CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In 1905 Alfred Binet and Theodore Simon developed the first modern intelligence test. Since then the word intelligence was mostly associated with intellect and used to describe the capacities of our rational mind to understand, reason, create ideas, plan, solve problems, learn or use language. Intelligence is sometimes defined as the ability to manage cognitive complexity. As mentioned in Webster’s Dictionary intelligence includes the ability to understand, to apply knowledge, to use reason skillfully, and to manipulate one’s environment. The view that intelligence comprises many different abilities is supported by current trends in neurology and cognitive psychology. Among researchers who have identified various types of intelligence, Howard Gardner’s (1993) pioneering work at Harvard on multiple intelligences has helped people understand that intelligence is multifaceted. He defines intelligence as “a computational capacity—a capacity to process a certain kind of information—that originates in human biology and human psychology. Intelligence entails the ability to solve problems or fashion products that are of consequence in a particular cultural setting or community” (Gardner, 1993: 6).

Gardner’s research indicates that different kinds of intelligence develop relatively independently of each other, and proficiency in one area does not imply proficiency in another. For example, linguistic skill with words can be differentiated from logical mathematical skill with numbers and from the spatial intelligence that perceives spatial relationships. Excellence in one area does not necessarily tell us anything about abilities in another. In addition, Gardner (1993) discussed kinesthetic intelligence that enables a person to use the body in highly differentiated and skilled ways, such as dance or athletics; musical intelligence necessary for all different kinds of musical aptitude; intrapersonal intelligence that implies awareness of one's own thoughts and feelings; and interpersonal intelligence that enables us to relate to others empathically. He did not discuss spiritual intelligence as a separate line of development.
MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCES

Gardner (1983) makes an important note about the difference between “know-how” (procedural knowledge of how to execute a task) and “know-that” (propositional knowledge about the procedures involved). His multiple intelligences should be viewed as sets of procedural knowledge. Finally, he warns that the intelligences in his theory are nothing more than “useful fictions” (Gardner, 1983: 70) for discussing sets of interrelated mental abilities. They exist only as scientific constructs and should not be thought of as physical entities, as this has yet to be verified (Gardner, 1983).

Linguistic Intelligence

The core abilities which compose linguistic intelligence include: a sensitivity to the meaning of words (i.e., semantics); a sensitivity to the order and arrangement of letters and words (e.g. phonology, spelling, grammar, syntax); a sensitivity to the sounds of words (e.g., rhythms and inflections); and a sensitivity to the many functions of language (i.e., pragmatics). Other important uses noted by Gardner (1983) include the ability to use language to convince others of a desired course of action, the capacity to use mnemonics to facilitate memorization of information, and the capacity for metalinguistics. He further, adds that pragmatics include input from some of the other intelligences, such as interpersonal intelligence, and the case for an autonomous linguistic intelligence is most convincing when looking at phonological and syntactic abilities.

Logical-Mathematical Intelligence

Logical-mathematical intelligence consists of the capacity to analyze problems logically, carry out mathematical operations, and investigate issues scientifically. It includes the ability to detect patterns, reason deductively, and think logically, and is most often associated with scientific and mathematical ways of thinking. Gardner (1983) relies heavily on Piaget’s (1963) stage theory of intellectual competence for both descriptions of these abilities as well as support for the developmental history of logical-mathematical intelligence. He reviews Piaget’s theory in detail and defines his formal operations stage as the expert end-state for this ability set (Gardner, 1983).
Spatial Intelligence

The core abilities of spatial intelligence include the capacity to perceive the world accurately, the capacity to perform transformations and modifications upon one’s initial perceptions and the ability to recreate aspects of one’s visual experience (even in the absence of the stimuli in question). While these abilities all appear to include some visual perception, Gardner (1983) suggests that this is not so, as there are documented cases of blind individuals who still demonstrate high spatial abilities using tactile senses. All abilities are useful in orienting oneself in a new environment, comparing or contrasting two forms, or being attentive to balance and composition, as in the case of artwork (Gardner, 1983: 170-204).

Musical Intelligence

The core operations which comprise musical intelligence include the capacities for musical composition, performance, and appreciation, accompanied by skills in the recognition of musical pitch, tone, and rhythm. Most of these elements require that an individual is capable of hearing, yet this is not always the case. In fact, deaf individuals are typically capable of recognizing rhythmic aspects of music in movement and motion. In spite of some subjective problems in the perception of music, research has shown that nearly all people are able to agree upon their perception of good music (Gardner, 1983: 99-127).

Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

Gardner (1983) only discusses two core operations involved in bodily-kinesthetic intelligence: the capacity to control one’s bodily motions and the capacity to handle objects skillfully. Included in these capacities are the abilities to judge timing, force, extent of movements, and to subsequently make the appropriate physical adjustments. Although Western culture tends to draw a sharp distinction between the mental and the physical, he suggests that this is not the case in most cultures.

Intrapersonal Intelligence

According to Gardner (1983), the core capacity of intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to access one’s own feelings and affects. This is accompanied by the capacity
to discriminate among these feelings, to label them, and to draw upon them in order to
guide behaviour. Basic capacities, therefore, include the ability to distinguish pleasure
from pain and to become more or less involved in a situation. Higher abilities include
detecting, symbolizing, and distinguishing between more complex sets of emotions.

**Interpersonal Intelligence**

Interpersonal intelligence is essentially the external application of intrapersonal
abilities. Included is the capacity to notice and make distinctions among other
individuals, particularly their emotions and mood states, temperaments, motivations,
and intentions. At a more extreme end, it also includes the capacity to influence others
and convince them to behave according to one’s desires. Gardner’s (1983)
interpersonal intelligence is largely comparable to Thorndike’s (1920) social
intelligence.

**Naturalist Intelligence**

After much deliberation, Gardner (1993) eventually accepted an eighth intelligence on
his list of multiple intelligences. Naturalist intelligence enables human beings to
recognize, categorize, and draw upon features of the environment, whether these
features be plants, animals, mountains, or cloud formations. These abilities are not
restricted to vision alone, but can be based on any of the senses, including audition, as
in the case of classifying bird calls. He suggests that in developed countries, naturalist
abilities have simply taken a unique form; that our consumer culture is based on the
naturalist intelligence, being used each time we shop for groceries or buy one car
rather than another.

**Moral Intelligence**

Gardner (1997, 1999) has also considered a moral intelligence as a potential candidate
in his model. He doubts, however, the possibility of delineating a moral domain from
other domains and establishing moral intelligence as an autonomous construct.
According to him, the moral domain “is a concern with those rules, behaviours and
attitudes that govern the sanctity of life - in particular, the sanctity of human life and,
in many cases, the sanctity of any other living creature and the world they inhabit”
He further contends that morality is more an issue of personality and character than it is an issue of intelligence, therefore denying its place in multiple intelligence theory (Gardner, 1999).

