CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In India, there are a number of sacred places or holy shrines that attract the attention of millions of people. The names of such places are Hazrat Nizamuddin Auwliya, New Delhi; Kaliyar Sharif, Roorkee; Khawaja Gharib Nawaaz, Ajmer, etc. These holy shrines or sacred places are considered as the places of divine revelation. People report that they have had extraordinary experiences while paying visit to such places. Different sacred places have the power to heal the body, enlighten the mind, increase creativity, develop psychic abilities, and awaken the soul to a knowing of its true purpose in life.

The present study is an attempt to examine the impact of psychological factors, i.e. spiritual orientation and purpose of visit on subjective well-being of the people who pay visit to the holy shrine – Mausoleum of Hazrat Nizamuddin Auwliya, New Delhi. The pilgrimage practices of Hindu people are quite unlike those of Muslim people. Even though irrespective of the religion people pay visit to this holy shrine. What I observed that their journey to this place have truly been a ‘pilgrimage’. The word pilgrimage means more than mere travel. Peoples’ visits to this place have fundamentally been an inner exploration of their heart, mind and soul. My primary intention is to collect the information beyond the realm of psychological instruments. Spiritualism has its source of information, the direct and personal experience of the sacred.
A brief note on Hazrat Nizamuddin Auwliya: The Head of Chishti Order

It was at the age of 23 that Shaykh Nizamuddin Auwliya was appointed as his khalifa (successor) by Shaykh Farid and was directed to settle in Delhi and work for the expansion of this silsilah, or mystical order. It was a stupendous challenge to work in the capital of the empire without being involved in shughl (government service) or consorting with kings; to provide guidance to the disciples of the great Shaykh spread far and wide, to push forward the work of the silsilah in the regions still beyond the reach of the Delhi sultans; and to evolve an effective mechanism to deal with those associated with the order. Shaykh Nizamuddin Auwliya not only rose to the occasion, he infused a new spirit into Chishti organization. Addressing him Amir Khusro once said:

"You have put the beads of Shaykh Farid in a rosary"
It is on this count that your title has become Nizam (stringer of pearls).

In the course of time, as the result of Shaykh Nizamuddin’s efforts, the entire country came to be studded with khangahs of Chishti order. In a very short time the fame of his spiritual excellence, his concern for his disciples and his interest reached every corner of the land and every ear, and his khalifas reached every province of the country to train the novice and to make perfect the initiated.

Place in Mystic History Shaykh Nizamuddin Auwliya occupies a unique place in the history of institutional Sufism in South Asia. After his death, i.e. since more than 665 years, kings, conquerors, nobles, scholars, saints, and all segments of
the population – Hindus and Muslims alike – have visited his mausoleum in search of blessings and benediction. The spiritual organizations that he set up flourished in almost all parts of India.

**Impact of Life Style of Shaykh Nizamuddin Auwliya**

He was one of the most charismatic personalities of his age. A scholar deep insight into religious sciences – particularly the Quran and the Hadith (saying and doings of the Prophet); a saint whose vigils and fasts cast an aura of serene spirituality round his face; a humanist who spent all time attending to the problems of the down trodden and the destitute; a pacifist who believed in non-violence and returning evil with good – the Shaykh represented in his person the highest traditions of morality, mysticism, and religion. For more than half a century his Khanqah in Delhi was a sanctuary of peace for people in search of spiritual solace. His mission in life was to cultivate a personal relationship with the Creator by expounding a worldview that transcend, and encouraged others to transcend, every narrow and parochial consideration.

* He immensely enhanced the impact of his teachings through frequent recourse to self-scrutiny and self-criticism.

* The Shaykh threw himself headlong into the work of moral reform and regeneration.

Shaykh Nizamuddin Auwliya (1242-1325) is one of the seminal personalities in the history of the Islamic mystical movement in South Asia. For about half a century he lived and worked in Delhi to save humankind from sin.
and suffering. His efforts to inculcate in people a respect for moral and spiritual values had a deep and far-reaching impact on medieval Indian society. His message of humanism, love, and benevolence still echoes through the corridors of time. In the Tughlaq dynasty Sultan Firuz Shah addressed him as Sultan al-Mash'ikh (King of the mystic teachers).

Shaykh Nizamuddin Awliya’s position in the history of Islamic mysticism in South Asia is unique in certain respects. He transformed institutional Sufism, which initially aimed at individual spiritual salvation and training, into a movement for mass spiritual culture. This led to the proliferation of hospices (Khanqahs) in the country and the adoption of common lingua franca for the communication of ideas, and brought about a significant change in the nature of mystic literature. It shifted the focus of mystic interest from abstract thought to concrete conditions of life and discipline.

The Shaykh’s conversations are recorded in Fawa'id al-Fu'ad. He had a peculiar way of instruction. He did not advise any visitor directly. He referred to the individual’s problems indirectly and suggested remedies through anecdotes and parables. He narrated numerous anecdotes to bring home to his audience the significance of this concept of religion, a concept that had revolutionary dimensions. Hardly any visitor left his hospice without experiencing a sense of relief in his heart.
The basic principles of the Shaykh’s ideology may be summarized in the following points:

(1) Service of humankind is the *raison d’être* of religion.

(2) He believed that if one learned “to live for the Lord alone”, love, peace, and amity would prevail in this world.

