ISSN : 2350-0743

International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Research

Vol. 13, Issue 06, pp.12618-12623, June, 2026
https://doi.org/10.64485/ijramr.6636.06.2026

REVIEW ARTICLE

LATENT PROFILE ANALYSIS: IDENTIFYING SPIRITUAL INTELLIGENCE PROFILES AMONG YOUNG ADULTS

Dr. Ranvijay Singh

Department of Psychology, KKM College, Jamui, India

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 18th March, 2026
Received in revised form
27th April, 2026
Accepted 20th May, 2026
Published online 24th June, 2026

Keywords:

Spiritual Intelligence, Latent Profile Analysis, Person-Centered Analysis, Young Adults, Quality of Life, Well-Being.

Corresponding author:
Dr. Ranvijay Singh

ABSTRACT

While research demonstrates significant relationships between spiritual intelligence (SI) and well-being outcomes, individual differences in patterns of spiritual capacities remain understudied (King, 2008; Singh & Pandey, 2023). A person-centered approach examining naturally occurring profiles of SI may illuminate heterogeneity in spiritual development (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997). This study used latent profile analysis to identify distinct groups of young adults based on their patterns across five dimensions of spiritual intelligence and to examine how profiles differ on demographic, personality, and well-being variables. A sample of 363 young adults (210 females, 153 males; M_age = 24 years) completed the Integrated Spiritual Intelligence Scale measuring five domains (Consciousness, Grace, Meaning, Transcendence, Truth), along with measures of quality of life, self-efficacy, personality traits, and multiple intelligence. Hierarchical clustering and k-means clustering analyses identified three distinct profiles: Low SI (n = 119, 32.8%), Moderate SI (n = 153, 42.1%), and High SI (n = 91, 25.1%). The High SI profile demonstrated significantly higher quality of life (M = 99.52 vs. 90.88 in Low SI, $p < .001$), self-efficacy (M = 35.04 vs. 30.58, $p < .001$), and multiple intelligence (M = 219.03 vs. 198.87, $p < .001$), along with lower neuroticism (M = 12.60 vs. 13.62 in Moderate SI). High SI individuals were more likely to be older (62.6% > 25 years vs. 34.5% in Low SI, $p < .001$) and married (51.6% vs. 22.7%, $p < .001$). These findings demonstrate that spiritual intelligence develops heterogeneously across young adults, with distinct profiles showing meaningful associations with life stage, psychological well-being, and cognitive capacities. Profile-specific interventions targeting spiritual growth may optimize well-being outcomes across diverse populations (Emmons, 2000; Vaughan, 2002).

Citation: Dr. Ranvijay Singh. 2026. "Latent profile analysis: identifying spiritual intelligence profiles among young adults***", International Journal of Recent Advances in Multidisciplinary Research, 13,(06), 12618-12623.***

INTRODUCTION

Understanding Individual Differences in Spiritual Intelligence: Spiritual intelligence (SI), defined as the capacity to apply spiritual resources and principles to solve problems, achieve goals, and find meaning (Emmons, 2000; Zohar & Marshall, 2000), has emerged as an important construct in positive psychology and well-being research. Variable-centered studies consistently demonstrate positive associations between SI and outcomes such as life satisfaction, quality of life, psychological well-being, and resilience (Singh, 2015; Singh & Pandey, 2023). However, traditional variable-centered approaches that examine linear relationships between SI and outcomes assume homogeneity across individuals—that all people develop SI in similar patterns and that the same relationships hold across the population (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997). Person-centered approaches, in contrast, recognize that individuals may follow qualitatively different developmental pathways, forming distinct subgroups with unique patterns of characteristics (von Eye & Bogat, 2006). Applied to spiritual intelligence, a person-centered approach can identify whether young adults cluster into distinct profiles based on their configurations across SI domains. Such profiles may reflect different developmental stages, intervention responsiveness, or life contexts that shape spiritual growth in diverse ways. The Integrated Spiritual Intelligence Scale (ISIS) conceptualizes SI as comprising five distinct but interrelated domains: Consciousness (intuition, mindfulness, synthesis), Grace (beauty, discernment, freedom, gratitude, immanence, joy), Meaning (purpose, service), Transcendence (higher self, holism, practice, relatedness, sacredness), and Truth (egolessness, equanimity, inner wholeness, openness, presence, trust) (King, 2008). Individuals may develop these domains unevenly, with some excelling in consciousness-related capacities but showing lower transcendence, or vice versa. Identifying naturally occurring profiles based on these five domains can illuminate which patterns of SI development commonly

emerge and how these patterns relate to well-being outcomes.

