

государственной и международной политики на современном этапе. Образование в течение жизни выделяется как морально-этическая, политическая и социальная ценность цивилизованного мира.

Ключевые слова: стратегия образования, глобальные тенденции, национальные тенденции, модель устойчивого развития, качественное образование, наращивание человеческого капитала, философия образования взрослых, образование в течение жизни, образование для всех.

Filipchuk Heorhiy Heorhiyovych – Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Full Member of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine, (Kyiv, Ukraine). E-mail: georg.filipchuk@gmail.com

Філіпчук Георгій Георгійович – доктор педагогічних наук, професор, дійсний член НАПН України (м. Київ, Україна). E-mail: georg.filipchuk@gmail.com

UDC 130.122

FROM THE BEGINNING TO SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING

John W. Fisher

This paper outlines potential interactions of God with humanity from the dawn of time through to attaining spiritual well-being. It briefly mentions alternative theories of origin, which connect to questions of ultimate reality, origin of human beings and our spiritual well-being.

The nature of spirit and its relationship with soul and mind is then canvassed, followed by an account of historical developments in "spirituality". The author's Four Domains Model posits that Spiritual Health/Well-Being is reflected in the quality of relationships that each person has in up to four areas, namely with themselves, with others, with nature and/or with a Transcendent Other (commonly referred to as God). A critique of available measures of spirituality and spiritual well-being reveals a decline in the number of instruments assessing human relationships with God from earlier to more recent times.

In contrast to this current trend of researchers selecting more humanistic emphases in spirituality/well-being in their research instruments, evidence is provided from recent findings that show that relating with God is the most important of the four sets of relationships for spiritual well-being. Further evidence is provided

that God is the most influential Transcendent to enhance people's relationships with themselves and others. Although researchers are free to choose the nature of questions raised in their projects, findings presented here clearly show that any research that cuts God out of the equation is excising the foundation of spirituality/well-being.

Keywords: Spirit, soul, mind, human relationships with God, Transcendent, spirituality, well-being.

1. In the Beginning

"In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth" are the opening words of the most published book, The Bible (Genesis 1:1). These words form the foundation of a Judaeo-Christian worldview that places God as the First Cause of everything we know and experience. This belief is said to derive from supernatural revelation from God to humankind. The beginning of the universe is connected to questions of ultimate reality. Cosmologists cannot agree on the origin of the universe (M. Chown). [10] However, according to Lennox, science has shown that the hypothesis of Creation is testable. The universe is mathematically extremely well organised, which provides an overwhelming indication of its "design" by a "mind that was responsible for both the universe and for our minds" (J. Lennox). [54, 207] J. Lennox claims, "what lies behind the universe is much more than a rational principle; it is God, the Creator, Himself", [54] not just an abstraction or impersonal force. This chapter investigates the importance of relating with God (or other Transcendents) for spiritual well-being.

Belief in God is at one end of a spectrum of worldviews held by people. In fact it was a, or the, dominant worldview in Western civilisation until the 1800s. Slightly before this time, Rene Descartes (in 1637) penned the phrase, "*Cogito ergo sum*" (I think, therefore I am), [16] which was built on by Rationalists, who hold reason, not revelation, as the chief source and test of knowledge. A rival of Rationalism is Empiricism, which holds that knowledge comes from, and must be tested by, sense experience. Many atheists believe that empirical science is the true path to understanding. The reason for saying many, rather than all, is that variations exist among people who claim each worldview. (For a useful exposition of many worldviews, see J. Sire [82]). The very idea of "empiricism" itself was not derived from scientific experimentation, so, it can therefore be considered a faith statement – considering something that is not visible as true. Ideas are not visible. Empiricism is an idea; therefore it requires faith to believe, but just not in God (N. Geisler & F. Turek). [27]

The answer to the existential question, “Where did we come from?” has a major influence on one’s quality of life and spiritual well-being. Believing in God and His Creation requires faith, as does belief in whatever permutation of the Big Bang or any other Theory that presumably explains how matter and energy arose from nothing to constitute our physical universe in four dimensions of space-time. Although Genesis starts, “In the beginning,” this does not mean that nothing existed before Creation. Jesus claimed that God the Father loved Him before the foundation of the world (John 17:24), and that they shared glory before the world came into existence (John 17:5) (F. Schaeffer). [74, 17] Two extreme worldviews posit “man” [sic] being made in the image of God through Creation (Genesis 1:27), as opposed to inanimate matter yielding elemental life forms which subsequently evolved into human beings, without apparent causation. Both views are statements of faith. Neither of these worldviews on the origin of “man” can be validated scientifically. As valuable as science is, it is a limited way of knowing, or attempting to explain, what happened, how and possibly where and when. It does not recognise revelation as a valid source of knowledge. But, science can never answer the question, “Why?” This question, however, is critically important for spiritual well-being because it relates to meaning and purpose in life. According to theistic worldviews, God made man for a purpose – to commune with Him. Conversely, no matter how one tries to anthropomorphise it, Mother Nature, Father Time and Lady Luck could not have made life, nor given it purpose.

2. Nature of Spirit

Some Empiricists claim that spirit does not exist because it cannot be gauged/measured directly by human senses or the machines we have made. The same could be said of beauty and love, even mind, conscience and intelligence, but Empiricists most likely believe in them, and deal with these matters as if they are real. D. Moberg clearly attests, just because many scientists’ opinions overstep the limitations of science by rejecting spirituality and the Bible as possible aspects of reality, is no reason for denying them. The fact of the existence of a spiritual dimension or of an intelligent Creator is outside the sphere of scientific examination per se. What is obvious in everyday experience need not be overlooked just because it cannot be measured. [62, 106]

The first obvious recorded mention of “spirit” in the Bible was attributed to Moses writing some time before 1100 BC (H. Morris). [65] Moses may have recorded the stories handed down orally by generations of Jews, or some even suggest there could have been a written record made by

Adam, following his conversations with his Creator in the Garden of Eden. But, evidence for this is disputed. [46] Whatever the source, Moses was inspired by God to write the book of Genesis, as all scripture is inspired by God (2 Timothy 3:16). Genesis 2:7 states, “The Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath or spirit of life, and man became a living being”.