(3) He taught the sublimation of desires through nourishing cosmic emotion. This gave real spiritual equanimity and poise to one who practiced it. The Shaykh never tried to curb an individual’s natural aptitudes. Rather, he sublimated them through the development to counter-attractions.

(4) He believed that one could not live a life of divine significance without firmly rejecting all materialistic attractions (tark-idunya). It meant the rejection of that attitude of mind, which involved man in material struggles in such a way that he frittered away his energies in petty material pursuits.

(5) He was a firm believer of pacifism and non-violence.

(6) The Shaykh analyzed the basis of human exchange as reflecting three possible types of relationship with other human beings: (a) He may be neither good nor bad to others (jamadat) non-living world. (b) He may do no harm to others but only what is deemed good. (c) He may do good to others, and yet if others harm him, still remain patient and not retaliate.

(7) Complete trust (tawakkul) in God and resignation to His will leads to blissful contentment in life.
(8) Miracle mongering had no place in the spiritual discipline of Shaykh Nizamuddin Awwliya. He considered performance of miracles as a sign of spiritual imperfection.

(9) The Shaykh had very definite and specific rules about his mystic discipline: (a) No one devoid of learning could be appointed a khalifa (deputy) to carry on the work of spreading the order; (b) no khalifa was permitted to visit the courts of kings or accept grants from them; (c) no khalifa could accept any government job, even a judgeship; (d) the khalifa was to live on futuh (solicited gifts); (e) nothing received by the way of futuh was to be hoarded.

The structure of the Chishti mystical ideology stood on these principles, and the Shaykh tried to build morally autonomous personalities in his disciples in accordance with the principles enunciated in his teachings.

**Spirituality: Meaning and Definition** The term spirituality is coined from the Latin word *spiritus*, meaning “breath of life”. In modern dictionary the word “spirituality” is a translation of the term *Ruhāniya* (in Arabic) derived from the adjective *rūhānī*, which means, mind or animating principle as distinct from body. The definition of spirituality provided by the tenth edition of Oxford English Dictionary is as follows: “the equality or condition of being spiritual, attachment to or regard for the thing of the spirit as opposed to material or worldly interest”. Belief in spiritual reality continues to characterize a majority of people, be it belief in a supreme being or order, life after death, an ultimate
reality, or supernatural beings, like angels or demons. Whatever behavioral scientists and health-care professionals may themselves believe, the spiritual side of human nature remains important to many or most people.

A substantial number of people describe spirituality as the most important source of strength and direction in their lives. We inherit spiritual elements from our parents as well as from the previous generation, just like physical and psychological elements. Our spiritual essence possesses the assimilated elements of past lives of the community, history, arts, cosmic world, and beyond.

Spirituality has been a proper subject for scientific study e.g., William James (1958); Carl Jung (1933,1964); Abraham Maslow (1962,1966,1970,1971); Rudolph Otto (1923), John Dewey (1934); Gordon Allport (1950); Mircea Eliade (1959); Martin Buber (1970); Erich Fromm (1950); Victor Frankl (1963) have explored this concept far more than a century ago. Definitions of spirituality in relevant literature usually include some version of the following words and phrases: feeling connected or belonging in the universe, believing in a power outside of one’s self, searching for a sense of meaning or purpose, experiencing transcendence and immanence, seeking one’s ultimate and personal truths, experiencing a numinous quality, knowing unity of the visible and invisible, having an internal relationship between the individual and the Divine, encountering limitless love, and moving towards personal wholeness (Canda, 1995; Ganje-Fling & McCarthy, 1996; Decker, 1993; King et al., 1995; Wulff, 1996). An operational definition of spirituality is yet to come. A great deal of
convergence and overlapping were found among the various writers in their usually implicit descriptions of spirituality. It became increasingly clear that the spirituality could not be defined in simple words because it is a complex phenomenon. On the basis of some theoretical research, Elkins, Hedstrom, Hughes, Leaf, and Saunders (1988) formulated the following definition of spirituality: “It is a way of being and experiencing that comes about through awareness of a transcendent dimension and that is characterized by certain identifiable values in regard to self, others, nature, life, and whatever one considers to be the Ultimate.”

A functional definition of spirituality which has been adopted by the California state psychological association task force of spirituality and psychotherapy – “courage to look within and to trust”, implying that what is seen and what is trusted appears to be a deep sense of belongingness, of wholeness, of connectedness and of openness of the infinite.

Spirituality which has always been considered to be natural part of being human, is an innate human capacity to transcend the egocentric perspective from which people constantly experience and evaluate their lives, opening them to a broader world view, a heightened capacity for loving, and an increased motivation to enhance the greater good (Chandler, Holder & Colander, 1992). According to Vrinte (1996) spirituality is inspired and sustained by transpersonal experiences that originate in the deepest recesses of the human being and they
are but natural manifestations of that domain of the human psyche that contain the greater depth of life.

**Dimensions of Spirituality.** Spirituality is not adequately defined by any single, continuum or by dichotomous classification; rather, it has many dimensions. Spirituality is better understood as multidimensional space in which every individual can be located (Larson, Swyers, & McCullough, 1997).