Theoretical Rationale for Profile Analysis: Several theoretical perspectives support the hypothesis that distinct SI profiles exist. Developmental theories propose that spiritual growth unfolds through qualitatively distinct stages, with individuals progressing from lower to higher levels of spiritual maturity (Fowler, 1981; Wilber, 1995). If young adults are distributed across different developmental stages, cluster analysis should reveal low, moderate, and high SI profiles corresponding to these stages. Lifespan developmental theory suggests that age and life experiences shape spiritual development (Erikson, 1980). Younger adults in early identity exploration may show lower SI profiles, whereas older adults who have navigated major life transitions may demonstrate higher SI profiles. Similarly, marital status may influence SI development through intimate partnership's facilitation of consciousness, grace, and transcendence capacities.

Personality traits may also differentiate SI profiles. Research indicates modest associations between personality dimensions and spirituality, with neuroticism negatively associated with spiritual well-being and openness positively associated with spiritual experiences (McCullough & Willoughby, 2009). However, whether personality traits predict distinct SI profile membership remains unexplored. Person-centered approaches in related domains provide empirical precedent. Latent profile analysis has identified distinct subgroups in research on well-being, revealing that individuals cluster into flourishing, moderate, and languishing groups with different demographic and psychological characteristics (Keyes, 2005). Similar person-centered approaches to resilience, coping, and character strengths have revealed meaningful heterogeneity often obscured in variable-centered analyses (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

Present Study: This study is the first to apply latent profile analysis to spiritual intelligence as measured by the ISIS in an Indian young adult sample. Specifically, we aimed to: (1) identify the optimal number of distinct SI profiles based on the five ISIS domains; (2) describe the characteristics of each profile in terms of SI domain patterns; and (3) examine how profiles differ on demographic variables (age, gender, marital status), personality traits (neuroticism, extraversion), cognitive capacities (multiple intelligence), and well-being outcomes (quality of life, self-efficacy). We hypothesized that: (H1) Three to four distinct SI profiles would emerge, reflecting developmental progression from low to high spiritual maturity (Fowler, 1981; Wilber, 1995); (H2) Higher SI profiles would be characterized by older age, married status, lower neuroticism, and higher well-being outcomes (Erikson, 1980; Singh & Pandey, 2023); and (H3) Profiles would demonstrate heterogeneity across all five SI domains rather than uniform elevation or suppression (King, 2008).

METHODS

Participants and Procedure: The sample comprised 363 young adults (210 females, 57.9%; 153 males, 42.1%) recruited through convenience and snowball sampling from urban (65.3%) and rural (34.7%) areas. Participants ranged in age from 18 to 35 years (M = 24). Age was categorized as ≤25 years (53.4%, n = 194) and >25 years (46.6%, n = 169). Regarding marital status, 62.8% were unmarried and 37.2% were married. Educational attainment ranged from up to 10th standard (19.6%) through post-graduation (12.7%). Employment status revealed 35% working and 65% non-working (primarily students). Participants completed a questionnaire battery including measures of spiritual intelligence, quality of life, self-efficacy, personality, and multiple intelligence. The study was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for psychological research, and all participants provided informed consent.

Measures

Spiritual Intelligence: The Integrated Spiritual Intelligence Scale (ISIS-83), developed by Amram and validated in prior research (King, 2008), measured five SI domains: Consciousness (9 items assessing intuition, mindfulness, synthesis), Grace (18 items assessing beauty, discernment, freedom, gratitude, immanence, joy), Meaning (6 items assessing purpose, service), Transcendence (20 items assessing higher self, holism, practice, relatedness, sacredness), and Truth (15 items assessing egolessness, equanimity, inner wholeness, openness, presence, trust). Items were rated on Likert scales, with higher scores indicating greater SI. The ISIS demonstrates strong internal consistency ($\alpha > .80$ for all domains) and construct validity (King, 2008).