According to D. Moberg, [62] the Hebrew word *ruah*, referred to 378 times in the Old Testament, and the Greek word *pneuma*, referenced 146 times in the New Testament, describe human beings as *spirit*. The word “breath” is derived from *spiritus*, Latin for “that which gives life or vitality”. [62] It is interesting to note that scriptural references posit this expression (life is in the breath) only applying to humans and not the other organisms that appeared on Earth before them. Human spirit is eternal, like angelic and demonic spirits, as well as God Himself, whereas the spirit of animals ceases to exist when animals die (according to Ecclesiastes 3:21) (H. Morris). [65, 74] This statement challenges re-incarnation into or from lower forms of life associated with some worldviews that are distinct from the Judaeo-Christian. With spirit, humans were given moral consciousness, capacity for abstract thinking, appreciation of beauty and emotions, and the capacity to worship and love God. [65]

Alternative views on nature of spirit include: New Physics, which is spawning some fascinating ideas, such as “*The Spiritual Genome*” in which it is postulated, “the DNA of all living creatures (including plants) is connected in the quantum substratum, and that it is this networked intelligence which constitutes the essential oneness from which springs all the diversity of life we see around us” (B. Bartholomew). [3] Simply put, this DNA-based supercomputer is supposedly “the ultimate source of life”. [3] B. Bartholomew, who is heavily influenced by Hinduism, at least asks the reader to “take a leap of faith”, regarding his proposition. In similar vein, many ideas and philosophies, some having a form of god, are espoused in relation to “spiritual evolution”, without offering any alternative source of spirit, apart from God. [92]

3. Spirit, Soul and Mind

Many believe humans are spirit, have a soul, and live in a body (e.g., K. Hagin [32], undated; D. Moberg [63]). The supposed tri-partite nature of man is illustrated in the Bible quotation, “And the God of peace Himself sanctify you completely, and your whole [being]; the spirit and the soul and the body be kept blameless in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Thess. 5:23). However, spirit and soul are often conflated, with both being

claimed as the essence of life, or the immaterial part of “man”, which survives death (in Oxford and Webster Dictionaries). For example, according to D. Moberg, “Spirit and its overlapping concept of soul refer primarily to the whole person...that can be interpreted as consisting of body, mind, and spirit or soul”. [63] Some even conflate spirit with mind (D. Helminiak [38]; A. Newberg et al.; K. Seybold [79]). It appears that the spirit can impact the mind, or at least the brain, as “different aspects of spirituality may be mapped in different neural regions” (C. Urgesi et al.). [89] S. Pandya’s review of brain, mind and soul concludes, “The mind and soul remain fascinating enigmas. Whilst we have made some progress in our understanding of these two hazy constituents of life, much is yet poorly understood”. [69] Going one step further, “A growing body of empirical evidence suggests that human consciousness...is not confined to specific points in space, such as brains and bodies [and that] nonlocal consciousness and spirituality are seen as a complementary dyad” (L. Dossey). [15]

Although it is difficult for some people to distinguish between spirit and soul, one Christian model proposes that soul (the seat of human personality) comprises conscious mind (thinking and reasoning), unconscious mind (will and emotions) together with beliefs, attitudes, feelings and memories (K. Copeland). [12] Hebrews 4:12 states that spirit and soul can be separated or divided as they are separate entities (Word of God ...dividing...soul and spirit) (K. Hagin). [32] Although these scriptures identify separate aspects of our human being we are integrated wholes, made complete in Christ (Colossians 2:10) from a Christian perspective.

What does the spirit influence first – the *heart* (spirit) or the head (mind)? J. Berryman [5] provided a thought-provoking view to help answer this question: When people have a tangible spiritual experience, words often fail them, as they just sense “the larger presence to our being and knowing” (e.g., John Wesley’s heart strangely warmed (D. Graves) [31] which “causes us to draw in our breath” (J. Berryman). [5] The experience causes a silent inspiration, followed by the response, a “sigh of ecstasy (“AHH!”)...which helps us uncover the deepest integration of self”. [5, 531] Following this sigh, “a sense of discovery (“AHA!”) introduces us to the possibility of reflection on the experience”. [5] This could lead to a narrative or “master story”. The accompanying sense of knowing, which comes from inspiration, is etched at the very core (French “*coeur*”), or heart of our being. Such a connection with God can lead to “cosmic laughter” (“HAHA!”) which “marks awareness of a paradox, which stimulates the imagination to recover what is no longer present to it in experience”. [5] J. Berryman’s narrative

posits mental understanding as the rear guard, or interpreter of the event, rather than the instigator. As such, the language used to describe outcomes of spiritual, with subsequent mental, experiences should be moderated in recognition that human beings are integrated wholes, not compartmentalised or fragmented parts. Mind is the last place to recognise and interpret the impact of spirit on humans. As we are holistic beings, spirit and soul (thus mind) interact with each other and the body. Eastern philosophies take this holistic notion of human beings further by considering relationship with their environment (C. Chan et al.). [8]