Psychologists have described spirituality in different dimensions. Glock and Stark (1965), for example, described four elements or domains, all of which are associated with religion: the experiential, the ritualistic, the intellectual and the consequential. Capps, Rambo, and Ransohoff (1976) offered a somewhat different categories of six spiritual dimensions within religion: the mythological, ritual, experimental, dispositional, social and directional. Elkins, Hughes, Saunders, Leaf, and Hedstrom (1986) reported components of spirituality, not related to religion: transcendent dimension, meaning and purpose in life, mission in life, sacredness of life, material values altruism, idealism, awareness of the tragic and fruits of spirituality. Karasu (1999) explained the three ways to spirituality in the context of belief: belief in the sacred, belief in unity and belief in transformation. Miller and Thoresen (1999) proposed three broad measurement domains as: spiritual practices, beliefs, and experiences.

The three domains described by Miller and Thoresen are meant to characterize spirituality more generally, whether inside or outside the context of religion. These broad domains are consistent with a psychological perspective
that is sensitive to cultural, ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious differences. Each domain, such as practices, can encompass a wide range of constructs and variables. Each is amenable to a variety of qualitative and quantitative assessment approaches (e.g., biographical and autobiographical material, narrative interviews, physiological measures, self-report questionnaires).

**Spiritual Practices** It is the easiest to measure because it focuses on overt observable behavior (e.g., Connors, Tonigan, & Miller, 1996). People can be described by the extent to which they engage in spiritual practices such as prayer, fasting, meditation, contemplation, and paying visits to holy shrines or pilgrimage to holy places; participation in specifically religious activities such as worship, dance, scriptural study, singing, confession, offerings, and public prayer.

**Spiritual Beliefs** This domain is large, and its content varies with culture (Smith, 1994). Directly pertinent here are beliefs about transcendence (e.g., soul, afterlife), deity, and the reality of a spiritual dimension beyond sensory and intellectual knowledge. Personal mortality and endorsed values are also part of this domain (Rokeach, 1973). Transcending "the me factor" (i.e., I, me, my, mine) in personal values has been a common quest in many religions (Bracke & Thoresen, 1996; Easwaran, 1989). The concept of God is an interesting dimension here (e.g., whether the nature, image, and intentions of a Supreme Being are seen as being fundamentally loving, indifferent, or punitive toward humankind).
It offers the greatest challenges for valid measurement, yet it is fundamental to an understanding of spirituality. Many would regard this experiential dimensions as the fundamental and defining nature of spirituality (Helminiak, 1996) such experiences might be roughly divided into routine, everyday encounters of the transcendent or sacred, versus exceptional spiritual and mystical experiences. Two perplexing problems of definition emerge. The first is the problem of defining which experiences are spiritual. Among individuals who have had sudden, dramatic, and transforming life experiences, for example, some describe them in spiritual language and others do not (Miller & C’deBaca, 1994). Believers and non-believers may have essentially parallel experiences, but they differ in the understanding of their meaning and nature. A second challenge is empirical description of the experiences themselves. Whether they are labeled as “spiritual” there appears to be a relatively common topography to certain numinous phenomena including mystical (Bucke, 1923; Oates, 1973), transformational (Loder, 1981; Miller & C’deBaca, 1994), and near-death experiences (Kellehear, 1996).

Assessment of Spirituality Spirituality can be assessed by a single item and as well as complex as qualitative ratings or a factorial instrument. The spiritual measures may follow the specific beliefs, behavior and experience dimensions. A set of paper-and-pencil items on spirituality can be used to identify spiritual orientation of people. People may be asked one of the most commonly used items with regard to spirituality: “How important is spirituality in your life”? A
single item measure of spiritual orientation or involvement may be "How often you visit to holy shrines"?

Few measures have been developed to assess spirituality. They are, for example, Spiritual Orientation Inventory (Elkins et al., 1988) and Spiritual Well-Being (Ellison, 1993). The broad goal of these measures is to understand spirituality. The present investigator developed a goal oriented - Spiritual Orientation Inventory - for assessing 'spirituality' among the people who pay visit to holy shrines.

**Spirituality and Religion** This section covers the meaning of religion and spirituality, and the differentiation between the two.

Though spirituality traditionally has been considered to be exclusively the domain of religion, it is now being conceptualized in terms that have no particular relationship to theology, and is at the same time being accepted as practical and intellectually respectable. Worthington et al., (1996) speak of three categories of people whose beliefs were classified to differentiate the religious from the spiritual; (1) those who may be spiritual but not religious in that they believe in and value a universal human spirit or an "élan vital" without holding religious beliefs to be true, (2) those who are religious but not spiritual holding to doctrines or a religious organization but not experiencing any devotion to a higher power, and (3) those who are both spiritual and religious and believe in valuing a higher power that is accepted to and consistent with some organized religion. It may be said that the majority of the Indian population fall into the
second and third categories, for most use religion to morally and spiritually guide their behavior.

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 an individual expression that speaks to the greatest of human capabilities. It is a unified quality of mind, heart and spirit. Spirituality is a commitment to existence.

Psychologists have been reluctant to acknowledge the importance of religious beliefs to human existence. They tend to think religious beliefs as coping mechanisms. Both spiritual and religious oriented people have sense of community participation. Pargament (1999) prefers the spirituality as part of religion, based on an understanding of the “sacred” as the spirituality is a wider concept than religion. Simply stated, religion is the path and spirituality is the outcome.

