R.N.I. No.: PUNENG/2014/59759 ISSN- 2348-9936

LIFE SKILLS SOCIAL-RESPONSIBILITY AND DECISION-MAKING AS CORRELATES OF THE SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Harjinder Kaur

Abstract

The present study was undertaken to examine the relationship between Social-Responsibility and Decision-Making and the Spiritual Intelligence of Student Teachers. The sample comprised of 500 Student Teachers studying in education colleges affiliated to Punjabi University Patiala. Data were collected by using Spiritual Intelligence Scale (2008) developed by Dr. Tirath Singh; Social-Responsibility and Decision-Making sub scale of Life Skills Scale developed by Prawit Erawan (2010). The result revealed that there was positive and significant correlation of Social-Responsibility with Divinity, Gratitude, Intuition, Inquisitive behaviour, Inner peace, Self-Awareness, Vision, Virtuous-behaviour and total Spiritual Intelligence of Student Teacher and there was also a positive and significant correlation of Decision making with Divinity, Flexibility, Inner Peace, Gratitude, Intuition, Inquisitive behaviour, Mission, Self-Awareness and total Spiritual Intelligence of Student Teacher. Decision making and Field Independent had low, negative significant correlation. No other significant correlation was found.

Keywords: Spiritual Intelligence, Social-Responsibility, Decision-Making

Spiritual intelligence as one of the new concepts of intelligence includes a type of adaptability and behavior of problem solving which has the highest levels of growth in different domains of cognitive, moral, emotional, interpersonal etc. and helps out the person for coordination with the surrounding phenomena and achieving internal and external integration as well as enforcement of the spiritual intelligence which is equal with obedience of God which improves the social behavior and taking responsibility. In his studies, Smith (2004) has shown that spiritual intelligence is the perquisite of a better adaptation with environment and those who have higher spiritual intelligence have higher tolerance in front of the pressures of life and show higher capability for adaptation with the environment. Spiritual intelligence provides the person with a general perspective regarding life and all the experiences and events and makes him capable of re-formulating and interpreting his experiences and to deepen his recognition and knowledge (Ghobari Bonab et al., 2007). Spiritual intelligence is a framework for recognition and organization of the required skills and capabilities, such that with the use of spirituality the adaptability of the person increases (Amram, 2009). Spiritual intelligence not only predicts spirituality, but also predicts the adaptability of individuals and grants him some capabilities for solving problems and achieving goals. Zohar and Marshall (2000) define spiritual intelligence as the mental aptitude used by human beings to address and find solution to problems of meaning and value in life. It is the intelligence makes whole and gives integrity. Spiritual intelligence includes various methods that can coordinate innate life and spiritual with extend life and it may lead to well being and important of life quality (Vahguan, 2003). Spiritual intelligence as the ultimate human intelligence produces a mechanism for resolving the sort of problems that one may face concerning the meaning and values (Brendan, 2004). By the intelligence, we may find a grasp of our own acts and find which one is invaluable and which track of lie is worth to take (Wolman, 2001). It also grants every individual an overview about life, experiences and events, empowering him or her to reframe and reinterpret his or her experiences and deepen his or her inner knowledge (Abdollahzadeh,

(Research Scholar, Ph.D) Dept. of Education, Punjabi University, Patiala

2011). Livn (2000) holds that spiritual intelligence would emerge once an individual tends to tie spirituality with life and act based on spiritual guidelines. Accordingly, spiritual intelligence both brings the internal and external aspects of life into harmony with one another, bringing happiness (Vaughan, 2002) and facilitates daily affairs, helping one to reach his or her goal (Emmos, 2000).

Spirituality is a form of intelligence that predicts functioning and adaptation, as demonstrated by correlations of spirituality, with improved health or well-being (Emmons, 2000). SI can be defined as the ability to create meaning based on deep understanding of existential questions, and awareness of and the ability to use multiple levels of consciousness in problem solving (Vaughan, 2002). Wolman (2001) defines SI as "the human capacity to address the ultimate questions about the meaning of life and to simultaneously experience the seamless connection between each of us and the world in which we live. Hosseini et al. (2010) reviewed that spirituality can be viewed as a form of intelligence because it predicts functioning and adaptation and offers capabilities that enable people to solve problems and attain goals. Kelley & Miller (2007) found that spirituality and religiousness have generally reported positive correlations between internal characteristics and well-being including life satisfaction. George (2006) showed that Spiritual intelligence has significant influence on the quality of decision-making. Stupar (2013) found that spiritual intelligence determines the decision making process. Spiritual intelligence affect the effectiveness of decisions would allow managers to focus on those which mostly contribute to the functionality of their decisions. Hachey and Sanders (2003) found that a person who has spiritual intelligence tends to have life meaning and goals be appreciative of life's purity and make better decision and handle stress more constructively.