There appears to be a heightening in the battle for hearts (spirits) and minds of the populace, between two extremes. The battle lines are not clearly divided by religion and science. Rather, it is discussion of contrasting views of theism and atheism (naturalism), which has been the subject of many books over the last two centuries (more recently by R. Dawkins [13]; A. McGrath [57]; S. Hawking & L. Mlodinow [35]; J. Lennox [55]). Theism goes beyond science to explain how perceived order is possible in the universe. Theism states that the universe is not self-generating, causing its own effect (J. Lennox) [54, 63–4]; it was made by a pre-existent, personal God, not some impersonal force that condensed itself into matter. Naturalists have their theories and laws, which by themselves cannot bring anything into existence. People believe what they want to believe, and this has consequences for their actions (R. York). [96] Many people try to sit on the fence between theism and atheism, but that position becomes rather untenable. The New Atheists, such as R. Dawkins and C. Hitchens, not only want to deny that God exists, they want to eradicate any mention of, or allegiance to, Him (J. Lennox). [54] So, they should really be called anti-theists.

One psychologist proposes that transcendence, going beyond the rational, is an ego experience rather than a metaphysical statement (M. Mirman). [60] Countering this position, B. Hanfstingl [33] argues that ego-transcendence is a kind of spiritual experience that contrasts with mystical experience, which itself involves spiritual transcendence and perception of divinity. Others are more subtly attempting to “bracket out God” from psychology of spirituality by seeking removal of “God and other non-falsifiable meta-physical entities or constructs from “truly scientific study” (D. Helminiak). [39] But, science is not the arbiter of truth. However, psychologists find ways of studying intelligence and personality, which are reflections of underlying states of humanity, not directly observable entities. In like manner, spirituality can be studied by its outcomes or effects on

people. Some researchers are investigating a theistic approach to psychology to complement the more traditional secular approaches normally undertaken, in recognition that “theists make up the vast majority of psychology’s clientele”, at least in the USA (B. Slife et al.). [83] In summary, then, science explains to a limited extent. To think not constitutes “scientism” or absolute *faith* in science. Science cannot explain why anything happens, but, God explains why science explains. “God is not an alternative to science as an explanation....He is the ground of all explanation ... whether scientific, or not” (J. Lennox). [54, 48]

New Physics seems to be presenting a challenge to God, although not front-on. S. Shelton proposes, “Quantum Skills are premised on the assumption that the quantum realm of energy is primary or causal and the material world is secondary”. [80, 165] These quantum skills supposedly provide humans with the ability to see intentionally, to think paradoxically, to feel vitally alive, to know intuitively, to act responsibly, to trust life’s processes, and to be in relationship. However, no source of these skills is stated. Further detail in S. Shelton’s paper concurs with recent thoughts by positive psychologist, M. Seligman, who effectively suggested that we make ourselves like god by use of our minds. [78] Some Transhumanists have a similar goal of transforming humans, but by use of technology and genetic manipulation, to attain immortality. [94] However, Christians already have the promise of immortality. John 3:16 (NIV) states, “For God so loved the world that He gave His one and only Son, that whoever believes in Him, shall not perish but have *eternal life*” [italics added for emphasis]. The battle for hearts and heads continues.

4. Spirituality

Considerable debate about the nature of spirituality has taken place for centuries. However, writers have had difficulty defining the concept (R. Goodloe & P. Arreola [28]; D. Diaz [14]; B. Seaward [77]; D. Moberg [62]). A conciliatory approach claims that agnostics and atheists can express a form of spirituality without God (W. Mohr). [64] In contrast to this and the above views of New Physics, positive psychology and Transhumanism, K. Waaijman contends, “spirituality appears as a complex whole, constructed out of elements which are complementarily interrelated. Spirituality is a relational process which constitutes an original whole in which God and man [who was made by God in His image] are reciprocally related”. [90, 14] However, not all people agree with K. Waaijman that God is essentially involved in spirituality. Views have changed over time.

According to W. Principe, [71] historically speaking, spirituality was based on the Latin concept of “*spiritualitas*,” which was not found in literature earlier than the fifth Century (C5th). Early comments on the Apostle Paul’s writings posit the spiritual nature of a person being ordered, led and influenced by the Spirit of God. For Paul, being spiritual meant following the ways of Christ rather than the ways of man. Paul’s ideas on spirituality held sway within Christian belief until around C12th, when there was a change in its meaning from a moral sense to an entitative-psychological sense, in which people began to despise the body. By C17th the word *spiritualité* (French) had been taken over by the Catholic Church and used as ecclesiastical property in the religious sense of a “devout life”, in contrast to physical property of the monarch, which was regarded as *temporalitas* (of this world, secular). In France, during the latter C18th and C19th, as the word “spirituality” was used pejoratively, it fell into disuse until the early C20th, when it became frequently used once again, being linked to the soul in opposition to the body, in a bi-partite view of man. In English, a religious or devotional sense of “spirituality” continued until the early C20th, when the term was appropriated by Hinduism to illustrate the superiority of Indian religion over Western “materialism”. Thus, from a Western perspective, the original usage of the term spirituality was steeped in religion.