**Existential Intelligence**

Consideration of an existential intelligence stemmed from earlier claims of a spiritual intelligence. Reportedly, Gardner (1993) devoted a year of study to the investigation of this topic, coming to the conclusion that a spiritual intelligence did not meet his eight criteria. In spite of this, one facet of spirituality proved a promising candidate for Gardner (1993): existential intelligence. He describes this as “the intelligence of big questions” (Gardner, 1993: 20), based on the human tendency to contemplate the most fundamental questions of life. Gardner (1993) contends that an existential intelligence scores reasonably well on his eight criteria, noting that such issues arise in every culture and that children often raise these questions at an early age. Individuals with exceptional existential abilities can be noted throughout history, such as religious leaders and philosophers. Nevertheless, he hesitates to include existential intelligence in his list, maintaining that evidence is lacking as to possible brain localization. He is often quoted as stating that until such evidence is found, he will continue speaking of “eight and a half intelligences” (Gardner, 1993: 21).

Daniel Goleman’s (1995) research on emotional intelligence, based primarily on intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence, indicates that success in many areas of life depends on emotional skills as much as on cognitive capacities. Emotional intelligence includes self-awareness and self-control, as well as the ability to get along well with others. Getting along with others implies an ability to listen, to communicate, to accept feedback, and to empathize with different points of view.

According to Goleman and others, different kinds of intelligence are associated with different areas of the brain. Although little research has been done to isolate areas of the brain associated with spirituality, numerous studies in meditation research indicate that significant physiological changes result from even limited practice (Murphy & Donovan, 1999; Shapiro & Walsh, 1984; Walsh & Vaughan, 1993). Studies that measure the effects of intensive, long-term practice point to significant psychological
benefits in addition to deepening emotional and spiritual sensitivity (Vaughan, 2002).

**Spirituality**

The Sanskrit term for spirituality is *adhyatma*. *Adhi* means ‘related to’; *atman* means ‘self’, that is, anything related to the self. So, spirituality refers to everything concerning the Self. If we consider ourselves to be the spirit and not the body, then we can be considered as spiritual persons. If we consider ourselves to be this body and if we continually cater to bodily needs and desires, then we are to be considered as worldly persons. Spirit, that is, consciousness, is our true nature. This Spirit is Al-Powerful and Al-Blissful (Paethasarathy, 2007: 247).

Frankl (1967) believes that three factors comprise the essence of human existence: spirituality, freedom and responsibility. According to Frankl spirituality is a difficult concept to define, it is irreducible. It cannot be explained in material terms. While it can be affected by the material world, it is not caused or produced by that world, perhaps we can best think of it as the spirit or the soul.

Elkins, Hedstorm, Hughes, Leaf and Saunders (1988) believed that there was a need for humanistic understanding of spirituality. They defined spirituality as, “Spirituality which comes from the Latin, spirits meaning “breath of life”, is a way of being and experiencing that comes about through awareness of a transcended dimension and that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, others, nature, life and whatever one considers to be the ultimate.”

Mulay al-arabi ad-darqawi, the founder of Darwawi order of Sufis in Morocco defined spirituality as against sensuality. Sensuality is used here in the broadest sense i.e., attachment to sensory experience. He advises the seeker to always free from sensuality, for it is the opposite of spirituality and opposite do not meet (Zainuddin, 1992: 16).

Spirituality is the concept of an ultimate or an alleged immaterial reality; an inner path enabling a person to discover the essence of his/her being; or the "deepest values and meanings by which people live" (Wikipedia Spiritual Intelligence).

Spirituality includes an “active life force” or “high levels of positive life energy” that
affect the state of human physiology (Harung, 1999; Owen, 2000).

Spirituality also includes developing higher levels of consciousness and self transcendence (Elkins & Associates). Consciousness is “the system, context, or field within which the different aspects of the mind, the contents of consciousness, including thoughts, feelings, sensations, perceptions, images, memories, and so forth, function in patterned interrelationships” (Metzner, 1989: 330). Attaining a higher consciousness (i.e. higher self) goes beyond the ego and the more surface layers of the mind (i.e. lower self) (Harung, 1999).

Spirituality exists in the hearts and minds of men and women everywhere, within religious traditions and independently of tradition. Spirituality, like emotion, has varying degrees of depth and expression. It may be conscious or unconscious, developed or undeveloped, healthy or pathological, naive or sophisticated, beneficial or dangerously distorted. Some current definitions of spirituality can be summarized as follows: (a) Spirituality involves the highest levels of any of the developmental lines, for example, cognitive, moral, emotional, and interpersonal; (b) spirituality is itself a separate developmental line; (c) spirituality is an attitude (such as openness to love) at any stage: and (d) spirituality involves peak experiences not stages. An integral perspective would presumably include all these different views and others as well (Wilber, 2000).

**Spirituality and Religion**

According to Pargament (1999) the question of whether our field should reliable itself the psychology of religion and spirituality. The meanings of religion and spirituality appear to be evolving. Religion is moving from a broadband construct—one that includes both the institutional and the individual, and the good and the bad—to a narrowband institutional construct that restricts and inhibits human potential. Spirituality, on the other hand, is becoming differentiated from religion as an individual expression that speaks to the greatest of human capacities. Several dangers in these trends are consociated, including the danger of losing the sacred core of our field.

Susan (2000) considered the utility of Emmons’s theory of Spiritual Intelligence for
the analysis of the religions of individuals. The explanation of personal growth as an expression of a universal capacity for transcendence is relatively weak that identifies immediate biographical causes. Attentiveness to differences in religious and secular conceptions of health and adaptation would improve Emmons’s assessment of the fruits of spiritual intelligence.

According to King, Speck, and Thomas (2001: 1015-1016) that religion is a framework for a system of beliefs and values, while spirituality involves “a person’s belief in a power apart from their own existence. It is the sense of a relationship or connection with a power or force in the universe that transcends the present context of reality. It is more than a search for meaning or a sense of unity with others. Some people use the word of God, others may be less specific”. Sinnott (2002: 199-200) defines spirituality as “one’s personal relation to the sacred or transcendent, a relation that then informs other relationships and the meaning of one’s own life”, while religious practices “may be the external sign of a spiritual orientation, or simply a set of culturally cohesive practices, beliefs, and habits”. Spirituality has also been defined as “the self’s existential search for ultimate meaning through an individualized understanding of the sacred” (Wink & Dillon, 2002: 79).

More and more researchers point out that religion and spirituality are not identical. (e.g., Saucier and Skrzypinska, 2006; Westgate; 1996) a religious person may not necessarily be spiritual. Koenig, McCullough,& Larson (2001) identified a number of characteristics that distinguish between religion and spirituality:

- Religion is community focused whereas spirituality focuses on the individual.
- Religion is more observable and objective whereas spirituality is less visible and more subjective.
- Religion is formal and organized whereas spirituality is less formal and systematic.
- Religion is behavior oriented whereas spirituality is more emotion oriented.
- Religion is more authoritarian and doctrine oriented whereas spirituality is not.

On the basis of these characteristics, Koenig et al. offer the following definitions for religion and spirituality:
“Religion is an organized system of beliefs, practices, rituals, and symbols, designed
(a) to facilitate closeness to the sacred or transcendent (God, higher power, or ultimate
truth/reality) and (b) to foster an understanding of one’s relationship and
responsibility to others in living together in a community Spirituality is the personal
quest for understanding answers to ultimate questions about life, about relationship to
the sacred or transcendent, which may (or may not) lead to or arise from the
development of religious rituals and the formation of community” (Lazar, 2009).