OBJECTIVES

- To study the correlation of Social-Responsibility with dimensions and total Spiritual Intelligence (SI) of Student Teachers.
- To study the correlation of Decision-making with dimensions and total Spiritual Intelligence (SI) of Student Teachers.

METHOD

SAMPLE

Population for present study is Student Teachers studying in all colleges of education affiliated to Punjabi University Patiala. There are total 84 colleges of education affiliated to Punjabi University Patiala. Approximately 14,000 Student Teachers are studying in these colleges, out of these colleges 25 colleges will be selected through stratified random sampling technique. 500 Student Teachers in these colleges were selected through cluster sampling technique.

MEASURES

- Spiritual Intelligence Scale developed by Dr. Tirath Singh (2008).
- Social-Responsibility and Decision-Making sub scale of Life Skills Scale developed by Prawit Erawan (2010)

Results and Discussion

Table 1: Coefficient of correlation between Social-Responsibility, Decision-Making and the dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence (SI) of Student Teachers.

SI(Dimensions)		Social Responsibility	Decision Making
Commitment	Correlation	.152*	.117
	Sig	.022	.099
Divinity	Correlation	.224*	-.045
	Sig	.005	.523
Flexibility	Correlation	.187*	.245*
	Sig	.000	.000
Gratitude	Correlation	.325*	.478*
	Sig	.000	.000

Intuition	Correlation	.294*	.293*
	Sig	.000	.000
Inquisitive	Correlation	.268*	.251*
	Sig	.001	.000
Field Independent	Correlation	-.102	.059
	Sig	.151	.406
Mission	Correlation	.202*	.090
	Sig	.004	.204
Inner Peace	Correlation	.346*	.145
	Sig	.000	.040
Self Awareness	Correlation	.097	.259*
	Sig	.173	.000
Vision	Correlation	.154	.252*
	Sig	.029	.000
Virtuous Behaviour	Correlation	.363*	.183
	Sig	.000	.010
Spiritual Intelligence	Correlation	.363*	.349*
	Sig	.000	.000

*p<0.05

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Commitment and Social-Responsibility is .152 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Commitment and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Commitment and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers, is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was low, positive and significant correlation between Commitment and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 2.34%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Divinity and Social-Responsibility is .224 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Divinity and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Divinity and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers, is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was low, positive and significant correlation between Divinity and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 5.017%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Flexibility and Social-Responsibility is .245 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Flexibility and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Flexibility and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers, is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there is positive correlation between Flexibility and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 6.025%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Flexibility and Decision –making is .245 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Flexibility and Decision –making of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Flexibility and Decision –making of Student Teachers, is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there is positive correlation between Flexibility and Decision –making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 6.025%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Gratitude and Social-Responsibility is .325 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Gratitude and Social-Responsibility of student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Gratitude and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers, is rejected. Therefore it may be

concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Gratitude and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 10.562%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Gratitude and Decision-Making is .478 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Gratitude and Decision-Making of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Gratitude and Decision-Making is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was significant correlation between Gratitude and Decision-Making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 22.848%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Intuition and Social-Responsibility is .294 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Intuition and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Intuition and Social-Responsibility is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Intuition and Social-Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 8.284%

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Intuition and Decision-Making is .293 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Intuition and Decision-Making of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Intuition and Decision-Making is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Intuition and Decision-Making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 8.584%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Inquisitive behaviour and Social Responsibility is .268 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Inquisitive behaviour and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Inquisitive behaviour and Social Responsibility is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Social Responsibility and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 7.182%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Inquisitive behaviour and Decision-Making is .251 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Inquisitive behaviour and Decision-Making of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Inquisitive behaviour and Decision-Making is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Inquisitive behaviour and Decision-Making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 6.300%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Mission and Social Responsibility is .202 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Mission and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Mission and Social Responsibility is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Mission and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 5.971%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Inner-Peace and Social Responsibility is .346 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Inner-Peace and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Inner-Peace and Social Responsibility is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Inner-Peace and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 11.971%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between the Self Awareness and the Decision Making is .259 which is significant at .005 level. It means that the Self Awareness and Decision Making of Student Teachers share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between the Self Awareness and the Decision Making is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between the Self Awareness and the Decision Making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 6.708%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between

Vision and Decision-Making is .252 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Vision and Decision-Making share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Vision and Decision-Making is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Vision and Decision-Making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 6.180%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Virtuous behaviour and Social Responsibility is .363 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Virtuous behaviour and Social Responsibility share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Virtuous behaviour and Social Responsibility is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Virtuous behaviour and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 13.176%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Spiritual Intelligence and Social Responsibility is .363 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Spiritual Intelligence and Social Responsibility share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Spiritual Intelligence and Social Responsibility is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Spiritual Intelligence and Social Responsibility of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 13.176%.