It would be helpful to understand spirituality, if we differentiate it from religion. Maslow believed that the ‘essential core religious experience may be embedded in either a theistic, supernatural context or a non-theistic context’ (1970, p.28). Maslow and Dewey were strongly committed to the view that spirituality is a human phenomenon and that it is more basic than prior to, and different from traditional expressions of religiosity. The churches and temples do not have a monopoly on spirituality or on the values that compose it. These
belong to humanity and are not the exclusive possession of organized religion or of traditionally religious persons.

Milton Yinger (1970) also warned against definitions that overemphasize conventional religiosity and noted the need for assessment approaches that would tap “awareness of, and interest in, the continuing, recurrent, permanent problems of human existence” (p.33). In a study of psychology and spirituality, Shafranske and Malony (1985) found that 71% considered spirituality to be personally relevant, yet only 9% reported a high level of involvement with traditional religion, and 74% indicated that organized religion was not the primary source of their spirituality.

A growing number of people are developing their spirituality outside traditional, organized religion. In the words of Erich Fromm (1950), they are discovering that “it is not true that we have to give up the concern for the soul if we do not accept the tenets of religion” (p.9).

Krippner and Welch (1992) distinguish spirituality from religiosity, maintaining that spiritual people may or may not engage in formal religious practice and religious people may not embody spiritual values. They say that people who have internalized an institutionalized common set of beliefs, practices and rituals (as dictated by religion) regarding spiritual concerns and issues are not always spiritual. This view is elaborated by Vrinte (1996) who says spirituality is distinct from religion in that spirituality is more related to authentic mystical experiences whereas religion is more associated with normative
practices (laid down by a prophet or a religious group). In fact Keen (1994) observes that millions of people who are unmoved by established religion as well as disillusioned with a secular view of life, are yet looking for some “missing value”, some absent purpose, some “new meaning” and some “presence of the sacred” – all of which indicate becoming spiritual in one’s orientation.

However defined, whether broadly as consciousness (Helminiak, 1996) or in relation to transcendence (Miller & Martin, 1988; Thoresen, 1998), spirituality is an attribute of individuals. Religion, in contrast, is an organized social entity. Thoresen (1998), drawing on recent work examining working definitions of spiritual and religious perspectives (Larson et al., 1997), suggested that some characteristics are shared, such as a search for what is sacred or holy in life, coupled with some kind of transcendent (beyond the self) relationship with God or a higher power or universal energy.

Religious factors focused more on prescribed beliefs, rituals, and practices as well as social institutional features. Spiritual factors, on the other hand, are concerned more with individual subjective experiences, sometimes shared with others (cf. Zinnbauer et al., 1997). Maslow (1976) similarly differentiated “the subjective and naturalistic religious experience and attitude” (spiritual) from institutional organized religions. Religion is characterized in many ways by its boundaries and spirituality by a difficulty in defining its boundaries. Religion involves an organized social institution with, among other things, beliefs about how one relates to that which is sacred or divine. Spirituality does not necessarily
involve religion. Some people experience their spirituality as a highly personal and private matter, focusing on intangible elements that provide vitality and meaning in their lives. In what has been described as "the new spirituality" arising apart from organized religion in recent decades (e.g., Roof, Carroll, & Roozen, 1995), spirituality may be conceptualized in ways that do not assume any reality beyond material existence. In such an individualistic perspective, each person (regardless of religious involvement) defines his or her own spirituality, which might center on material experiences such as mountain biking at dusk, quiet contemplation of nature, reflection on the direction of one’s life, and a feeling of intimate connection with loved one’s. Therefore, spirituality and religion are not the same.

From the beginning of time, religion has been considered as the panacea of all ills, and mankind, despite moments of doubt, has always leaned on religious faith for solace. There exists a breathtaking diversity of faith in the world. Every religion has three aspects – values, symbols and practices – while the last two might differ, values are essentially common.

The spirit manifests itself in every religious universe where the echoes of the Divine word are still audible, but the manner in which the manifestations of the Spirit takes place differs from one religion to another. In the following section we discuss spirituality in Hinduism and spirituality in Islam in detail.

**Spirituality in Hinduism** The term “Hindu” refers to the religious life of the people of India or, more correctly, of Bhārata-varsa, the “world of Bharata”. The
latter expression is not merely the geographical equivalent of India in vogue before the advent of the English term (which etymologically means the land of the Indus River), but it signifies a single, though cumulatively diversified, cultural area like a pyramid inverted or, better, slanted on the side picturing its horizontal expansion.

Hinduism stands indistinguishable from the spiritual life of a culture and was not introduced or inaugurated as a movement at any assignable period of time. Hinduism is concerned and preoccupied with the order of the world - cosmic, social, and the individual. The sacred order is not man-made but given in the nature of things. “The four-fold order was created by me” (BG 4.13). Likewise, the Hindu spiritual tradition sanctifies the life of the householder with his civic, social, and “cosmic” obligations while, at the same time, providing a path to inward liberation for those wholly absorbed in the spiritual quest.

The Hindu spiritual journey is typically the affirmative: using things found in the realm of the many as means to affirming the one. The ascetic way of denial of the many as a means for realizing the unaffirmable One, surely, is accepted but only in spirit.