Love (2002) maintained that all religions encompass three main components: (1) the
quest for the “ultimate,” (2) story and symbol, which result from the need to express
religious experiences, and (3) doctrine and dogma, which result from philosophical
articulation of religious experiences (p. 357). In contrast, Love (2002) noted (Parks’
2000: 16) description of spirituality as a “personal search for meaning, transcendence,
wholeness, purpose, and the realization of spirit as the animating essence at the core
of life” (King, 2007: 358).

According to Wigglesworth “Spirituality is the innate human need to connect with
something larger then ourselves.” It is something beyond our ego-self or constricted
sense of self. It may be defined as having two components: the vertical and the
horizontal.

**Vertical component**: something sacred, divine, timeless and placeless…a higher
power, source, Ultimate Consciousness-or any other language the person prefers.
Desiring to be connected to and guided by this Source

**Horizontal component**: being of service to our fellow humans and to the planet at
large.

As (Worthington and Sandage, 2001: 473) note, “religion and spirituality are
intimately connected”; indeed for many people they are. Such interconnectedness can
develop in a number of ways. One may develop a high level of spirituality as a result
of religiosity, or one may turn to the religion which best reflects his/her spirituality,
possibilities that were suggested by Koenig et.al. (2000). Following either of these
events, one can maintain aspects of both spirituality and religiosity or abandon either
one, often due to conflict that might arise between social and personal attitudes.
Regardless of potential interconnectedness between the two constructs, they remain quite distinct. Furthermore, there exist many individuals for whom such interconnectedness has not occurred; for whom either religiosity or spirituality is the only option (King, 2007).

SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE

Even though humanity has reached the age of wisdom, many cultures of today are still characterized as “left-brained”, material or “spiritually stunted.” Due to these problems in the fabric of daily life, quite a number of people are making an effort to find ways to re-connect with their essence, attain a higher meaning in life, manage uncertainties successfully with inner poise, and in short to undergo an “inner change.” Fortunately this inner change has begun for many. Spiritual intelligence (SQ) took the leading role in this great transformation process, since SQ necessitates our perception, provides the key to changing feeling, understanding and behavior. In other words SQ serves as an inner compass that facilitates the integration of subjective insights and illuminations with ways of being and acting in the world (Dincer, 2007).

A higher level of intelligence power distinguishes human beings from other animals on this planet. It has been the favourite subject of research for psychologists. In the 20th century, they created IQ tests to define and measure intelligence power of an individual. But, it proved inadequate for measuring the wide spectrum of intelligence. In the 21st century, they are saying that ultimate intelligence is spiritual intelligence.

Howard Gardner who pioneered research on multiple intelligencedid not include spiritual intelligence in his list of intelligences because of the difficulty to find adequate scientific criteria to measure it but soon many studies were undertaken to investigate this fundamental aspect of human life scientifically and develop ways to improve spiritual competencies.

Spiritual Quotient (SQ) offers a viable tertiary brain process for synchronous neural oscillations that unify data across the whole brain, which unifies, integrates and has the potential to transform material arising from the two other processes: reason and emotion. Spiritual intelligence facilitates dialog between mind and body, between reason and emotion. “If we know how to rely on our Spiritual Quotient (SQ) we shall
become less fearful, more accustomed to relying on ourselves, more willing to face the difficult and the uncomfortable, and more ready to live at the edge. That is, at the boundary of chaos and order [“chaorder”], between the known and the unknown, between creativity and self-organization the frontier for information creation.

Spiritual Quotient gives us the ability to discriminate. It gives us our moral sense, our ability to temper rigid rules with understanding and compassion and an equal ability to see when compassion and understanding have their limits. We use Spiritual Quotient to battle with questions of good and evil and to envision unrealized possibilities-to dream, to aspire, to raise ourselves.

1. Intelligence of the deep self

Danah Zohar created the term “spiritual Intelligence” in her book ReWiring the Corporate Brain and developed the term empirically. However the concept was known for ages, the term spiritual intelligence is first exposed by them. The term derived from the Latin word ‘Wind or breath’. This is literally a wind that is blowing through us, the principle that makes us alive and humane. Spiritual intelligence has also been described as the ultimate intelligence by Zohar and Marshall (2000), who place it at the top of a hierarchy, with emotional intelligence below and rational intelligence (IQ) below that. Relying loosely on limited neurological findings, Zohar and Marshall (2000) suggest that Spiritual Intelligence (which they refer to as SQ) represents the brain’s tertiary process of unitive thinking. This tertiary process combines the lower processes of rational and emotional intelligence in order to “reframe or reconceptualize our experience and thus transform our understanding of it” (Zohar & Marshall, 2000: 65), allowing for higher orders cognition of a spiritual and moral nature.

While a specific set of mental abilities is not defined, Zohar and Marshall (2000) stress the utility of spiritual intelligence in solving problems of meaning, value, and those of an existential nature, concurring with Vaughan (2002) and Wolman (2001). Intelligence with which we access our deepest meanings, purposes, and highest motivations. It is the intelligence that makes us whole, that gives us our integrity. It is the soul’s intelligence, the intelligence of the deep self. It is the intelligence with which we ask fundamental questions and with which we reframe our
Spiritual intelligence also facilitates decision-making and the recognition of choices which will be more meaningful, suggesting a potential means of adaptation and problem-solving. Zohar and Marshall (2000) relate spiritual intelligence to moral reasoning, suggesting that it allows us to “play with the boundaries”, “gives us our moral sense”, and is used “to wrestle with questions of good and evil”. It further allows us “to be creative, to change the rules and to alter situations” (Zohar and Marshall, 2000: 5). While spiritual intelligence may assist one in dealing with issues of a moral or existential nature, to say that spiritual intelligence gives us our moral sense is premature. As noted by Gardner (1999), morality is more an issue of personality than one of intelligence.

Zohar and Marshall have identified 12 qualities of SQ:

1- Self-awareness: Knowing what I believe in and value, and what deeply motivates me
2- Spontaneity: Living in and being responsive to the moment
3- Being vision- and value-led: Acting from principles and deep beliefs, and living accordingly
4- Holism: Seeing larger patterns, relationships, and connections; having a sense of belonging
5- Compassion: Having the quality of "feeling-with" and deep empathy
6- Celebration of diversity: Valuing other people for their differences, not despite them
7- Field independence: Standing against the crowd and having one's own convictions
8- Humility: Having the sense of being a player in a larger drama, of one's true place in the world
9- Tendency to ask fundamental "Why?" questions: Needing to understand things and get to the bottom of them
10- Ability to reframe: Standing back from a situation or problem and seeing the bigger picture; seeing problems in a wider context
11- Positive use of adversity: Learning and growing from mistakes, setbacks, and suffering
12- Sense of vocation: Feeling called upon to serve, to give something back

2. Adaptive use of spiritual information in everyday life

The turn of the millennium saw an explosion of publications on the topic of spiritual intelligence. Most notable was a series of articles published in the International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, which devoted an entire issue to the subject in 2000. Robert Emmons (2000) describes Spiritual Intelligence as "the adaptive use of spiritual information to facilitate everyday problem solving and goal attainment."