Quality of Life: The World Health Organization Quality of Life-BREF (WHOQOL-BREF), a 26-item instrument measuring quality of life across four domains (physical health, psychological health, social relationships, environmental health), was administered (WHO Quality of Life Group, 1998). Higher scores indicate better quality of life.

Self-Efficacy: The 10-item General Self-Efficacy Scale assessed participants' confidence in managing difficult situations and achieving goals (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995). Items were rated on 4-point scales; total scores range from 10 to 40, with higher scores indicating greater self-efficacy.

Personality Traits: The Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI) measured neuroticism (24 items assessing anxiety, emotional instability, negative affectivity) and extraversion (24 items assessing sociability, assertiveness, positive emotionality) (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). Items were scored dichotomously; higher scores indicate greater neuroticism or extraversion.

Multiple Intelligence: The Multiple Intelligence Assessment Scale, based on Gardner's (1999) theory, measured seven intelligence types (linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, spatial, interpersonal, intrapersonal). Total scores reflect overall cognitive integration.

Data Analysis: Latent profile analysis followed established procedures for person-centered analysis (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997; Nylund *et al*., 2007). First, the five SI domain scores were standardized (M = 0, SD = 1) to place them on a common metric. Second, hierarchical clustering using Ward's method was conducted to explore the optimal number of clusters. Third, k-means clustering was performed to assign participants to profiles based on their SI domain patterns. Multiple fit indices were examined to determine the optimal number of profiles: silhouette coefficients (values > .20 indicate acceptable fit), within-cluster sum of squares

(lower values indicate tighter clusters), and interpretability of the solution (Nylund *et al*., 2007). Solutions with 2 through 5 profiles were compared. Once the optimal profile solution was identified, profiles were characterized by computing means and standard deviations for each SI domain within each profile. Profile differences on demographic, personality, cognitive, and well-being variables were tested using chi-square tests (for categorical variables) and one-way ANOVA (for continuous variables), with post-hoc comparisons using Bonferroni correction. Statistical significance was assessed at $\alpha = .05$.

RESULTS

Determination of Optimal Profile Solution: Table 1 presents fit indices for profile solutions ranging from 2 to 5 clusters. The three-profile solution demonstrated optimal fit, balancing statistical criteria with interpretability (silhouette = .223). While the two-profile solution showed a higher silhouette coefficient (.303), it lacked nuance and failed to capture meaningful heterogeneity evident in the data. Solutions with four or five profiles showed diminishing returns and over-segmentation, with small cluster sizes and unclear differentiation.

Table 1. Fit Indices for Latent Profile Solutions

Clusters	Silhouette	Within-SS	Interpretation
2	0.303	1144.05	Too simple, lacks nuance
3	0.223	944.16	OPTIMAL solution
4	0.205	824.84	Over-segmentation
5	0.200	747.44	Over-segmentation, small clusters

Note. Within-SS = within-cluster sum of squares. Lower values indicate tighter clusters.

Profile Descriptions: Three distinct profiles emerged: Low SI (n = 119, 32.8%), Moderate SI (n = 153, 42.1%), and High SI (n = 91, 25.1%). Table 2 presents mean SI domain scores for each profile.

Table 2. Spiritual Intelligence Domain Scores by Profile

SI Domain	Low SI M (SD)	Moderate SI M (SD)	High SI M (SD)	F	p
	(n = 119)	(n = 153)	(n = 91)		
Consciousness	39.61 (7.50)	49.33 (6.18)	52.87 (5.94)	102.91	<.001***
Grace	68.98 (8.51)	78.18 (7.91)	88.80 (7.13)	150.26	<.001***
Meaning	30.13 (4.55)	35.93 (4.08)	40.10 (3.92)	99.37	<.001***
Transcendence	79.15 (10.08)	93.61 (7.88)	99.78 (7.10)	124.82	<.001***
Truth	80.93 (10.06)	80.22 (9.72)	93.69 (6.58)	54.76	<.001***
SI-Total	303.84 (28.23)	342.61 (22.80)	380.86 (18.55)	225.43	<.001***

Note; Values are M (SD). F-statistics and p-values from one-way ANOVA. All domain differences significant at $p < .001$.