With increasing secularisation of the West, significant changes since the 1960s have seen “spirituality acquire more distinct meanings [being seen as] separate from religion” (R. Turner et al.). [88] With attendant “increasing individualism in American religious culture...new spiritual practices are evolving” (B. Zinnbauer et al.). [97] A diversity of different forms of spirituality that are arising is not often encountered in an explicitly religious domain, but rather in a secular context (P. Heelas & L. Woodhead). [37]

A variety of opinion currently prevails on the nature of any relationship between spirituality and religion. Some people equate “spirituality” with “religious activity”, or use these words interchangeably (R. Piedmont [70]; R. Gorsuch & S. Walker), [29] whereas others believe this stance is not valid (R. Banks et al. [2]; D. Scott) [76]). Some people discuss commonalities between spirituality and religion, as well as differences (P. Hill et al.). [41] Although spirituality and religiosity are often used interchangeably, they are distinct, yet overlapping, constructs. Three polarising views are held by some behavioural scientists, differentiating spirituality and religion (B. Zinnbauer et al.). [97] Some social scientists argue that spirituality is subsumed by religion (P. Hill et al.), [41] whereas others see religion as one dimension of

spirituality (P. Nolan & P. Crawford). [68] The view that “religiosity can but does not necessarily include spirituality” (H. Gough et al.) [30] is countered by one that claims, “Outstanding spiritual leaders developed most religions” (D. Hay et al.). [36] Rather simplistically speaking, M. Horsburgh [42] maintains that religion focuses on ideology and rules of faith and belief systems, whereas spirituality focuses on experience and relationships which go beyond religion (D. Lukoff et al.). [56] This simplistic view is rejected by many (D. Martsolf & J. Mickley, [58]; P. Benson [4]; D. Hay et al. [36]). In a recent study “using a large sample of American adults, analyses demonstrate that subjective spirituality and tradition-oriented religiousness are empirically highly independent” (G. Saucier et al.), [73] suggesting divergence between the two constructs. A close inspection of the instruments used in that study is warranted to see how much confidence can be placed in the findings. In contrast to this view of divergence, S. Schneiders [75] contends, “some see religion and spirituality as two dimensions of a single enterprise...often in tension but are essential to each other and constitute, together, a single reality....as partners in the search for God.”

“A relationship [of people] to the sacred *or* transcendent” [my italics] is included in many definitions of spirituality (J. Sinnott [81]; C. Hyman & P. Handal, [45]). Taking this broader view, B. Seaward asserts that spirituality involves “connection to a divine source whatever we call it”. [77] But, spirituality does not have to include “God-talk” according to N. Jose and E. Taylor. [48] A number of authors have followed this latter, humanistic line of thinking by attempting to define secular spirituality as a spirituality without any need for a religious/God component (C. Harvey [34]; M. Newby [67]). Understandably, many Christian writers raise arguments against removing religion and God from discussions of spirituality (D. Smith [85]; A. Wright [95]).

Abraham Maslow, claimed by many to be the father of humanistic psychology, and John Dewey, a founder of the philosophical school of Pragmatism, both consider spirituality to be part of a person’s being, and therefore prior to and different from religiosity (L. Fahlberg & L. Fahlber) [17]. Many supporters of the notion of evolutionary psychology fail to distinguish between “spiritual awareness as a natural phenomenon [i.e., innate] and religion as a belief system”, which is enculturated through family, education and community (I. Brown). [7]

A wide range of descriptions and classifications of spirituality can be found in relevant literature. From his review of literature, B. Spilka [86] proposed three categories of spirituality oriented towards (i) God, (ii) the

world, or (iii) people. M. Marty [59] reduced this classification even further by naming two prominent orientations of spiritual wellness as (i) theocentric (God-centred), and (ii) nontheocentric. According to M. Cohen et al., [11] D. Larson and colleagues [53] identified 10 general domains of religion and spirituality. B. Zinnbauer, K. Pargament and A. Scott [97] conducted content analysis of 40 definitions of spirituality and 31 of religiousness, which yielded 9 content categories. P. Hill and R. Hood [40] reviewed 125 measures of religion and spirituality which they placed in 17 different categories. D. Moberg [62] reported that eight of these measures included “spiritual” in their titles, and others would now be considered as measures of spirituality. H. Koenig et al. [51] proposed five types of spirituality, (i) humanistic, with no reference to any higher power, (ii) unmoored, with focus on energy, connection, nature; and moored spirituality, (iii) Eastern, or Western, (iv) evangelical or (v) conservative. From a casual survey of literature, D. Moberg [63] listed more than 20 “subcategories and types of spirituality, each reflecting a specialized range of perspectives”.

Therefore, it is not surprising to note that nearly every paper on spirituality/spiritual well-being states there is no agreed definition of these terms. Although that is so, and spirituality/spiritual well-being cannot be observed directly, most are agreed that they involve relationships. Many have mentioned a number of commonalities or potential areas of focus for these relationships, which, when present, illustrate or reflect healthy spirituality or spiritual well-being (M. Hyland, P. Wheeler, S. Kamble & K. Masters). [44]

5. Spiritual Well-Being

The term “spiritual well-being” (SWB) appears to have first been mentioned at the 1971 White House Conference on Aging (D. Moberg). [62] Subsequent establishment of the National Interfaith Coalition on Aging (NICA) led to its “working definition”, namely that, “Spiritual well-being is the affirmation of life in relationship with God, self, community and environment that nurtures and celebrates wholeness”. [66] Many subsequent descriptions of SWB have consistently referred to these four notions. For example, in highlighting the centrality of relationships in these four areas, K. Waaijman states, “Spirituality unfolds itself as the unity of the divine-human, interhuman, human-cosmic, and intrahuman relationships”. [91] However, not all researchers address all four areas. For example, M. Rovers and L. Kocum’s [72] definition of spirituality as “Faith, hope and love” excluded mention of nature/environment, thus denying, or at least

diminishing, spiritual reality for many indigenous peoples and most people with Eastern philosophies or environmental sensitivities.