Emmons originally proposed the following five components of spiritual intelligence and later removed the last one as it is more of a behavior than ability.

1- The capacity to transcend the physical and material.
2- The ability to experience heightened states of consciousness.
3- The ability to sanctify everyday experience.
4- The ability to utilize spiritual resources to solve problems.
5- The capacity to be virtuous.

3- Ability to Act With wisdom and compassion

Cindy Wigglesworth(2006) defines spiritual intelligence as “the ability to act with wisdom and Compassion while maintaining inner and outer peace (equanimity), regardless of the circumstances.”

Cindy proposed 21 qualities in four quadrants that comprise the competencies of awareness and mastery in the realms of the subjective and the objective.

Higher Self / Ego Self Awareness

1- Aware of own world view
2- Aware of life purpose
3- Aware of values hierarchy
4- Complexity of thought
5- Aware of ego and higher self
Universal Awareness

6- Aware interconnectedness
7- Aware of other world views
8- Breadth of time perception
9- Aware of perception limits
10- Aware of Spiritual laws
11- Experience of oneness

Higher Self / ego self-Mastery

12- Commitment to Spirit, Growth
13- Keeping spirit in charge
14- Living purpose and values
15- Sustaining faith
16- Seeking guidance

Spiritual presence (social Mastery)

17- Wise teacher of spirit
18- Wise change agent
19- Compassionate/wise decisions
20- Calming healing presence
21- Align ebb and flow of life

4. Mental capacities for transcendence

David B. King (2007) who has undertaken a research on spiritual intelligence in Trent University (Canada) defines spiritual intelligence as a set of adaptive mental capacities based on non-material and transcendent aspects of reality, specifically those that:" contribute to the awareness, integration, and adaptive application of the nonmaterial and transcendent aspects of one's existence, leading to such outcomes as deep existential reflection, enhancement of meaning, recognition of a transcendent self, and mastery of spiritual states."
David proposes four core abilities or capacities of Spiritual Intelligence:

**Critical Existential Thinking**

The capacity to critically contemplate the nature of existence, reality, the universe, space, time, and other existential/metaphysical issues and also the capacity to contemplate non-existential issues in relation to one's existence (i.e., from an existential perspective). Chance (1986) defined critical thinking as “the ability to analyze facts, generate and organize ideas, defend opinions, make comparisons, draw inferences, evaluate arguments and solve problems” (Chance, 1986: 6).

**Personal Meaning Production**

The ability to derive the personal meaning and purpose from all the physical and mental experiences, including the capacity to create and master a life purpose. While one may be able to derive purpose from daily events and experiences, one may also be able to define a purpose for his/her life. This likely involves more coherent and creative forms of meaning production. The mastering of a purpose refers to one’s ability to infer his/her purpose in all events and experiences.

**Transcendental Awareness**

The capacity to identify transcendent dimensions/patterns of the self (i.e. transpersonal or transcendent self), of others, and of the physical world (e.g. non-materialism) during normal states of consciousness, accompanied by the capacity to identify their relationship to one's self and to the physical.

**Conscious State Expansion**

The ability to enter and exit higher states of consciousness (e.g. pure consciousness, cosmic consciousness, unity, oneness) and other statestrance at one's own discretion (as in deep contemplation, meditation, prayer, etc.).

**5. Capacity to identify with Higher self**

William Frank Diedrich defined as choosing between the ego and Spirit (Higher Self)”. This definition is based upon the root words: spiritus, meaning breath. Spirit is
the breath of life. Intelligentia, meaning "to choose between". There are three major aspects of spiritual intelligence. This capacity involves:

**Identifying with one's Higher Self or Spirit rather than with the ego**

That is, you are not your body, your problems, your past, your finances, your job, your gender, or your ethnicity. These are each roles you play. You are a spiritual being having a human experience.

**Understanding Universal Law: Cause and Effect**

Spiritual Intelligence means that you take responsibility for your life, your situation, and for yourself. You recognize that you are the creator of your life and that your thinking, your beliefs, and your assumptions create your world. This means no blaming!

**Non-attachment**

As a spiritual being you are unattached to outcomes, forms, or experiences. Your well-being comes from within you, by way of your spiritual identity.

**6. Higher integrating dimension of intelligence**

Richard Griffiths (2011) defines spiritual intelligence as a higher dimension of intelligence that provides access to advanced capabilities. Spiritual intelligence replaces the ego with the soul, both as the seat of identity, and as the governor of Intelligence and Emotional Intelligence. His research clarifies how spiritual intelligence regulates intelligence and Emotional Intelligence: "Spiritual intelligence regulates intelligence and Emotional Intelligence by replacing the feeling of separation with an awareness of the connection between everything. Instead of feeling isolated and separate, Spiritual intelligence feels the unity that binds everything together. Consequently Spiritual intelligence exercises intelligence and Emotional Intelligence from an integral perspective beyond ego. When Spiritual intelligence is not active, intelligence and Emotional Intelligence are used to fulfill the desires of the ego. But when Spiritual intelligence is active, intelligence and Emotional Intelligence are used to express the qualities of the soul, in the form of wisdom, compassion,
integrity, love, creativity, and peace."

Other definitions of Spiritual Intelligence

(Wolman, 2001: 3) argued that understanding the context and meaning of our actions frees us to make conscious choices rather than enslaving us to respond reflexively to life’s demands. Accordingly, developing spiritual intelligence empowers one to articulate ineffable moments that release the psyche’s intrinsic spiritual energy.

Noble, Kathleen (2000/2001) identifies spiritual intelligence as an innate human potential. She agrees with Emmons’ (2000) core abilities and adds two others: 1-The conscious recognition that physical reality is embedded within a larger, multidimensional reality with which we interact, consciously and unconsciously, on a moment to moment basis. The conscious pursuit of psychological health, not only for ourselves but also for the sake of the global community.

Buzan, Tony (2001) described spiritual intelligence as “Awareness of the world and your place in it” in his book The Power of spiritual Intelligence. Spiritual Intelligence is supposed to be one of the 10 intelligences.

Psychologist and proponent of the integration of psychological and spiritual development, Vaughan, F. (2002), agrees with Noble’s (2000, 2001) contention that phenomenological experiences of a spiritual nature may contribute to the development of a spiritual intelligence. In addition, Vaughan (2002) views spiritual intelligence as involving the following: the capacity for a “deep understanding” of existential issues and questions, such as “Who am I?” “Why am I here?” and “What really matters?” the capacity to recognize multiple levels of consciousness; the “awareness of spirit as the ground of being” (Vaughan, 2002: 19), and the awareness of one’s relationship to the transcendent, to all people, and to the earth. While she goes into little detail about each of these abilities, basing them on her experience as a psychotherapist, Vaughan (2002) believes that spiritual intelligence exists as a potential in all people and can be cultivated by a variety of practices or training. She also emphasizes the relationship between spiritual intelligence and adaptation to stressful events (King, 2007).

According to Sisk spiritual intelligence as: “a deep self-awareness in which one becomes more and more aware of the dimensions of self, not simply as a body, but as
a mind-body and spirit.” When we employ our spiritual intelligence, we reach the extraordinary place in which our mind no longer produces data of the type wanted or needed and the need for intuition becomes accelerated (Sisk, 2002: 209).