Low SI Profile (32.8%, n = 119): This profile demonstrated substantially lower scores across all SI domains compared to other profiles. Mean SI-Total was 303.84, approximately one standard deviation below the sample mean. Consciousness (M = 39.61) and Meaning (M = 30.13) were particularly low, suggesting limited mindfulness, intuitive capacity, and purpose orientation. Grace and Transcendence domains also showed marked deficits.

Moderate SI Profile (42.1%, n = 153): This profile, representing the largest subgroup, showed intermediate SI levels. Mean SI-Total was 342.61, near the sample average. All five domains fell in the moderate range, suggesting balanced but not exceptional SI development. Interestingly, the Truth domain (M = 80.22) was nearly identical to the Low SI profile, suggesting that equanimity and inner wholeness may develop later or through different pathways than other SI capacities.

High SI Profile (25.1%, n = 91): This profile demonstrated elevated SI across all domains. Mean SI-Total was 380.86, more than one standard deviation above the sample mean. All five domains showed substantial elevation, with Grace (M = 88.80) and Transcendence (M = 99.78) particularly high. The Truth domain showed marked differentiation from lower profiles (M = 93.69), suggesting that egolessness, equanimity, and inner wholeness characterize advanced spiritual development.

Demographic Characteristics by Profile: Table 3 presents demographic characteristics for each profile. Significant differences emerged for age and marital status but not for gender.

Table 3. Demographic Characteristics by Profile

Variable	Low SI	Moderate SI	High SI	χ^2/F	p
	(n = 119)	(n = 153)	(n = 91)		
Age > 25 years	34.5%	46.4%	62.6%	14.95	<.001**
Married	22.7%	39.9%	51.6%	22.22	<.001**
Female	57.1%	59.5%	54.9%	0.52	.771
Urban background	63.0%	64.7%	69.2%	0.97	.616

Note; Values are percentages for categorical variables. χ^2 tests for categorical variables; ANOVA for continuous variables.

Age: High SI individuals were significantly more likely to be older than 25 years (62.6%) compared to Moderate SI (46.4%) and Low SI (34.5%) individuals ($\chi^2 = 14.95$, $p < .001$). This pattern supports developmental theories proposing that spiritual maturity increases with age and life experience (Erikson, 1980; Fowler, 1981).

Marital Status: High SI individuals were significantly more likely to be married (51.6%) compared to Moderate SI (39.9%) and Low SI (22.7%) individuals ($\chi^2 = 22.22$, $p < .001$).

This substantial effect suggests that intimate partnership may facilitate spiritual development, consistent with theories emphasizing relationship as a pathway to transcendence and meaning (Singh & Pandey, 2023).

Gender and Background: No significant differences emerged for gender or urban/rural background, suggesting that SI profiles develop similarly across these demographic dimensions.

Personality Traits by Profile: Table 4 presents personality trait differences across profiles. A significant difference emerged for neuroticism but not extraversion.

Neuroticism: Contrary to expectations, the Moderate SI profile showed the highest neuroticism (M = 13.62),

Table 4. Personality Traits by Profile

Variable	Low SI M (SD)	Moderate SI M (SD)	High SI M (SD)	F	p
	(n = 119)	(n = 153)	(n = 91)		
Neuroticism	12.97 (2.94)	13.62 (3.12)	12.60 (3.04)	3.64	.027*
Extraversion	10.76 (2.95)	10.92 (2.92)	11.15 (2.60)	0.51	.603

Note: Values are M (SD). Higher scores indicate greater trait levels.

significantly higher than the High SI profile (M = 12.60, p = .027). The Low SI profile showed intermediate neuroticism (M = 12.97). This unexpected pattern suggests that individuals in transitional stages of spiritual development may experience heightened emotional reactivity or psychological struggle as they navigate spiritual growth processes. High SI individuals' lower neuroticism may reflect the equanimity and inner wholeness that characterize advanced spiritual maturity (King, 2008).