Although “spiritual well-being” was only proposed as a concept 40 years ago, the influence of spirit on health has been discussed from at least Hippocrates’ time, around 400BC (F. Adams), [1] as well as in Chinese medicine. In a similar vein, psychology, as a study of mind and behaviour, dates back to Ancient Greece, but psychology, as an independent scientific discipline only originated in the 1870s. A German, Johann Christian Reil, is reported to be the first person to use the term Psychiatry, derived from psych- and -iatry, to mean “medical treatment of the soul”, in 1808. [93] Therefore, close relationships between spiritual and mental aspects of health have been known for a considerable time. An American psychiatrist, Harold Koenig, has made comments to the effect that the concept of spiritual well-being has *contaminated* current research into relationships between mental and physical health. [49; 52] Such comments should be ameliorated in light of the historical connections between psychology, psychiatry and spirituality mentioned. A focus on holistic well-being could be said to comprise spiritual-psycho-social-biophysical aspects of people as integrated wholes, not fragmented parts. I have deliberately re-ordered the components to challenge thinking about the relative importance of each factor of health, in contrast to the standard view which places the biophysical before the psycho-social, with spiritual being considered in last place, if at all (e.g., D. Sulmasy [87]).

A conception of spiritual health posits that it is “a, if not *the*, fundamental dimension of people’s overall health and well-being, permeating and integrating all the other dimensions of health (i.e., physical, mental, emotional, social and vocational). Spiritual health is a dynamic state of being, shown by the extent to which people live in harmony within relationships in up to four domains of spiritual well-being” (J. Fisher), [18, 181] namely with themselves in the Personal domain, with other people in the Communal domain, with nature in the Environmental domain, and/or with something or some-One beyond the human and natural world, in the Transcendental domain.

This working definition laid the foundation for the development of the Four Domains Model of Spiritual Health/Well-Being. In this model, nearly all descriptors that refer to self and to others are clearly stated, whereas the words “environment” and “nature” are used interchangeably. The fourth area, relationship with a Transcendent (commonly called God) is the one in which researchers use a diversity of terms depending on their worldviews.

This model delves beneath the surface of labels to interrogate the structure of four domains shown in literature to be key components of spiritual health/well-being. This model can be represented pictorially as, shown in Figure 1.

The more I read, the more I find this model captures the views expressed by authors on spirituality and well-being.

For example, the claim that the *Inspirational component* of each domain, which can be considered as small *t* transcendent *essence* and *motivation* that can be experienced by people, is filtered by worldview, concurs with a statement by J. Sire, “A worldview is a commitment, a fundamental orientation of the heart, that can be expressed as a story or in a set of presuppositions that we hold about the basic constitution of reality, and that provides the foundation on which we live and move and have our being.” [82, 20]

K. Waaijman expresses a similar sentiment in a quote from philosopher Theo de Boer, “One of the four pillars of scholarly research is inspiration: what animates and orientates human thought? Imagination, reasoning, and experience are not enough.

	FOUR DOMAINS OF SPIRITUAL WELL-BEING			
	PERSONAL	COMMUNAL	ENVIRON- MENTAL	TRANSCEN- DENTAL
Knowledge component - filtered by beliefs <i>Inspirational component essence & motivation</i> - filtered by worldview	meaning, purpose, and values - human spirit creates - <i>self-awareness</i>	morality, culture (and religion) - <i>in-depth inter- personal relations</i> - reaching the heart of humanity	care, nurture and stewardship of the physical, eco- political and social environment <i>connectedness with Nature/Creation</i>	Transcendent Other - ultimate concern Tillich - cosmic force New Age - God, for theists <i>Faith</i>
Expressed as	- joy, - peace, - patience - identity, - self-worth	- love - forgiveness - justice - hope & faith in humanity - trust	- sense of awe and wonder - valuing Nature/Creation	adoration & worship, being: - at one with Creator - in tune with God

Fig. 1. Four Domains Model of Spiritual Health & Well-being

A truth-loving mind is not content with the so called “reality” or “horizons” or “categories”.

The ultimate question is: what is this really? To what is this leading? What gives direction to these perceptions, constructions and argumentations?” [91, 105]

There does not appear to be any expression of a worldview that does not fit the four domains model. Put more positively, this model of spiritual health/well-being appears to encompass the vast majority of, if not all, worldviews.

A selection of 48 items was made from the model depicted in Figure 1. Exploratory Factor Analyses were used to select the best five items for each of the four domains.

The resultant items in the four *domains* of SWB in SHALOM relate to developing: “sense of identity, self-awareness, joy in life, inner peace and meaning in life” for *Personal* SWB; “love of other people, forgiveness toward others, trust between individuals, respect for others, kindness toward others” for *Communal* SWB; “connection with nature, awe at a breathtaking view, oneness with nature, harmony with the environment and a sense of “magic” in the environment” for *Environmental* SWB; relationship with the Divine/God, worship of the Creator, oneness with God, peace with God and prayer life’ for *Transcendental* SWB.

Some studies, other than those using SHALOM, have also employed this model as the basis for research in spirituality (L. Francis & M. Robbins [25]; [26]; P. Hughes, [43]).

6. Spirituality/Well-Being Measures

Publications abound with authors’ personal beliefs about the relevance of God to spiritual well-being (see above), but very little hard evidence has been systematically supplied to support the plethora of divergent views. From a Western historical perspective, the term “spirituality” was embedded in the confines of religion up to the start of the 20th Century, but now applies to broad contemporary views within and without religion. Compendiums of religiosity measures have been compiled by P. Hill and R. Hood [40] and Koenig et al. [51; 50] However, only instruments that focussed on spirituality have been included in this chapter. Those with a focus on religion were excluded because the thrust of my research is on the importance of relating with God for *spiritual* well-being, not *religious* well-being. As most instruments which clearly focus on religion would be expected to show some concern about relating with God, this would skew the results of my studies.

