). Above discussed (General intelligence) cause may be explained here for emotional intelligence. Shakunthala (2001) and Singh (2008) partially support the present finding.

5.3 Discussion on the basis of correlations

5.3.1 Teaching Competence and General Intelligence

There was positive and significant correlation between planning and general intelligence; presentation and general intelligence; classroom control and general intelligence; evaluation and general intelligence; management dimension and general intelligence; and teaching competence and general intelligence of student-teachers. When emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence are partial out (statistically controlled), there was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and general intelligence of student-teachers (vide table no. 4.32). It indicates that emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence do no intervene between teaching competence and general intelligence of student-teachers and general intelligence of student-teachers influences the teaching competence of student teachers. It indicates the need of cognitive abilities discussed above for better teaching. Without good reasoning abilities and mastery of subject matter, student teacher cannot perform better on dimensions of teaching competence that is why general mental ability was/is remained primary part of B.Ed entrance test. Previous findings of Mertens (1989), Heller and Clay (1993), Perry et al.(2005), Grigorenko et al. (2006), Kelly (2008), also partially support the present findings.

5.3.2 Teaching Competence and Emotional Intelligence

There was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and self-regard; teaching competence and interpersonal relationship; teaching competence and impulse control; teaching competence and problem solving; teaching competence and emotional self-awareness; teaching competence and flexibility; teaching competence and reality; teaching competence and stress tolerance; teaching competence and assertiveness; teaching competence and empathy dimension of emotional intelligence of student-teachers. There was positive and significant correlation between planning and emotional intelligence; presentation and emotional intelligence; classroom control and emotional intelligence; evaluation and emotional intelligence; management dimension of teaching competence and emotional intelligence; and between (total) teaching competence and (total) emotional intelligence.
intelligence of student-teachers. When general and spiritual intelligences are partialled out (statistically controlled), there was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and emotional intelligence of student-teachers.

The basic reason behind these finding may be social-emotional nature of the classroom teaching-learning process. It involves interaction between teacher and individual learner and teacher and group of learners primarily on the basis of emotional state of teacher. Effective interaction demands using positive emotions such as love, joy, empathy etc. and regulating negative emotions particularly aggression and fear. Using positive emotions and regulating negative emotions is another cause of present finding. That is why in the present study there is positive and significant correlation between (total) teaching competence and (total) emotional intelligence of student-teachers. Even when general and spiritual intelligences are partialled out, there is positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and emotional intelligence of student-teachers. It indicates that as emotional intelligence of student-teachers increases teaching competence also increases. In previous (2nd) finding Student teachers with higher level of emotional intelligence demonstrated better teaching competence than Student teachers with average and low emotional intelligence. Many Indian Educational Philosophers have suggested emotion as base of knowledge communication. Even in Flander’s interaction analysis, he has put categories such as accepting feelings of learner, praise or encourage and accepting ideas of learner. This is nothing but positive components of Emotional Intelligence. It indicates that giving respect to learner in the class room make teaching smooth, social, and psychological. Student teachers with high emotional intelligence use these techniques. Further, regulation of negative emotion save classroom environment as well as teaching from cognitive disturbance. Whenever teacher show aggression or hurt feelings of learner, cognitive process (i.e. communication of knowledge) becomes disturb. He/she cannot receive information from teacher. That is why, in present study student-teachers with low emotional intelligence show low teaching competence. The present study reveals that ‘impulse control’ dimension of emotional intelligence is positively and significantly correlated with planning, presentation, classroom control and management dimensions of teaching competence. The present finding get support from large number of study such as Bajwa et al. (1996), Bernet and Michael (1996), Lewkowicz and Bloom (1999), Bhattacharya (2004), Ashkanasy and Dasborough (2003), Hawkey (2006), Drew (2006), Bansi et al. (2006), Penrose et al. (2007), Justice et al. (2007), Kelly (2008), Wu and Stemler (2008), Palomera et al. (2008), Hooda and Sirohi (2010), David and Roy (2010), Wong et al. (2010), Drew (2010), Gupta and Jaiswal (2011),
5.3.3 Teaching Competence and Spiritual Intelligence