McMullen wrote that “If cognitive intelligence is about thinking and emotional intelligence is about feeling, then spiritual intelligence is about being” (McMullen, 2003: 60).

Nasel believes that Spiritual intelligence represents the ability to draw on one’s spiritual abilities and resources to better identify, find meaning in, and resolve existential, spiritual, and practical issues (Nasel, 2004: 42).

Halama (2003) proposed four potential components of an existential intelligence: the ability to perceive adequate value and meaning in concrete situations; the ability to form adequate hierarchies of values and goals; the ability to manage and assess goal achievement; and the ability to influence and help others in finding purpose and meaning in life (Halama & Strizenec, 2004). The ability to find meaning in life is reserved for its own capacity in the current model, while helping other individuals to find meaning is better described as behaviour and essentially involves one’s own meaning-producing capacity. While goal achievement may be related to existential abilities, it is difficult to distinguish from behaviour. Furthermore, one can set goals within a variety of domains beyond those which are existential.

Ronal, Natti (2008) focused on spirituality as part of a broad understanding of intelligence and the inquiry into human abilities. Based on atheistic approach, spiritual intelligence is perceived as an ability to understand the world oneself through God-centeredness and to adapt one’s life accordingly. It is a basic ability that shapes and directs all other abilities. Relying on the personal experiences of spiritual authors and lay people, several attributes of spiritual intelligence such as faith, humility, gratitude, integrative ability, the ability to regulate emotions, morality and the ability for moral conduct and the ability for forgiveness and love are portrayed in a self.

More recently, a grounded theory approach was undertaken by Amram (2007) in order to investigate a spiritual intelligence. Amram’s (2007) underlying assumptions reflected that of traditional intelligence theorists: that spiritual intelligence “can be
differentiated from spiritual experience (e.g., a unitary state) or spiritual belief (e.g., a belief in God)” (Amram, 2007: 1). His preliminary research involved 71 interviews of individuals who were described as adaptively embodying spirituality in daily life. Participants, many of whom were spiritual teachers, encompassed 10 major spiritual traditions, ranging from Christianity and Buddhism to Taoism and “Eclectic Personal Integration.” All were asked to describe their spirituality in terms of daily practices, particularly as they draw on their spirituality for daily functioning. Open coding was then employed to identify themes within the interviews (Amram, 2007).

Seven major themes were identified: (1) meaning (experiencing meaning and purpose in daily activities); (2) consciousness (trans-rational knowing, mindfulness, and practice); (3) grace (trust, love, and reverence for the sacred); (4) transcendence (holism, nurturing relationships and connections); (5) truth (acceptance, forgiveness, and openness to all truth); (6) peaceful surrender to Self (egolessness, accepting one’s true nature); and (7) inner-directed freedom (liberation from attachments and fears, discernment, integrity). Although this grounded theory of spiritual intelligence provides immense insight, Amram (2007) does not proceed to apply any criteria to his seven major themes so as to justify their manifestation as an intelligence. As a result, these seven major themes can be more accurately and broadly defined as the manifestation of a lived spirituality (i.e., a spirituality that is put into daily practice). Many aspects do not, however, constitute cognitive ability.

Intelligence and Psychological Health

Spiritual Intelligence can generally be associated with psychological health, although some forms of spirituality may be dysfunctional or pathogenic. When spiritual beliefs foster denial and projection and contribute to fear and conflict; they can be destructive and seriously problematic (Parthasarathy, 2007: 149-150).

A person may still belong to a group, but with the development of spiritual intelligence the circle of empathic identification expands to all people and takes the well-being of the whole into account. When we recognize our interconnectedness and interdependence, it becomes possible to view the world from multiple perspectives.

Developing spiritual intelligence includes and transcends personal growth, extending
to the farther reaches of healthy psychological development. Some personal characteristics that could be associated with spiritual intelligence are the traditional virtues of veracity, humility, and charity, which could also be described as authenticity, respect for differences, and the willingness to engage in service to others.

One of the qualities of SQ is wisdom. This includes knowing the limits of our knowledge. Other ingredients are values such as courage, integrity, intuition, and compassion (Parthasarathy, 2007: 149-150).

GOAL ORIENTATION

The study of academic motivation is concerned with the factors which determine the direction, intensity and persistence of behavior related to learning and achievement in academic frameworks. Motivation has been a highly important variable, as reflected in the fact that every learning model either explicitly or implicitly incorporates a theory of motivation (Maerh & Meyer, 1997; Alonso, 1997; Walberg, 1981). Many research studies have been conducted to investigate the relationship between motivation and academic achievement of students. Analysis of the extensive research in the area shows a consistent relationship between the motivational factors and achievement and suggests that motivation plays an important role in determining the level of achievement at all stages of academic study. Indeed, motivation is generally considered a necessary condition for learning and behavior. In addition to its significant for level of achievement, educators view academic motivation as an important variable in his own right, as a central factor in the personality and social development of the child.

Motivation is the force that initiates, guides and maintains goal oriented behaviors. It lies at the heart of human behavior and affects human behavior in many ways and at many levels. Motivation affects behavior by acting as a driving force which energizes and directs the human response and behavior.

Theories of Motivation

Researchers have developed a number of different theories to explain motivation. To
get a better understanding of motivation as whole, key ideas behind each theory is as follows-

**Instinct theory of Motivation**

According to instinct theories, people are motivated to behave in certain ways because they are evolutionarily programmed to do so.

**Incentive theory of Motivation**

The incentive theory suggests that people are motivated to do things because of external rewards.

**Drive Theory of Motivation**

According to the drive theory of motivation, people are motivated to take certain actions in order to reduce the internal tension that is caused by unmet needs.

**Arousal Theory of Motivation**

The arousal theory of motivation suggests that people take certain actions to either decrease or increase levels of arousal.

**Humanistic theories of Motivation**

Humanistic theories of Motivation are based on the idea that people also have strong cognitive reasons to perform various actions. This is famously illustrated in Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, which presents different motivations at different levels. First, people are motivated to fulfill basic needs for food and shelter, as well as those of safety, love and esteem. Once the lower level needs have been met, the primary motivator becomes the need for self actualization, or the desire to fulfill one’s individual potential (Kendra Cherry).

**Goal Orientation Theory**

A prominent feature in motivation theory is the role of goals. Goals are defined as the end toward which effort is directed. Stated another way, goals are that which an individual attempts to accomplish. Goal Orientation theory (Achievement Goal Theory) has been the focus of a great deal of research in education due to the impact
that goals are hypothesized to have on student performance. Goal orientation theorists have defined achievement goals as the reason which one engages in an achievement task. (De la Fuente, 2004: 38) defines academic goals as “motives of an academic nature that students use for guiding their classroom behavior”. The specific type of goals one sets determines the personal experience one has following success or failure of the task in which one engages. Goal orientation theorists have engaged in attempts to determine the types of goals that are most productive for students and what types of goals result in the cognitive strategies, affective responses, and behaviors which lead to student success.