“Ātman sarvam devasya”

Spirit is the whole of what God is. (Nirukta, 7.4)

The general Hindu conceptualization of spirit is done in terms of the upanisadic notion of ātman and its identity with the ground of being Ātman, the true theion of Hindu spiritual tradition, is preeminently not will or dynamic spirit
as such. Itself beyond the distinction of static and dynamic, ātman is rather the “ground” which provides for this and similar other distinctions. It is the manifesting source of everything that is, and, likewise, negatively speaking the condition of everything that is not. But when it is discovered or realized, it is realized rather as a fullness of the depth in which everything “of the surface” disappears. The Knower of the transcendent world of spirit, it is avowed, attains the highest (TU2.1). But it is also avowed, paradoxically, that by knowing the ātman one knows the all (ChU6.3).

The imagery of a tree is a commonplace of Indian religious literature. The tree in manifesting itself above ground inevitably relates to that which lies invisible underground as well as to the ground itself. The image, incidentally, vivifies the sense of the spectrum as applied to Hindu spirituality, its compactness and differentiation. The nature of “spirituality” (ātmyan) is outreaching and resisting identification with religious processes, therefore, we can say that the spiritual is the soil or the ground, intrinsically prior to beyond the forms of religion that are cognate with it, just as the soil is cognate with a seed or roots. Spirituality surrounds and underlies its religious expressions and is not reducible to the latter. What is unique about the Hindu notion of spirit (ātman) is intrinsic otherness in relation to its “expression” as the ethical, the political, the aesthetic, and even the religious. In their very midst spirit remains transcendent.

The traditional Hindu religious notion of adhyātma, literally “pertaining to ātman”, plays almost the same pervasive role that the category “spiritual” does in
the West. It is the name for the integrative function by which to unify the various aspects of existence. In this respect it is cognate to and paired with adhibhūta, implying unification on the objective side, and adbūdeva, meaning integration in divines. Adhyātman functions like a symbol pointing beyond itself, opening up levels of reality, which remain, undiscovered without a corresponding opening up of levels of the human mind beyond the discursive and the sense-bound.

Spirituality can be understood as wisdom about the "way back into the ground" of pluralism of religious forms, serves as the rationale also for the infinite diversity in the way of one's being in the world. Spirituality also pre-eminently integrates the affirmative and negative ways. The foundational conceptual formulation of the tradition can be stated thus: Brahman represents the highest state of existence, universal and transcendent, the ultimate source of all positivity from which all things originate, have their being, and into which all return; samsāra, that is, "the phenomenal or natural existence", refers to the human being's empirical situation governed by the law of necessity (karma) and consequent unfreedom and finitude. The scriptures inculcate and encourage cognitive, reflective disciplines (vidyā(s)), emphasizing negation in the sense of a turning away, a choosing of the "good" in the place of that which is pleasing.

The ultimate "good" in this case is liberation or "freedom of the spirit". The other goals described as life values in the picturesque scheme of "ends of human life" (purusārtha) may be summed up under the rubric of the "pleasant" (preyas). The order of the pleasant includes the enjoyment of senses (kāma) and
material comfort (artha); both are always determined by a sense of obligation to the “other” as against self-centeredness. The latter represents the sphere of dharma, which marks the transition from the pleasant to the good. The sommun bonum (śreyas) of liberation or “freedom of the spirit” is commonly cherished goal of life marking the attainment of fulfillment in life as well as beyond life. “Spirituality” is marked by both a process (sādhana) and its result (sādhyā). Seeking and finding are a dialectical continuum involving, in existential terms, an inner transformation of life. One may even stretch this continuum to encompass phenomenal or natural existence itself: spirituality – a matter of winning an orientation or a sense of perspective and a wholeness or completeness, which the ideal of “liberation” implies. Living in the presence of the ideal with such a perspective enables one to look in retrospect at “life in the world” and to see it as continuous with its transformation. This is spirituality and spiritual life. The natural man imperceptibly yields to be a spiritual man; life values are transformed through a retrospective reorientation into spiritual values. When the distinction between the “should” or “must” and the “is” thus ceases to exist, the spiritual goal of “being free from” (mukti, moksha) overreaching the divide or distinction, humanly speaking, may be said to have been realized.

Spirituality in Islam ‘Islam’ is an Arabic word which bears two meanings, (i) peace and (ii) commitment. The words like submission, resignation, and surrender do not make justice while translating the word, ‘Islam’ with the positive aspect of the ‘total commitment’. Thus, Islam means the act of
committing oneself unreservedly to Allah, and its adherents, Muslims, are the persons who make the commitment – in faith, in obedience, and in reposing trust to the one and only god revealed to Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) through Angel Jibrael (Gabriel) and his Apostles, with Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) being the last of them.

In Islam the spirit breathes through all that reveals the One and leads to the One, for Islam's ultimate purpose is to reveal the Unity of the Divine Principle and to integrate the world of multiplicity in the light of that unity. Spirituality in Islam is inseparable from the awareness of the One, of Allah, and a life lived according to His will. The principle of Unity (al-tawhīd) lies at the heart of the Islamic message and determines Islamic spirituality in all its multifarious dimensions and focus.

The central theophany of Islam, the Quran, is the source par excellence of all Islamic spirituality. It is the word manifested in human language. Through it, knowledge of the One and the paths leading to Him were made accessible in that part of the cosmos, which was destined to become the abode of Islam. Likewise, the soul and inner substance of the Prophet are the complementary sources of Islamic spirituality – hidden outwardly but living as presence and as transforming grace within the hearts to those who tread the path of realization. Moreover, it can be said that both the created order and man himself are also marked by the imprint of the Divine Unity and must be taken into consideration in any study of Islamic spirituality. According to the Quran, God has manifested
His sign upon the “horizons” or the macrocosmic world and also within the soul of man, for He has “breathed into man” His own spirit (nafakht-u-fih-i-min rūḥī).