Authors’ views on what they consider important for spirituality/well-being are reflected in their choice of items included in any instrument or measure that they develop (D. Moberg). [61] Three types of spirituality measures are found in literature:

Those that focus on spiritual health, wellbeing or wellness (SH/WB)

Those with specific mention of spirituality, and

Related/partial spirituality measures (reflecting key aspects of the four domains model of SH/WB. These measures do not often employ a “spirituality” label).

It is not possible for measures with only one, or even up to four, items to comprehensively cover four domains of spiritual health and well-being. In line with comments by J. Sloan et al., [84] I decided that this multifaceted construct would best be measured with multidimensional, multi-item instruments. In my previous work, 169 multi-dimensional measures were described (J. Fisher, chapter 3). [19] Further data-mining using “spiritual*” with “measure” and “assess*” has revealed another 91 instruments that fit similar criteria. There are probably more measures available in literature worldwide, but these are the only ones that were readily accessible to me.

A total of 260 multi-item spirituality/well-being measures are reported elsewhere (J. Fisher). [23] These have been roughly divided into three groups in order to ascertain if any change in emphasis is present in the spirituality instruments developed over time. By the end of the 20th century, 79 pertinent measures had been reported. In the first five years of the 21st century, increasing interest in spirituality saw a further 90 instruments developed. Literature searches from 2006 to 2014 revealed another 86 newly-reported spirituality measures.

The percentage of instruments with three or more items per domain is shown in Table 1, for the three types of spirituality/well-being measures described above. Particular emphasis will be given here to the Transcendental domain, with cursory comments on religious items. Items in the instruments that referred to beliefs were categorised as either “religious” or “other”. Spirituality is taken to be reflected in respondents’ quality of relationships, so an assessment of their lived experience is required, not just their beliefs. For example, belief in God is a religious attitude, that may or may not result in any form of relationship with God, as even the devil “believes” in God.

Table 1

Percentage composition of instruments in four domains of spirituality/well-being

Instrument type	year	No.	Per swb	Com swb	Env swb	Tra swb	Relig.
Spiritual Health/ Well-being	<2000	15	100	67	13	73	27
	2000-5	8	100	63	75	75	17
	2006+	16	94	63	25	50	31
	total	39	97	64	28	64	26
Spirituality	<2000	32	88	66	25	72	47
	2000-5	55	76	49	11	55	49
	2006+	50	80	54	22	48	44
	total	136	80	55	18	56	46
Related/ Partial spiritual well-being	<2000	32	91	56	13	19	22
	2000-5	27	78	44	19	22	30
	2006+	23	78	26	9	39	35
	total	82	83	44	13	26	27
ALL	<2000	79	91	62	19	51	33
	2000-5	90	91	49	21	47	39
	2006+	89	82	49	18	46	38
	TOTAL	258*	88	53	18	47	37

NB * 2 undated, Per = Personal, Com = Communal, Env = Environmental, Tra = Transcendental spiritual well-being Relig = religious items.

Some interesting trends were noted over time:

Personal SWB – L. Bregman claimed, “The individual in his/her freedom and quest for meaning is now the *whole* focus of the concept of “spirituality” [my italics]. [6]

However, focus on the Personal domain of spiritual well-being for the range of instruments has dropped slightly over time, but it is still greater than for the other three domains of Communal, Environmental and Transcendental spiritual well-being.

Communal SWB – A similar percentage of Communal and Transcendental spiritual well-being factors are present over time in the spirituality/well-being measures.

Environmental SWB – apart from an influx of instruments based on the four domains model, reported in 2000-05, only one in five instruments address environmental issues for spiritual well-being. Transcendental SWB – Spiritual health/well-being measures developed since 2006 show a marked decline in percentage of instruments assessing relationship with a Transcendent (e.g., God); a drop from three quarters to half. This reducing

trend had been noticed by L. Chiu et al. [9] A decline of similar magnitude has taken place in spirituality measures from 2000 to the present time. Counter to this downward trend, related /partial measures of spirituality revealed an increase in assessment of relationships with a Transcendent over the last 40 years. However, even now, less than half of these instruments contain assessments of relationship with a Transcendent.

7. Importance of Relating with God for Spiritual Well-Being

The above trends in spirituality/well-being are of particular interest as they highlight the variations among researchers who are developing new scales. These trends raise questions as to whether researchers in spirituality are building on their own worldviews or focussing on the perceived needs or lived experiences of people being studied by means of their instruments. The marked divergence of worldviews and noticeable variations in measures of spirituality/well-being identified here lays the foundation for a primary research question which investigated, “How important is relating with God (or Transcendent) for spiritual well-being?” Meta-analyses of 32 studies with approximately 15000 people revealed that, of the four sets of relationships assessed using SHALOM, relating with God is most important for spiritual well-being (J. Fisher). [20] More recent analyses of 52 studies with 41686 people from 27 countries have reinforced this finding (J. Fisher). [23] Investigations with SHALOM and another measure of spiritual well-being, developed with a broad range of Australian students, also showed that relating with God is the most influential of four relationships which reflect SWB (J. Fisher). [21] Evidence presented from a study with a generic form of SHALOM revealed that it looks like you can’t beat relating with God for spiritual well-being (J. Fisher). [22] “Those who claim non-theistic Transcendents, such as fate, higher self and higher power, as their motivating forces in life show...less spiritual well-being” compared with those who relate with God (J. Fisher). [24] This study also reported that relating with God helps people relate better with themselves and others, compared with the influence of other Transcendents.

8. Conclusion

Alternative worldviews are generally closely held truth claims, beliefs or opinions. No empirical studies had been identified that reported evidence comparing the importance of relating with God, with that of another three sets of relationships, for spiritual well-being until the recent study reported above. [24] Relating with God facilitates relationship with self and others to a significant extent, which relating with other Transcendents fails to do.