**Types of Goal Orientation Theory**

Goal Orientation theory states that students have distinctive orientation towards certain types of goals. The dominant theoretical approach to goal orientation in academic settings is one that distinguishes between mastery and performance orientations. The simple distinction between these goal orientations contends that students who set mastery goals focus on learning the material and mastering the task at hand. Students who set performance are concerned with demonstrating their ability and performance as measured by their relative standing to others’ achievements. The distinction between these two different goal orientations has been a major focus in previous research regarding achievement motivation (e.g., Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988); Harackiewiez & Elliot, 1993; Nichollas, 1983; Maehr, 1984).

**Mastery Goal Orientation**

In the literature of more than the past 25 years mastery goals have been hypothesized to be the appropriate approach to enhancing learning, increasing self efficacy, effort and persistence as well as the goal orientation, which encourages the use of more effective metacognitive and cognitive strategies. Researchers have also used terms such as learning goals (Dweck, 1986) and task involved goals (Nicholls, 1984) to describe mastery goal orientation. Mastery goal orientations focus on knowledge acquisition and self-improvement with respect to performance (Slavin, 2006).
**Performance Goal Orientation**

Performance goals are based on measuring competence in comparison to others. Performance goals lead students to attempt appearing competent or to avoid appearing incompetent when compared to others (Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Dweck and Leggett, 1988; Elliot and Dweck, 1988; Lepper, 1988). In contrast to students with a mastery orientation, students attuned to performance goals are more apt to become frustrated and defensive in the face of failure and attribute success and failure to more external factors such as luck, task difficulty, and an uncontrollable lack of ability (Dweck, 1986). Students who are performance-approach oriented view themselves as having a good deal of ability and wish to measure themselves against others' performance hence, demonstrating their ability. Others have described a similar orientation have labeled this orientation Ego-social orientation (Somuncuoglu & Yildirim, 1999). Somuncuoglu & Yildirim stated that ego-social orientation leads to an emphasis on high grades and outperforming others to gain approval and enhance one's self-esteem. Nicholls (1984) stated that individuals who are ego-involved and have high self-efficacy seek to demonstrate their ability in comparison to others, while those who are ego-involved and have low self-efficacy avoid demonstrating their lack of ability relative to others.

**Performance Avoidance Orientation**

Performance Avoidance Orientation is grounded in one viewing themselves as lacking ability and therefore wishing to avoid public demonstrations of achievement that would confirm their lack of ability. These students often base their sense of competence on their last grade and never truly build a sense of self-efficacy. In order to protect their self-worth they begin to adopt failure-avoiding strategies. These strategies include weak efforts, avoiding academic risks, setting unrealistically high or low goals, claiming not to care and procrastination.

**Work-Avoidant Goal Orientation**

Performance Avoidance differs from work-avoidance orientation, also referred to as academic alienation (Meece, Blumenfield, & Hoyle, 1988; Nicholls, Patashnick, & Nolen, 1985; Nolen, 1988) in which failure is avoided without hard work and
achievement is viewed as completing the task with as little effort as possible (Brophy, 1983; Nicholls, 1989). There has not been as great a quantity of research in the area of work-avoidant behaviors in the academic goal orientation literature when compared to performance and mastery goals. However, the work that has been done provides evidence that work-avoidant goals are the most detrimental to learning and achievement outcomes (Archer, 1994; Duda & Nicholls, 1992; Meece, Blumenfield, & Hoyle, 1988). Elliot (1999) stated that work-avoidance goals may actually represent the lack of an achievement goal in an academic setting. McInerney (2001) determined that work-avoidance was an important facet of academic motivation. Particularly this orientation was associated with a great deal of effort minimization strategies. Unlike mastery oriented students, it is hypothesized that work-avoidant students do not value hard work and effort, and unlike performance-approach oriented students, these students do not have a need for ego-social displays of competence. The student who adopts this goal orientation just wants to complete the course or curriculum with minimal effort expenditure.

In the motivation model proposed by Dweck and Colleagues (Cain & Dweck, 1989; Dweck & Bempechat, 1983; Dweck & Elliot, 1983; Dweck & Leggett, 1988) the two implicit theories of intelligence create an emphasis on different goals, cognitive strategies, affect and behavior. Roedel and Schraw (1995) reported that beliefs about intelligence were related to students’ goals and these goals were related to students’ behavioral responses. Dweck’s model distinguishes between two views of intelligence: incremental and entity. Students, who hold an incremental theory of intelligence, see intelligence as a set of skills and knowledge that can be increased through practice (Dweck & Bempechat, 1983) and tend to adopt learning or mastery goals.

The entity view of intelligence is one in which intelligence is seen as a stable trait. This view often accompanies the assumption that intelligence is unevenly distributed among individuals, and that this trait affects performance in a broad range of domains. Performance oriented students have an entity view of intelligence. This student sees intelligence as a stable trait, and is driven to either display their ability or hide their lack of ability in comparison to their peers (Was, 2006).
Character-the inherent complex of attributes that determines a person’s moral and ethical actions and reactions; “education has for its object the formation of character”-Herbert Spencer-a distinguishing feature of your personal nature personality-the complex of all the attributes-behavioural, temperamental, emotional and mental-that characterize a unique individual; “their different reactions reflected their very different personalities”. Being a good person, however, is more than a matter of understanding what is morally right. In philosophy a distinction is made between deontic judgments of what is morally right and arcaic judgments of responsibility which involve a commitment to act on one’s deontic judgment. In everyday language we use the term ‘character’ to refer to the tendency to act in ways that are consistent with what one understands to be morally right. Character comes from the Greek meaning a distinctive mark or stamp (Moody-Adam, 1990). A person of good character is someone who attends to the moral implications of actions and acts in accordance with what is moral in all but the most extreme of circumstances. In terms of contemporary psychology, character may best be understood as the specifically moral dimension of the personality or self. Developmentalists, such as Arnold (1993); Blasi (1993); and Higgins (1995) have recently become interested in exploring character in this sense as they have struggled to bridge the gap between moral judgment and moral action. This everyday usage of the term character captures an important feature of what is ordinarily meant by a good person. The question for an educational researcher becomes one of understanding how these common sense notions of character map onto actual human psychology, and what aspects of the educative process can contribute to character formation.

Origin and Concept of Character

Traditional character education, which has been under focus since the early part of this century, had as its central aim fostering formation of elements of the individual’s personality and value structure which would constitute socially desirable qualities or virtues. In the late 1920’s a major research effort was undertaken by Huge Harthorner and Mark May to identify the factors that contributed to the formation of character. The design of their research was based on the reasonable premise that the
first step should be to identify those individuals who possessed moral virtues. What they had expected to find was that the population of 8,000 students they studied would divide up into those who displayed virtuous conduct nearly all of the time, and those who would not. To the surprise and disappointment of the researchers they discovered that few students were virtuous, and that instead most children cheated, behaved selfishly, and lacked “self control” a large amount of the time. Virtue according to their data seemed to be context dependent as students cheated, or lied in some situations and not in others. As (Clark Power, 1989: 127) noted: Hartshorne and May concluded that there were no character traits per se but “specific habits learned in relationship to specific situations which have made one or another response successful”.