To be fully human is to stand on the vertical axis of existence and to seek tawhīd, to see the reflection of the One in all that makes up the manifold order from the angelic to the mineral.

Man is called upon to function on earth as a vicegerent of god, i.e. as a free agent by His choice. His role of vicegerency is not difficult of comprehension, if we refer ourselves to the Islamic concept of God in relation to his attributes; “Believe and Work” is the commandment; work, by “investing yourself with Divine attributes”. To live by the Will of God, who is one and to obey His laws is the alpha of the spiritual life. Its omega is to surrender one’s will completely to Him and to sacrifice one’s existence before the One who alone can be said ultimately to be. Between the two stand various levels of connect and ever more interiorized action, and above the plane of action the love of God and finally knowledge of Him, the knowledge that is summarized in the testimony (Shahādah) of Islam, “Lā īlāha illa’ Llāh, Muhammad-un rasūl Allāh” (There is no divinity but God, but Allah, the One; and Muhammad is God’s Messenger).

To accept it is to become a Muslim. To realize its full meaning is to reach the highest degree of spirituality, to act perfectly according to His Will, to love only the beloved, and to know all that can be known. It is to gain sanctity and attain the crown of spiritual poverty. It is to become a friend of God, Wālī Allāh, the term that Muslims use for saints.
One of the main objectives of the present investigation is to assess the level of subjective well-being of the high and low spiritually oriented people. The SWB is the dependent variable in the present study. It is fitness of thing to describe here the definitions, components and theories, and measurement of SWB.

**Well-Being: Eastern Perspective** The concept of well-being is well illustrated in the schools of Hindu philosophy. Buddhism and Jainism represent a view of personality and describe methods for its growth into particular form of perception. Well-being is equated with the integration of personality.

Psychological well-being to the Hindu means (1) integration of emotions with the help of an integrated teacher (a spiritual master, Guru), (2) acquiring a higher philosophy of life which helps to resolve inner tensions, (3) channelizing basal passion directing the emotions to ultimate reality, (4) developing an attitude whereby everything is viewed as a manifestation of ultimate reality, (5) cultivation of higher qualities which replace negative qualities, and (6) the practice of concentration (Sinha, 1965).

The ultimate goal in Indian thought goes beyond self-realization or transcendence and seeks for a spiritual pursuit leading to the highest state of everlasting happiness, "nirvana" or supreme bliss. The ultimate motive is spiritual pursuit with the aim of attaining union with the universal self or moksha or nirvana. The concept of well-being has also been elaborately given in *Charka Samhita*, the ancient treatise on the Indian systems of medicine which is called
Ayurveda (the treatise on life). In this treatise the characteristics of happy and unhappy life have been elaborated. According to the *sankhya* philosophy, human personality is a product of the interaction between the spirit (*purusha*) and the matter (*prakriti*). The influence of *prakriti* on behavior is emphasized in terms of the three Gunas or qualities called *sattva* or the element of knowledge, *rajas* or the principle of activity, which on the affective side is the cause of all painful experiences, and *tamas* of the principle of passivity that clouds our intellect thereby producing ignorance. It is said that the state of *samyavastha* or equilibrium of the three Gunas is that which holds the secret to an individual’s well-being.

The *Bhagavad Gita* (1905) focuses on the idea of avoidance of extremes and maintaining a kind of balance or equilibrium to enjoy a state of well-being. The concept of well-being in Indian (Hindu) thought is significantly characterized by a state of “goodmind” which is peaceful, quiet, and serene. The *Bhagavad Gita* speaks of being steady of mind (*Sthitapragya*) and of performing one’s duties without being lustfully attached to the fruits of one’s action (*karmayoga*) as presenting a healthy person. The dissolution of the self or ego is considered the most evolved stage of mental health; further it is believed that the healthy mind acts but does not react and, therefore, is always watchful of the root cause of any disturbance. A mind, which is free from conflicts and hence is clear about its duties that are performed with a spiritual mission, is a mind, which enjoys well-being (Verma, 1998).
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Besides “the steady of mind” which is characterized by calm and poise in all situations, adverse or favorable, other features such as being friendly, not bearing ill-will for anyone, having compassion, forgiveness, being free from attachment and egoism and being balanced in both pleasure and pain are hallmarks of well-being according to The Bhagavad Gita (Chapter XII, Verse 13); self control, self-realization which is the realization that everything is totally interconnected, and the dissolution of the self by the expansion of the “self” beyond its personal boundary leads to a stage of the finest form of humility where there are positive feeling for all things and beings. So according to Indian thinking, well-being unfolds at cognitive (rigorous self examination), conative (performance of duty) and affective (expression of self beyond the ego) levels.

General well-being refers to “the subjective feelings of contentment, happiness, satisfaction with life, experience of one’s role in the world of work, sense of achievement, utility, belongingness with no distress, dissatisfaction and worry, etc.” (Verma & Verma, 1989). In other words, general well-being implies hope, optimism, happiness and faith in the normal absolutes of truth, beauty and goodness, a proper perception of the means and ends related to the purpose of life and more than all a realization of the value of life.