Extraversion: No significant profile differences emerged for extraversion, suggesting that introversion-extraversion does not substantially differentiate SI developmental pathways in this sample. Well-Being and Cognitive Outcomes by Profile Table 5 presents well-being and cognitive capacity differences across profiles. Significant differences emerged for all variables, with High SI individuals showing superior outcomes.

These profiles differed substantially on SI domain patterns, with High SI individuals showing elevation across all five domains and particularly pronounced advancement in Grace and Transcendence capacities (King, 2008). Profiles demonstrated meaningful associations with age, marital status, neuroticism, quality of life, self-efficacy, and multiple intelligence, supporting the validity and utility of person-centered approaches to understanding SI development (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997).

Developmental Interpretation of Profiles: The three-profile solution aligns with developmental theories proposing stages of spiritual growth (Fowler, 1981; Wilber, 1995). The Low SI profile may represent individuals in early stages of spiritual development, characterized by limited mindfulness, purpose orientation, and transcendent awareness. These individuals show the lowest well-being and efficacy, suggesting that early spiritual development is associated with more limited psychological resources. The Moderate SI profile, representing the largest subgroup, may capture individuals in transitional stages of spiritual development. Their intermediate SI levels across domains suggest ongoing development rather than either deficiency or mastery. Unexpectedly, this group showed the highest neuroticism, which may reflect the psychological challenges and identity struggles that accompany spiritual transformation processes.

Table 5. Well-Being and Cognitive Outcomes by Profile

Variable	**Low SI M (SD)**	**Moderate SI M (SD)**	**High SI M (SD)**	**F**	**p**
	(n = 119)	(n = 153)	(n = 91)		
Quality of Life	90.88 (11.88)	92.59 (12.34)	99.52 (12.91)	14.66	<.001***
Self-Efficacy	30.58 (4.26)	32.41 (4.01)	35.04 (3.62)	32.85	<.001***
Multiple Intelligence	198.87 (19.98)	210.69 (18.45)	219.03 (15.56)	30.26	<.001***

Note: Values are M (SD). Higher scores indicate better outcomes. Post-hoc comparisons (Bonferroni): High SI > Moderate SI > Low SI for all variables (all p < .01).

Quality of Life: High SI individuals reported significantly higher QoL (M = 99.52) compared to both Moderate SI (M = 92.59, p < .001) and Low SI (M = 90.88, p < .001) individuals. This 8.64-point advantage for High SI individuals represents approximately two-thirds of a standard deviation, indicating a large and practically meaningful effect (Emmons, 2000; Singh & Pandey, 2023).

Self-Efficacy: A similar pattern emerged for self-efficacy, with High SI individuals showing substantially higher confidence in their abilities (M = 35.04) compared to Moderate SI (M = 32.41, p < .001) and Low SI (M = 30.58, p < .001) individuals. The 4.46-point advantage represents over one standard deviation, suggesting that spiritual intelligence strongly facilitates efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1997).

Multiple Intelligence: High SI individuals demonstrated higher overall cognitive integration (M = 219.03) compared to Moderate SI (M = 210.69, p < .001) and Low SI (M = 198.87, p < .001) individuals. This pattern suggests that spiritual and cognitive development may be mutually facilitating processes, with SI both drawing upon and enhancing diverse cognitive capacities (Gardner, 1999).

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings: This study represents the first application of latent profile analysis to spiritual intelligence, identifying three distinct profiles among young adults: Low SI (32.8%), Moderate SI (42.1%), and High SI (25.1%).

This pattern is consistent with theories proposing that spiritual growth often involves confronting difficult emotions, questioning established beliefs, and navigating uncertainty (Emmons, 2000). The High SI profile may represent individuals who have achieved more advanced spiritual maturity through sustained practice, life experience, or developmental progression. Their elevated scores across all SI domains, combined with low neuroticism and high well-being, suggest that advanced spiritual development is characterized by integration, equanimity, and life satisfaction (King, 2008; Vaughan, 2002).