The reference to habit by Hartshorne and May is concordant with traditional views of character formation. Since Aristotle, the development of virtue has been thought to emerge out of the progressive building up of habits. Contemporary character educators (Ryan and Mclean, 1987; Wynne in Nucci, 1989) likewise rely heavily on psychological theories that emphasize punishment and reward systems to reinforce desired behavior, and systems of inculcation which are presumed to instill values and virtues in the young. It is worth remembering that in response to their findings, Hartshorne and May concluded that such traditional approaches to character education through the use of didactic teaching, exhortation, and example probably to more harm than good since such practices do not take into account the practical demands of social contexts. In other words, such rigid instruction runs counter to the evaluative and contextualized nature of moral life. By focusing solely on efforts to instill proper values and habits, such approaches fail to develop students’ capacities to make the social and moral judgments that contextualized actions require. Moreover, these rigid approaches run counter to the multifaceted and complex nature of human personality.

The Moral Self

Findings that individual personality and character are multifaceted, complex and responsive to contextual cues, seems to comport with such common experiences as knowing people who are shy in some contexts and gregarious in others, and fits our general common sense understanding that people are not always consistent in their
moral positions or actions. On the other hand, our awareness of such inconsistencies also runs counter to shared experiences that people are more or less shy than others, kinder and more trustworthy than others, and so forth. In other words, there seems to be a sense in which human personality or character is consistent. Resolving this apparent contradiction in the nature of persons has been the task of contemporary personality and social psychology. Resolution with respect to issues of morality and character seems to rest on a recognition that judgments and not just habits are operating when people respond to social contexts. In other words, if individual moral actions are guided by choices and not simply the result of unreflective habit, then the issue for character education rests not with inculcation and habit formation, but in understanding how it is that people judge the worth of their own actions in relation to their world view and sense of themselves as moral beings. We need to move away from the notion of character as a set of externally provided traits and habits to a view of the moral self as constructed rather than absorbed and as being updated and reconstructed continuously (Sarbin, 1986).

**Character and the moral**

In Blasi’s (Noam, 1993) work on the moral self, he made the point that morality may or may not be a central element of the general narrative we construct about who we are. In other words, morality may or may not be a salient issue in constructing one’s personal identity. The fact that virtually all children construct basic moral understandings about fairness and human welfare does not mean that being a person who acts on that knowledge in relation to others is necessarily an important part of how one self defines. According to Blasi, the experience of “guilt” or moral responsibility emerges in those situations in which one acts counter to what one knows to be morally right only for those for whom morality is an integral part of personal identity.

The most important departure that the professional psychologists and the spiritual psychologists make is that one emphasizes personality and the other emphasizes character. Personality is false. Character is the truth, it is reality and it is something you have to build from scratch. Character building cannot be undertaken by just reading books: “How to build a character by ten easy lessons”-there are many books.
Character building is a brick-by-brick process, like we build a house. And in that process, it is important to realize that we are not building a personality. When a man of character stands before you, you don’t need to say, “He is a man of personality”. Often, they have no personality whatsoever. If they just slip out of this room, you wouldn’t even recognize them because character is not something which is external. It may be reflective in your activities and your words.

A man of character has not even the awareness that he is a man of character. It shines in everything that he does. Therefore such people attract, like they say, the moth of the candle. You cannot possibly accuse or praise the candle for attracting the insect; it is what it is, and being responsive to what it is, the rest of the insect life flocks to it. We flock to the light when we are in darkness. The truth behind the spiritual statement is: “Be yourself, and you will achieve much more than flaunting a false personality” (Excerpt from Principles of SahajMarg, Vol.5, pp.28-42).

Character has been defined as “doing the right thing despite outside pressure to the contrary” (Likona, 1991), and has been elsewhere seen as an essential leadership attribute (Barlow et al., 2003). In a leadership capacity, character is seen as “moral excellence” (Hendrix et al., 2003: 60), a view similar to early Greek philosophers who saw character as central to a life of moral conduct (Aristotle 384-322 BC; Sherman, 1989). Peterson and Seligman assert that building character is a form of moral development, which improves with age. In particular, they claim that “good character can be cultivated and that character strengths are the bedrock of the human condition” (Peterson and Seligman, 2004: 3-4). These views on character revive Kohlberg’s (1981) seminal research on character as a form of moral development, and reclaim the importance of character to everyday human interactions and activities. Both social as well as individual psychological factors influence the expression of character. The strengths of the clinical- psychological-personality tradition of character (Cloninger et al., 1993; Sperry, 1997) and its focus on the three character dimensions self reliance, cooperativeness and self transcendence, it is believed that a socio-psychological perspective is more relevant for focus on organizations and their leaders, and is akin to the positive psychology perspective espoused by Seligman (2002). Character is revealed in the moral and ethical choices we make. To act with
character is to show virtue. Character and virtue are very important for the development of the ethical qualities of persons, with what we view as good, or excellent, or praiseworthy about them. Virtues are central to character. The term virtue comes from the Latin word virtus and the Greek concept arete, both of which translate to “strength” or “excellence” (Cowley et al., 2000; McCullough and Snyder, 2000). Authentic leaders: knows who they are and what they believe in; they show consistency between their values, ethical reasoning and actions; they develop positive psychological states such as confidence, optimism, hope, and resilience in themselves and their associates; and they are widely known and respected for their integrity (UNL Gallup Leadership Institute, 2004). Aristotle (384-322 BC) believed that character helped explain a person’s past actions and could predict future behavior (Sherman, 1989). Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) showed that character as a leadership trait consists of six elements: drive; desire to lead, honesty and integrity, self-confidence, cognitive ability, and knowledge of the business. Character attributes are also featured in the seven virtues of leadership identified by Barker and Coy (2003). The seven virtues are: humility, courage, integrity, compassion, humor, passion and wisdom.

Character Education and Academic Achievement

“Intelligence plus character—that is the goal of true education.” as said by Martin Luther King, Jr. about the role of education in society. (United States Department of Education [USDE], 2006, Introduction section). Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings echoed this sentiment decades later by noting that education at its best should both expand the mind and build character (USDE). Preceding both King and Spellings by several millennia, Socrates wrote that, “The right way to begin is to pay attention to the young, and make them just as good as possible” (Dorn, 2003: XVII). Proponents of today’s character education programs in schools agree with his assessment, and they work to teach students about essential life skills and values that go beyond the blackboard. Rutgers Professor of Clinical Psychology Maurice Elias, who has researched and stressed the importance of character education and says that a successful school is going to be a school that is concerned with the character of its students. Character education is sometimes defined as an approach that is
comprehensive in fostering the moral development of students (Berkowitz, Marvin, and Bier, 2005).

Students are taught social awareness, including how to cooperate, work in a group effectively, and take turns. These skills are important for use in group work in the classroom. Character education also emphasizes responsibility and respect, both of which are necessary for classroom success. After all, if students don’t take responsibility for their schoolwork or for handing in their homework on time, and if they are unable to act respectfully towards the teacher and towards other students, they will likely struggle to stay afloat in the classroom.

In addition, students in a character education program learn how to manage their own feelings and deal with them appropriately. “That’s so important,” Elias (2006) maintains. “Some kids come from difficult home environments. If they can’t deal with those feelings once they get to school, their learning is going to be limited, no matter how smart they are.”