**Western Perspective** The work on subjective well-being or psychological well-being is carried out under the broad topic of quality of life. The concept of well-being has been defined variously by the behavioral scientists. According to Campbell and others (1976), the quality of life is a composite measure of
physical, mental and social well-being. Levi (1987) defined well-being as a
dynamic state of mind characterized by a reasonable amount of harmony
between an individual abilities, needs and expectations and environmental
demands and opportunities. The WHO has also declared health as a state of
physical, psychological and spiritual well-being (WHO, 1987, cf. Verma et al.,
1989).

Veenhoven’s (1991) definition of life satisfaction as the degree to which
an individual judges the overall quality of life as a whole favorably was extended
to represent subjective well-being. Psychological well-being is a person’s
evaluative reactions to his or her life either in terms of life satisfaction ‘cognitive
evaluations’ or affect ‘ongoing emotional reactions’ (Diener & Diener, 1995).

Good life can be defined in terms of “subjective well-being” (SWB) and
in colloquial terms is sometimes labeled “happiness”. Nishizawa (1996)
interpreted the term “psychic well-being as the same as “happiness” along with
one’s cognitive appraisal of how satisfying his or her life has been and is, also
encompassing positive future prospect of life, “hope”. Diener, Sapyta, and Suh
(1998) stated that Subjective well-being is not sufficient for the good life but it
appears to be increasingly necessary for it. According to Diener (2000)
“Subjective well-being refers to people’s evaluations of their lives-evaluation
that are both affective and cognitive. People experience abundant subjective
well-being when they feel many pleasant and few unpleasant emotions, when
they are engaged in interesting activities, when they are satisfied with their lives”
The field of subjective well-being focuses on people’s own evaluations of their lives.

Diener (1984) suggested that these definitions can be grouped into three categories. The first involved the assessment of the qualities of individuals (for instance, virtuousness, success) by others, hence it cannot be thought as a subjective state. The second encompasses the individual’s assessment of satisfaction with life. Shin and Johnson (1978) have defined this form of happiness as “a global assessment of a person’s quality of life according to his own chosen criteria” (p.478). Finally, the third meaning of well-being is defined as – denoting a preponderance of positive affect over negative affect (Bradburn, 1969),

According to Diener (1984), there are three characteristics in the study of subjective well-being. First, it is subjective. According to Campbell (1976), it resides within the experience of the individual. Notably absent from definitions of subjective well-being are necessary objective conditions such as health, comfort, virtue or wealth (Kammann, 1983). Second, subjective well-being includes positive measures. It is not just the absence of negative factors, as is true of most measures of mental health. However, the relationship between positive and negative indices is not completely understood. Third, subjective well-being measures typically include a global assessment of all aspects of a person’s life. Although affect or satisfaction within a certain domain may be assessed, the emphasis is usually placed on an integral judgment of the person’s life.
Nonetheless, measures may cover a period ranging from a few weeks to one’s entire life. There is not a priori way to decide what time period is best. Rather, researches must uncover the correlates of subjective well-being within varying frames.

Mohan (2001) says that differences exist between the conceptualizations made in the East and West. The concept of well-being in the west is centered around the ability to satisfy one’s needs, avoidance of frustrations and stress, and exercising certain amounts of control on the environment such that it enhances the satisfaction of personal and social needs. In the Indian tradition control over the senses is thought to be essential to well-being. Emphasis is on the maintenance of balance between extremes of satisfaction and denial (implying that needs need not be totally denied) and adoption of a path of moderation. Further, since frustration, failure, successes and joys are considered inevitable in one’s life, the essence of well-being lies in not being overwhelmed by either. While in the West, the idea is to have control or exploit the environment since it is thought that environment provides the inputs that lead to need satisfaction, in Hindu spiritual thought the concept of “being in tune” with the environment in encouraged to be able to experience well-being.

Components of Subjective Well-Being (SWB) There are three components of SWB: satisfaction, pleasant affect and low levels of unpleasant affect. For Diener, Suh, and Oishi (1997), each of the three components of SWB can be split into sub-divisions. Global satisfaction can be divided into satisfaction with the
various domains of life such as recreation, love, marriage, friendship, and so forth, and these domains can in turn be divided into facets. *Pleasant affect* can be divided into specific emotions such as joy, affection, and pride. Finally, *unpleasant affect* can be described in specific terms of emotions and moods such as shame, guilt, sadness, anger, and anxiety. Each of the sub-divisions of affect can also be further divided.

Subjective well-being can be studied at the global level, or at progressively narrower levels, depending on one's purposes. The justification for studying more global levels is that the narrower levels tend to co-occur. In other words, there is a tendency for people to experience similar levels of well-being across different aspects of their lives, and the study of molar levels can help us understand the general influences on SWB that cause these covariations. A justification for studying narrower definitions of SWB is that we can gain a greater understanding of specific conditions that might influence well-being in particular domains. Furthermore, narrower types of measures are often more sensitive to causal variables.

**Measurement of Subjective Well-Being** Most of the researches have employed self-report measures in which the respondent judges and reports his life satisfaction, the frequency of his/her pleasant affect, or the frequency of his/her unpleasant emotions. For example, Watson, Clark and Tellegen's (1988) PANAS is designed to separately measure both positive and negative affect. This scale tends to measure aroused or activated states of affect (e.g., excitement and
distress) and thus a researcher may prefer in some situations to use scales that measure a wider range of emotions (e.g., contentment and embarrassment). Pavot and Diener (1993) review evidence on the Satisfaction with Life Scale. This review suggests that self-report measures seem particularly appropriate in this field. Self-report scales that are designed to measure SWB usually correlate with each other, and converge with SWB assessed by other methods (Sandvik, Diener, & Seidlitz, 1993).