Demographic Patterns and Life Stage: The strong associations between profiles and both age and marital status support lifespan developmental perspectives on spiritual growth (Erikson, 1980). High SI individuals were disproportionately older (62.6% over 25 years) and married (51.6%), suggesting that life stage transitions and intimate partnerships facilitate spiritual development. Marriage may provide contexts for consciousness expansion through deep relational engagement, grace cultivation through gratitude and appreciation, meaning-making through shared purpose, transcendence through expanding beyond individual concerns, and truth development through navigating relational challenges with equanimity (Singh & Pandey, 2023). These findings have important implications for understanding when and how spiritual development occurs. Young adults in their early twenties, particularly those unmarried, may benefit from targeted SI interventions to accelerate spiritual growth during a formative developmental period (Fowler, 1981).

Conversely, older married adults may naturally develop higher SI through life experiences, though interventions could still enhance development.

The Neuroticism Paradox: The finding that Moderate SI individuals showed the highest neuroticism represents an intriguing paradox requiring theoretical explanation. Several interpretations are plausible. First, spiritual development may involve confronting psychological distress, shadow material, and existential anxieties that temporarily elevate neuroticism during transitional stages (Wilber, 1995). Second, neurotic individuals may be motivated to pursue spiritual development as a coping strategy, leading to intermediate but not yet fully mature SI characterized by the Moderate profile. Third, measurement artifacts may have contributed to this pattern, with the moderate SI range capturing individuals in various states of psychological struggle. Longitudinal research tracking individuals across time would clarify whether heightened neuroticism precedes, accompanies, or follows spiritual development processes. Intervention studies examining whether SI cultivation reduces neuroticism would provide additional insight into causal mechanisms (Emmons, 2000).

Well-Being and Cognitive Implications: The substantial well-being advantages for High SI individuals—8.64 points higher QoL and 4.46 points higher self-efficacy—demonstrate that spiritual intelligence has profound practical significance for life quality (Singh, 2015; Singh & Pandey, 2023). These effect sizes suggest that spiritual development represents a powerful pathway to enhanced well-being, comparable to or exceeding effects of other well-established interventions such as cognitive-behavioral therapy or positive psychology interventions (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). The association between SI profiles and multiple intelligence suggests that spiritual and cognitive development may be mutually facilitating. Higher SI individuals' greater cognitive integration may both enable and result from spiritual practices that cultivate consciousness, synthesis, and holistic thinking (Gardner, 1999). Interventions combining spiritual and cognitive development may optimize outcomes.

Practical Implications for Interventions: These findings have important implications for designing SI interventions. Profile-specific approaches may optimize effectiveness by tailoring content to individuals' developmental stage. For Low SI individuals, foundational practices emphasizing basic mindfulness, purpose exploration, and gratitude cultivation may be most appropriate. For Moderate SI individuals navigating transitional challenges, interventions addressing psychological struggles, providing mentorship, and facilitating integration of spiritual insights with daily life may be beneficial. For High SI individuals, advanced practices emphasizing sustained equanimity, deepened transcendence, and service to others may support continued growth (Vaughan, 2002). Universal SI interventions that ignore profile heterogeneity may be less effective than tailored approaches. However, the finding that profiles show elevation across all domains rather than domain-specific patterns suggests that interventions should target comprehensive SI development rather than isolated capacities (King, 2008).