These results indicate that, although each person has the right to choose what seems important to them, not all views are of equal value in practice. Therefore, contrary to the declining inclusion of God in studies of spirituality/well-being, relating with God must be included as an option in all future studies, otherwise the key component thereof is excluded.

References

1. Adams, F. (1939). *The Genuine Works of Hippocrates*, trans. from the Greek (Aphorisms, I.1). London, UK: Bailliere, Tindall & Cox, p. 299.
2. Banks, R., Poehler, D. & Russell, R. (1984). Spirit and human-spiritual interaction as a factor in health and health education. *Health Education, 15*(5), 16-19.
3. Bartholomew, B. (2014). *The Spiritual Genome*. North Hollywood, CA.: Timeline Publishing Inc.
4. Benson, P.L. (2004) Emerging themes in research on adolescent spiritual and religious development. *Applied Developmental Science, 8*, 47-50.
5. Berryman, J.W. (1990). Teaching as presence and the existential curriculum. *Religious Education, 85*(4), 509-534.
6. Bregman, L. (2012). Spirituality definitions: A moving target. In *Spirituality: Theory Praxis and Pedagogy*. Edited by Martin Fowler, John D. Martin III, and John L. Hochheimer. Oxford, UK: Inter-Disciplinary Press, pp. 4-10.
7. Brown, I. (1978). Exploring the spiritual dimension of school health education. *Eta Sigma Gamman, 10*, 12-16.
8. Chan, C., Ho, Petula S.Y. & Chow, E. (2001). A Body-Mind-Spirit Model in health: An eastern approach. *Social Work Health and Mental Health, 34*(3 /4), 261-282.
9. Chiu, L. Emblen, J. D., Van Hofwegen, L., Sawatzkyi, R. & Meyerhoff, H. (2004). An integrative review of the concept of spirituality in the health sciences. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 26*, 405-428.
10. Chown, M. (2012). In the beginning. *New Scientist* 216, Issue 2893, 02624079, 12/1/2012.
11. Cohen, M. Z., Holley, L. M., Wengel, S.P. & Katzman, M. (2012). A platform for nursing research on spirituality and religiosity: Definitions and measures. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 34*(6), 795-817.
12. Copeland, K. (undated). Kenneth Copeland Ministries. Understanding the Soul. Retrieved on 15 April 2014 from <http://www.kcm.org/print/real-help/article/understanding-soul>
13. Dawkins, R. (2006). *The God Delusion*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
14. Diaz, D.P. (1993). Foundations for spirituality: Establishing the viability of spirituality within the health disciplines. *Journal of Health Education, 24*, 324-326.
15. Dossey, L. (2014). Spirituality and nonlocal mind: A necessary dyad. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice, 1*(1), 29-42.

16. Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2013). Retrieved on 10 June 2014 from <http://www.britannica.com/EBcheckedtopic/124443/cogito-ergo-sum>
17. Fahlberg, L. L., & Fahlberg, L.A. (1991). Exploring spirituality and consciousness with an expanded science: Beyond the ego with empiricism, phenomenology, and contemplation. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 5*(4), 273-281.
18. Fisher, J. W. (1998). *Spiritual health: Its nature and place in the school curriculum*. PhD thesis, University of Melbourne. Available online <https://minerva-access.unimelb.edu.au/handle/11343/39206>
19. Fisher, J. W. (2009). *Reaching the heart: Assessing and nurturing spiritual well-being via education*. EdD dissertation, University of Ballarat, Victoria, Australia. Available online.edu.au:8080/vital/access/HandleResolver/1959.17/42221
20. Fisher, J.W. (2012) The importance of relating with God for spiritual well-being. In *Spirituality: New Reflections on Theory Praxis and Pedagogy*. Edited by Martin Fowler, Michael Weiss, and John L. Hochheimer. Oxford, UK: Inter-Disciplinary Press, pp. 147-161.
21. Fisher, J. W. (2013a). Assessing spiritual well-being: Relating with God explains greatest variance in spiritual well-being among Australian youth. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality, 18*(4), 306-317.
22. Fisher, J. W. (2013b) You can't beat relating with God for spiritual well-being: Comparing a generic version with the original spiritual well-being questionnaire called SHALOM. *Religions, 4*(3), 325-335.
23. Fisher, J. W. (2014a). *Importance of relating with God for spiritual well-being*. PhD dissertation, Federation University Australia. Available from: <http://researchonline.federation.edu.au:8080/vital/access/HandleResolver/1959.17/73747>
24. Fisher, J. W. (2014b). Comparing the influence of God and other Transcendents on spiritual well-being. *Religious Education Journal of Australia, 30*(2), 9-15.
25. Francis, L. J. & Robbins, M. (2005). *Urban Hope and Spiritual Health: The Adolescent Voice*. Peterborough, UK: Epworth.
26. Francis, L. J., Penny, G. & Baker, S. (2012). Defining and assessing spiritual health: A comparative study among 13- to 15-year old pupils attending secular schools, Anglican schools, and private Christian schools in England and Wales. *Peabody Journal of Education, 87*(3), 351-367.
27. Geisler, N. & Turek, F. (2004). *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
28. Goodloe, R. & Arreola, P. (1992). Spiritual health: Out of the closet. *Health Education, 23*, 221-226.
29. Gorsuch, R. L. & Walker, S.E. (2006). Measurement and research design in studying spiritual development. In *Handbook of Spiritual Development in Childhood and Adolescence*. Edited by E.C. Roehlkepartain, P.E. King, L.M. Wagener & P.L. Benson. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 92-103.