**Theories of Subjective Well-Being** Researches in the field have proposed different theoretical models to study the phenomenon of subjective well-being.

Theories can be grouped into major categories – cognitive oriented and affect oriented. *Cognitive theories* generally maintain that deficits in meeting one's needs lead to ill-being and that positive discrepancies between perceived reality and personal aspirations lead to well-being (Brickman, Coates, & Janoff-Bulman, 1978; Wills, 1981; Michalos, 1985; Headey, & Wearing, 1989). *Affect-oriented theories* of well-being suggest that self satisfaction is enhanced by short term positive experiences or reducing aversive states. Therefore, well-being reflects the feelings people experience during their lives (Diener, & Larsen, 1993).

Another, category of theories of SWB is: Bottom-up and Top-down theories. *Bottom-up theories* suggest that happiness is derived from a summation of pleasurable and unpleasurable moments and experiences. A happy individual is happy because he or she experiences many happy moments. *Top-down*
theories maintain that individuals are predisposed to experiences and react to events and circumstances in positive or negative ways: global dimensions of personality, in essence, determine levels of subjective SWB. Top-down theories hold that there is a general propensity to experience things in a positive way such that “despite circumstances, some individuals seem to be happy people, some unhappy people” (Costa, McCrae, & Norris, 1981, p.79).

Ryff and Keyes (1995) proposed six distinct dimensions of wellness, which are, autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, and self-acceptance.

Need of the present study. The investigator has endeavored to study the impact of psychosocial factors on subjective well-being. Need of the present study emerged from the realization of the fact that psychologists overwhelmingly focus on the negative aspects of individual lives. In the past decade researches have begun to examine such topics as happiness, optimism, life satisfaction, quality of life, hope, etc. under the broad field of subjective well-being. Subjective well-being consists of people's own evaluations of their lives. Spiritual behavior is the most broad domain, and yet very motivating force for the human being. Therefore, a study of such aspect of behavior first demands a complete understanding of the spiritual behavior or orientation among solace seekers.

Also, a keen insight into the contemporary socio-cultural scenario gives one a feeling that the spiritual orientation of the people is almost coming to an end. The spiritual discipline and life of the Indians are all together evaporating
from the present social milieu. These virtues of the past are being replaced by a new persona, which is known as 'spiritual diseases' manifested in terms of hostility, envy, jealousy, malice, etc. This observation has also led to the choice of psychological variables such as 'purpose of visit' and 'spiritual orientation' to be studied in relation to subjective well-being.

In the present investigation, the sample under study were Hindu and Muslim males and females from the employed and unemployed (students) groups of the society. The deliberate or purposive choice of the sample viz., solace seekers was made because, in our society, Hindus and Muslims have always been followers of spiritual traditions, practices and rituals. Moreover, it would have been practically too unwieldy to cover all the shrines in India.

People have different purposes and expectations of paying visit to a holy shrine. They are totally based on their experiences. Spiritual behavior or orientation assigns importance to the subjective or phenomenological elements, and assess individuals' thoughts and feelings about their spiritual lives. Therefore, the present investigator felt the need to identify solace seekers' purpose of visit and to assess their spiritual orientation. Spiritual orientation or experience is a very important way of knowing; therefore, the investigator developed Spiritual Orientation Inventory.

**Research Objectives:**

The main objectives of the present study are to:

* identify the purpose of visits to holy shrines.
* develop a scale meant for the assessment of spiritual orientation among the people who pay visit to holy shrines.
* examine the item-wise comparison between Hindu and Muslim subjects' attitude towards the purpose of visit to holy shrines.
* examine the item-wise comparison between male and female subjects' attitude towards the purpose of visit to holy shrines.
* examine the item-wise comparison between employed and unemployed subjects' attitude towards the purpose of visit to holy shrines.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of Hindu and Muslim subjects on Spiritual Orientation Questionnaire.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of male and female subjects on Spiritual Orientation Questionnaire.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of employed and unemployed subjects on Spiritual Orientation Questionnaire.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of Hindu and Muslim subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of male and female subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of employed and unemployed subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of high spiritually 
oriented Hindu and Muslim subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of low spiritually 
oriented Hindu and Muslim subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of high spiritually 
oriented male and female subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of low spiritually 
oriented male and female subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of high spiritually 
oriented employed and unemployed subjects on Subjective Well-
Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of low spiritually 
oriented employed and unemployed subjects on Subjective Well-
Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of ‘high’ and ‘low’ 
spiritually oriented Hindu subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of ‘high’ and ‘low’ 
spiritually oriented Muslim subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of ‘high’ and ‘low’ 
spiritually oriented male subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of ‘high’ and ‘low’ 
spiritually oriented female subjects on Subjective Well-Being.
* examine the difference between the mean scores of ‘high’ and ‘low’ spiritually oriented employed subjects on Subjective Well-Being.

* examine the difference between the mean scores of ‘high’ and ‘low’ spiritually oriented unemployed subjects on Subjective Well-Being.