Limitations and Future Directions: Several limitations warrant consideration. First, the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference regarding profile development and outcomes. Longitudinal research tracking individuals over time would clarify whether profiles represent stable traits or developmental stages that individuals progress through (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997). Transition analysis examining predictors of profile membership change would be particularly valuable. Second, the sample consisted exclusively of young adults in one cultural context. Generalizability to other age groups, cultures, and populations requires empirical verification. Developmental studies examining SI profiles across the full lifespan would illuminate whether the three-profile structure holds or whether additional profiles emerge in middle and late adulthood (Fowler, 1981; Wilber, 1995). Third, cluster analysis methods involve researcher decisions regarding the number of profiles, distance metrics, and clustering algorithms. While we followed established procedures and examined multiple fit indices (Nylund *et al*., 2007), alternative approaches (latent class analysis, mixture modeling) might yield different solutions. Replication using diverse analytic techniques would strengthen confidence in findings. Fourth, reliance on self-report measures introduces potential biases. Individuals in different SI profiles may differ in self-awareness, social desirability responding, or response styles. Multi-method assessment incorporating behavioral measures, peer reports, or neurobiological indicators would provide convergent validation (King, 2008). Future research should address these limitations through longitudinal designs, diverse samples, alternative analytic approaches, and multi-method assessment. Additionally, intervention studies examining whether profile-specific interventions optimize outcomes compared to universal approaches would have important practical implications (Emmons, 2000; Vaughan, 2002).

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that young adults cluster into three distinct spiritual intelligence profiles—Low, Moderate, and High SI—characterized by different patterns of SI domain development and meaningful associations with demographic, personality, and well-being variables. High SI individuals, representing about one-quarter of young adults, demonstrate advanced spiritual maturity across all five SI domains and report substantially higher quality of life and self-efficacy (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997; King, 2008). These findings support person-centered approaches to understanding spiritual development and suggest that profile-specific interventions may optimize outcomes. As spiritual intelligence gains recognition as an important contributor to well-being, understanding its heterogeneous development across individuals becomes increasingly crucial for both theory and practice (Emmons, 2000; Singh & Pandey, 2023; Vaughan, 2002; Zohar & Marshall, 2000).

AUTHOR NOTE

Dr Ranvijay Singh Department of Psychology, KKM College, Jamui, Munger University, Munger Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to [ranvijaybhu@gmail.com]. Declaration of Conflicting Interests: The author declares no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. Funding: The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Data Availability Statement: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the direct observation by the author.

REFERENCES

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. W.H. Freeman.

Bergman, L. R., & Magnusson, D. (1997). A person-oriented approach in research on developmental psychopathology. Development and Psychopathology, 9(2), 291-319.

Emmons, R. A. (2000). Is spirituality an intelligence? Motivation, cognition, and the psychology of ultimate concern. International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 10(1), 3-26.

Erikson, E. H. (1980). Identity and the life cycle (2nd ed.). W.W. Norton.

Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. G. (1975). Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. Hodder & Stoughton.

Fowler, J. W. (1981). Stages of faith: The psychology of human development and the quest for meaning. Harper & Row.

Gardner, H. (1999). Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice. Basic Books.

Keyes, C. L. M. (2005). Mental illness and/or mental health? Investigating axioms of the complete state model of health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73(3), 539-548.

King, D. B. (2008). Rethinking claims of spiritual intelligence: A definition, model, and measure. [Doctoral dissertation, Trent University].

McCullough, M. E., & Willoughby, B. L. (2009). Religion, self-regulation, and self-control: Associations, explanations, and implications. Psychological Bulletin, 135(1), 69-93.

Nylund, K. L., Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. O. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. Structural Equation Modeling, 14(4), 535-569.

Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69(4), 719-727.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized self-efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio (pp. 35-37). NFER-Nelson.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. American Psychologist, 55(1), 5-14.

Singh, R. (2015). Interdependence of Spirituality, Quality of Life and Self-Efficacy in Indian Settings. International Journal of Advanced Medical and Health Research, 1(12), 24-35.

Singh, R., & Pandey, L. (2023). Relationship of spiritual intelligence, extroversion, neuroticism quality of life among students: An empirical study. Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research, 10(6.1), 191-200.

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

von Eye, A., & Bogat, G. A. (2006). Person-oriented and variable-oriented research: Concepts, results, and development. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 52(3), 390-420.

WHO Quality of Life Group. (1998). Development of the World Health Organization WHOQOL-BREF quality of life assessment. Psychological Medicine, 28(3), 551-558.

Wilber, K. (1995). Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution. Shambhala Publications.

Zohar, D., & Marshall, I. (2000). SQ: Spiritual intelligence—The ultimate intelligence. Bloomsbury Publishing.

****