**Significance of the study**

The question raised in the mind of the researcher is whether goal orientation and character have any relation with spiritual intelligence. Goal orientation is a part of motivation and motivation plays a very important role in education. All the theories of learning are based on motivation. A motivated student has a desire to acquire the distinct aim/goal. Goals can be looked at in terms of goal content-what is the desired outcome-and goal processes-what strategies to use to secure the goal. Spiritual intelligence is a new concept introduced in the theory of intelligence. It is important to see the effect of goal orientation on spiritual intelligence in students. Now a days it is demand of the time to develop spiritual intelligence among students as they are lacking moral values and aims for preventing violence in educational institutions. Emmons (2000a, 2000b) considers Spiritual Intelligence as a part of intelligence and relates it to goal attainment.

Character is a part of personality. In education, personality development is given the utmost importance. The aim of teaching is to develop a positive personality of the
According to Cloninger in character there is a dimension called “Self Transcendence” which seems to be directly related to spiritual intelligence. However, other dimensions like: Cooperativeness and Self Directedness are also related to Spiritual Intelligence. According to Dr. Sethi, H. et al.(2012) merging of the individual spirit with the universal is seen as the ultimate development of human character and its ultimate goal. According to Paul Brian Greenwood (2007) relationship between increased self reported ability level and the measure of character as well as support for an interaction between ability level and orthogonal achievement goal orientation on the measure of character. Since we consider that spiritual intelligence is very important in different walks of life including leaning, perception, creativity a, critically thinking and problem solving etc. therefore the study of spiritual intelligence seems to be relevant to goal orientation and character.

It seems that character, goal orientation and spiritual intelligence are directly or indirectly related to each other in educational field. Studies have also found that character education helps increase academic achievement (Elias, Zins, Weissberg et al., 1997). Studies have acknowledged many social and academic attitudes associated with enhanced student success (Benninga, Berkowitz, Kuehn, & Smith, 2003). According to (Esquith, 2003) academic achievement is bond to critical thinking skills (a sub dimension of Spiritual Intelligence) and for Brooks (2002) critical thinking is one of fundamental principles entrenched in character education and critical thinking skills and problem solving are related to spiritual intelligence.

Students have spiritual yearnings that can be met in the classroom by building character and goal attainment techniques. Character education and Goal Orientation will help develop and strengthen students’ Spiritual Intelligence.

Thus, Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character are very important factors in educational setting. The researcher has taken these variables in the present study. Goal Orientation and Character are for long accepted as part of educational aims. The researcher in the present study has taken Goal Orientation and Character as independent variables. Spiritual Intelligence is relatively a new but powerful concept and it has been treated as dependent variable in the present study.
Title of the study

“Spiritual Intelligence in relation to Goal Orientation and Character among Senior Secondary Students of Government as well as Private Schools.”

Objectives of the study

Every research must have some objectives to achieve. The present study aimed at achieving the following objectives:

1) To explore the relationship among various sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character for the Total Sample.
2) To find relationship among various sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character for male and female students.
3) To find relationship among various sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character for the students of Government and Private Schools.
4) To determine the contribution of various dimensions of Character, Goal Orientation (Predictor Variables) to all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence (Criterion variable) in terms of accountable variance for students of the total sample.
5) To determine the contribution of various dimensions of Character, Goal Orientation (Predictor Variables) to all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence (Criterion Variable) in terms of accountable variance in male and female students.
6) To determine the contribution of various dimensions of Character, Goal Orientation (Predictor Variables) to all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence (Criterion Variable) in terms of accountable variance for the students of government and private Schools.
7) To study the differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence between Male and Female students.
8) To study the differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Goal Orientation between Male and Female students.
9) To study the differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Character between Male and Female students.
10) To study the differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence between government and private schools students.

11) To study the differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Goal Orientation between Government and Private schools students.

12) To study the differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Character between Government and Private schools students.

**Hypotheses**

To every problem, there may be more than one solution. A researcher’s effort is also directed towards a solution of the selected academic problem. Most of the time, it is possible to make intelligent guesses about the solution of the problem. Such an intelligent guess of a tentative solution is known as “hypothesis”. As for that matter, the investigator formulated the following hypotheses.

1) There exists no significant relationship among various dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character for the Total Sample.

2) There will be no significant relationship among various dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character for male and female students.

3) No significant relationship exists among various dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence, Goal Orientation and Character for the students of government and private Schools.

4) There will be no significant contribution of various dimensions of Character, Goal Orientation (Predictor Variables) to all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence (Criterion variable) in terms of accountable variance for the total sample.

5) There will be no significant contribution of various dimensions of Character, Goal Orientation (Predictor Variables) to all the sub dimensions of spiritual Intelligence (Criterion Variable) in terms of accountable variance among male and female students.

6) There will be no significant contribution of various dimensions of Character, Goal Orientation (Predictor Variables) to all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence (Criterion Variable) in terms of accountable variance for the students of government and private Schools.
7) No significant differences of Means exist in all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence between Male and Female students.
8) No significant differences of Means exist in all the sub dimensions of Goal Orientation between Male and Female students.
9) No significant differences of Means exist in all the sub dimensions of character between Male and Female students.
10) There will be no significant differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence between government and private schools students.
11) There will be no significant differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Goal Orientation between Government and Private schools students.
12) There will be no significant differences of Means in all the sub dimensions of Character between Government and Private schools students.

**Operational Definitions Used**

The three variables selected for the present study are:

1) Spiritual Intelligence
2) Goal Orientation
3) Character

The operational definitions of the three variables taken into consideration for the research are:

**Spiritual Intelligence**

“Spiritual intelligence as a set of adaptive mental capacities based on non-material and transcendent aspects of reality, specifically those that contribute to the awareness, integration, and adaptive application of the nonmaterial and transcendent aspects of one’s existence, leading to such outcomes as deep existential reflection, enhancement of meaning, recognition of a transcendent self, and mastery of spiritual states” (David B. king, 2007).
Goal Orientation

De la Fuente (2004) defines academic goals as “motives of an academic nature that students use for guiding their classroom behavior” (in Academic Achievement Goal Orientation: Taking Another look by Christopher Was, 2006).

Character

“Character dimensions are consciously learned components of personality which mature in adulthood and influence personal and social effectiveness by insight learning about self concepts” (Cloninger et. al., 1993).

Delimitations of the Study

Every research study is limited in several ways. It has to be delimited in terms of population covered, sample selected and scope of variables studied. The present investigation has also certain delimitations which are as follows:

1) The sample was restricted to Aligarh city only, whereas the same study could have been conducted on broader level.
2) The sample was not targeted to the streams of Arts, Social Science, Science, Commerce etc.
3) The number of students included in the sample was limited to 500.

Organization of the study

This study has been presented in five chapters. Chapter-1 includes the Introduction of the three variables, Significance of the study, Title of the study, Objectives of the study, Hypotheses, Definitions of terms, Delimitations of the study and Organization of the study. Chapter-2 provides a review of literature related to the variables taken in the study. Chapter-3 includes a detailed description of the methodology and strategy for collecting data with a plan for analysis. Chapter-4 is devoted to the presentation and discussion of the analysed data. Chapter-5 comprises of summary, implications and suggestion for further research.