The coefficient of correlation (table-1) between Spiritual Intelligence and Decision-Making is .349 which is significant at .005 level. It means that Spiritual Intelligence and Decision-Making share variance significantly. In the light of this the null hypothesis that there is no significant correlation between Spiritual Intelligence and Decision-Making is rejected. Therefore it may be concluded that there was positive and significant correlation between Spiritual Intelligence and Decision-Making of Student Teachers. The shared variance is 12.180%.

FINDINGS

1. Social Responsibility of student teachers was low, positive and significantly correlated with Commitment, Divinity, Gratitude, Intuition, Inquisitive behavior, Mission, Inner-Peace, Virtuous Behaviour dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence and total Spiritual Intelligence.
2. Social Responsibility Skill of student teachers was low, negative significantly correlated with Field Independent dimension of Spiritual Intelligence.
3. Social Responsibility of student teachers was not significantly correlated with Field Independent, Vision, Self-Awareness and Flexibility the dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence.
4. Decision-Making of student teachers was low, positive and significantly correlated with Flexibility, Gratitude, Inquisitive behavior, Intuition, Self Awareness and Vision dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence and total Spiritual Intelligence.
5. Decision-Making of student teachers was negative correlated with Divinity the dimensions of Spiritual Intelligence.

DISCUSSION

Results on the basis of correlation showed that most of the dimensions Divinity, Gratitude, Empathy, Self Awareness, Vision, Virtuous Behavior and total Spiritual Intelligence were positively related with Social Responsibility. The shared variance varies from (5.017% to 22.84%). It indicates the degree of commonness between these variables or sub variables. There were some studies which indirectly examined the relationship between Spiritual Intelligence and Decision-making. Spiritual intelligence provides the person with a general perspective regarding life and all the experiences and events and makes him capable of re-formulating and interpreting his experiences and to deepen his recognition and knowledge (Ghobari Bonab et al., 2007). Sagharvani (2007) has showed that spiritual intelligence not only predicts spirituality, but also predicts the adaptability level of individuals and grants some capabilities to the person such as solving problems and achieving the goals. Narimani (2014) found that social support as a construct have a direct and highly significant relationship with spiritual intelligence. Fatemeh(2013**)** showed that there is a positive and meaningful relationship between spiritual intelligence and social compatibility of the fourth grade of high school

female students. George (2006) showed that creation of understanding between individuals and management of changes and removing obstacles are among the applications of spiritual intelligence in workplace. The recent studies have shown that spiritual tendencies also have a positive role on taking responsibility and the life quality of adolescence and young individuals. Naderi et al. (2009) have shown that there is a relationship between spiritual intelligence and life satisfaction. Savo Stupar (2013) found that spiritual intelligence determines the decision making process. Spiritual intelligence affect the effectiveness of decisions would allow managers to focus on those which mostly contribute to the functionality of their decisions. Pragadeeswaran (2012) this study also attempts to formulate a theoretical model for yoga in the development of ethics on Executives' decision through spiritual intelligence.

REFERENCES

Amram, Y. (2009). *The contribution of emotional and spiritual intelligences to effective business leadership*. (Electronic version), unpublished doctoral dissertation, Institute of transpersonal psychology.

Emmons, R. A. (2000a). Is Spirituality an Intelligence? Motivation, Cognition and the Psychology of Ultimate Concern. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 10*(1), 3-26.

Emmons A. R. (2000). *Spirituality and Intelligence: Problems and Prospects.*

George, M. (2006). Practical application of spiritual intelligence in the workplace. *Human Resource Management International Digest, A* (5), 3–5.

Ghobari Bonab, Bagher; Salimi, Mohamamd; Saliani, Leila and Noori Moghadam, Sana. (2007). Spiritual intelligence. *Research Quarterly Theological Seminary of New Religious Thinking*, *10,* 125–147.

Hosseini, M., Elias, H., Krauss, S.E., and Aishah, S. (2010). A Review Study on Spiritual Intelligence, Adolescence and Spiritual Intelligence, Factors that may Contribute to Individual Differences in Spiritual Intelligence, and the Related Theories. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, *2*(2), 179-189.

Naderi, F. et al. (2009). *The relationship between spiritual intelligence and emotional intelligence with life satisfaction of elderly.* Islamic Azad University.

Sagharvani, S. (2007). *Spiritual intelligence, the unknown dimension of humans*. 1st edition, Tehran, publications of Ahang Ghalam.

Smith, S. (2004). Exploring the interaction of emotional Intelligence and spirituality. *Traumatology, 10* (4), 231–243.

Vaughan, F. (2002). What is spiritual intelligence? *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 42*(2), 16-33.

Wolman, R.W. (2001). *Thinking with Your Soul: Spiritual Intelligence and Why it Matters*. Harmony Books, New York, 288.

Zohar, D., and Marshall, I., (2000). *SQ: Spiritual Intelligence: the Ultimate Intelligence.* New York, NY, USA: Bloomsbury.

■