There was positive and significant correlation between teaching competence and virtue; teaching competence and vision and insight; teaching competence and commitment; teaching competence and divinity; teaching competence and compassion; and teaching competence and flexibility dimension of spiritual intelligence (vide table no. 4.34). It is notable that these relationships are weak. While studying nature of these dimensions of spiritual intelligence, it is found that these are moral characteristics of a teacher which are indirectly necessities of good teaching as measured in the present research. In general sense these are direct demand of teaching profession. Further, there was no significant correlation between teaching competence and gratitude; teaching competence and being holistic; teaching competence and intuition; teaching competence and self-awareness; teaching competence and inquisitive; teaching competence and resilient; teaching competence and mission and servant-leader; teaching competence and servant-leader value; teaching competence and inner peace dimension of spiritual intelligence of student-teachers. Whereas there is negative significant correlation between teaching competence and field independent dimension of spiritual intelligence of student-teachers. On the other hand for total (irrespective to dimensions) there was no significant correlation between teaching competence and spiritual intelligence of student-teachers, Even when there was not significant correlation between teaching competence and spiritual intelligence of student-teachers, when general and spiritual intelligences are partialled out (statistically controlled). Non-spiritual nature of present classroom teaching may be the cause of these findings. That is why, in present study general intelligence and emotional intelligence significantly influence the various dimensions and total teaching competence, But in planning, presentation, class control, evaluation and management there is almost no role of spatiality. Yes, spiritual intelligence may become base of strong emotional intelligence. That is why in the present study spiritual intelligence does not influence teaching competence. It is also notable that previous literate shows no correlation between spiritual intelligence or spiritual related variables with cognitive variables such as general intelligence or academic achievement (Singh, 2012). Hence it may be accepted that Spiritual intelligence does not directly contribute for classroom teaching.

5.4 Discussion on the basis of Regression Analysis

29% variance is explained by dimensions of emotional intelligence and spiritual intelligence (vide table no. 4.38). It can be seen from table 4.40 that general intelligence,
compassion, field independent, self-regard and interpersonal relationship are the significant predictors of teaching competence. The regression equation formulated from all these variables is as given below:

\[
\text{Teaching Competence} = 0.87 + 1.90 \times \text{General Intelligence} + 1.71 \times \text{Compassion} - 0.57 \times \text{Field Independent} + 0.90 \times \text{Self-Regard} - 0.60 \times \text{Interpersonal Relationship}.
\]

No doubt teaching needs cognitive abilities for knowledge collection and dissemination. All parts of teaching competence like planning, presentation, class control, evaluation and management needs ability to forge new insights, the ability to discern meaning in confusion, the ability to perceive, and the ability to identify relationships. Even previous research findings of Heller and Clay (1993), Mertens (1989), Perry et al. (2005), Kelly (2008), and Grigorenko et al. (2006) indirectly favors this findings.

5.5 Discussion on the basis of factor analysis

In factor analysis general intelligence, ten dimensions of emotional intelligence and 16 dimensions of spiritual intelligence were examined. The results are shown in tables 4.49 to 4.51. Total eight dimensions were found and 61.95% of variance is explained by these eight factors. Results (table 4.45) showed that in first factor fourteen variables were grouped. Out of these fourteen variables thirteen were already dimensions of Spiritual intelligence. The new finding is that empathy dimension comes under this factor which was dimension of Emotional intelligence. It means that this dimension has high commonness with Spiritual intelligence’s thirteen factors. Second, unique finding under first factor is that three dimensions i.e. intuition, resilient and field independent excludes this factor.

In second factor seven variables were grouped all of which are dimensions of emotional intelligence inventory. The new thing in this factor is that three dimensions of bar on EQ i.e. problem solving, assertiveness and empathy excludes from this factor. Empathy becomes part of Spiritual intelligence factor on large. Assertiveness becomes part of sixth factor and problem solving of forth factor.

Third factor involve only resilient variable which was dimension of Spiritual intelligence. Resilient is the ability to become normal after being hurt. Recently it was studied as independent construct of Psychology under various types of correlational researches. The present finding also suggests the similar as it has least, no or negative correlation with other factors). Just like intuition it become an independent factor from Spiritual intelligence.

In the fourth factor (vide table no. 4.45) two variables are grouped i.e. problem solving and field independent. The problem solving was dimension of Emotional intelligence whereas field independent was dimension of Spiritual intelligence. Problem solving means
effectiveness of resolving a problem. Emotional intelligence is the ability to not influence by negative environmental forces. The present finding indicates the commonness between these variables.

Fifth factor in the present findings was General intelligence which is not correlated with any of the variables as discussed earlier. General intelligence is based on ‘g’ factor given by spearman which involves four abilities i.e. the ability to forge new insights, the ability to discern meaning in confusion, the ability to perceive, and the ability to identify relationships. The present findings justify that General intelligence measured by ravens SPM is an independent construct.

Assertiveness is the ability to express own feeling without hurting the feeling of other. Like resilient General intelligence and intuition, assertiveness is an independent variable. No other dimension of Emotional intelligence and Spiritual intelligence is grouped with assertiveness. In Psychology or social Psychology assertiveness is measured as an independent construct rather assertiveness schedule (1973).