30. Gough, H. R., Wilks, S.E. & Prattini, R.J. (2010). Spirituality among Alzheimer's caregivers: Psychometric reevaluation of the Intrinsic Spirituality Scale. *Journal of Social Science Research*, 36, 278-288.
31. Graves, D. (undated). John Wesley's heart strangely warmed. Retrieved on 7 May 2014 from <http://christianity.com/church/church-history/timeline/1701-1800/john-wesleys-heart-strangely-warmed>
32. Hagin, K. W. (undated). The dividing of soul and spirit. Retrieved on 15 April 2014 from http://www.rhema.org/index.php?option_content&view=article&id=274:the-dividing-of-soul-and-spirit
33. Hanfstingl, B. (2013). Ego and Spiritual Transcendence: Relevance to psychological resilience and the role of age. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine* 2013, article ID 949838. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/949838>
34. Harvey, C. L. (1996). *The role of the soul*. A paper presented at "Whose Values?", the Third Annual Conference on "Education, Spirituality and the Whole Child", Roehampton Institute, London, June.
35. Hawking, S. & Mlodinow, L. (2010). *The Grand Design*. London: Bantam Press.
36. Hay, D., Reich, K.H. & Utsch, M. (2006). Spiritual development: Intersections and divergence with religious development. In *The Handbook of Spiritual Development in Childhood and Adolescence*. Edited by E.C. Roehlkepartain, P.E. King, L.M. Wagener & P.L. Benson. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: Sage Publications, pp. 46-59.
37. Heelas, P. & Woodhead, L. (2005). *The Spiritual Revolution: Why religion is giving way to spirituality*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
38. Helminiak, D. (1996). *The Human Core of Spirituality: Mind as Psyche and Spirit*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
39. Helminiak, D. A. (2008). Confounding the Divine and the Spiritual: Challenges to a Psychology of Spirituality. *Pastoral Psychology*, 57, 161-182.
40. Hill, P. C. & Hood, R.W. (Eds.) (1999). *Measures of Religiosity*. Birmingham, Alabama: Religious Education Press.
41. Hill, P.C., Pargament, K.I., Hood, R.W., McCullough, J.P., Swyers, D.B., Larson, D.B. & Zinnbauer, B.J. (2000). Conceptualizing religion and spirituality: Points of commonality, points of departure. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 30(1), 51-77.
42. Horsburgh, M. (1997). Towards an inclusive spirituality: Wholeness, interdependence and waiting. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 19(10), 398-406.
43. Hughes, P. (2007). *Putting Life Together: Findings from Australian Youth Spirituality Research*. Melbourne: CRA/Fairfield Press.
44. Hyland, M.E., Wheeler, P., Kamble, S. & Masters K.S. (2010). A sense of "Special Connection", self-transcendent values and a common factor for religious and non-religious spirituality. *Archive for the Psychology of Religion*, 32, 293-326.

45. Hyman, C. & Handal, P.J. (2006). Definitions and evaluation of religion and spirituality by religious professionals: A pilot study. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 45(2), 264-282.
46. Jewish Encyclopedia. (2002). Book of Adam. Retrieved on 30 May 2014 from <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/759-adam-book-of>
47. Jo, K. (2005). *A threefold relational approach to spiritual maturity: An exploratory study of Korean evangelical spirituality*. Dissertation Abstracts International, Section B: Hum. Soc Sci Vol 66(3-A), p.1042.
48. Jose, N. & Taylor, E. (1986). Spiritual health: A look at barriers to its inclusion in the health education curriculum. *The Eta Sigma Gamman*, 18(2), 16-19.
49. Koenig, H. G. (2008). Concerns about measuring "Spirituality" in research. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 196(5), 349-355.
50. Koenig, H. G. (2011). *Spirituality & Health Research: Methods, measurement, statistics and resources*. West Conshohocken, PA, USA: Templeton Press.
51. Koenig, H. G., McCullough, M.E. & Larson, D.B. (Eds.) (2001). *Handbook of Religion and Health*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
52. Koenig, H. G., King, D. A. & Carson, V.B. (2012). *Handbook of Religion and Health*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
53. Larson, D. B., Swyers, J.P. & McCullough, M.E. (Eds). (1998). *Scientific research on spirituality and health: A consensus report*. Rockville, MD: National Institute for Healthcare Research.
54. Lennox, J.C. (2009). *God's Undertaker: Has science buried God?* rev. ed. Oxford, UK: Lion Books.
55. Lennox, J.C. (2011). *God and Stephen Hawking: Whose design is it anyway?* Oxford, UK: Lion Books.
56. Lukoff, D., Lu, F., Turner, R. (1992). Toward a more culturally sensitive DSM-IV. Psychoreligious and psychospiritual problems. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 180(11), 673-682.
57. McGrath, A. (2007). *The Dawkins Delusion?* London: SPCK Publishing.
58. Martsolf, D. S. & Micklej, J. R. (1998). The concept of spirituality in nursing theories: Differing world-views and extent of focus. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 27, 294-303.
59. Marty, M. (1997). Designed to be imprecise. *Aging and Spirituality*, 9(1), 3.
60. Mirman, M. C. (2012). An atheist's guide to the divine: Throwing out the bathwater but keeping the baby. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 23, 171-189.
61. Moberg, D. O. (2002). Assessing and measuring spirituality: Confronting dilemmas of universal and particular evaluative criteria. *Journal of Adult Development*, 9(1), 47-60.
62. Moberg, D. O. (2010). Spirituality research: Measuring the immeasurable? *Perspectives on Science and Christian Faith*, 62(2), 99-114.
63. Moberg, D. O. (2011). Expanding horizons for spirituality research. Retrieved on 15 October 2013 from <http://hrr.hartsem.edu/sociology/spirituality-research.html>

64. Mohr, W. K. (2006). Spiritual issues in Psychiatric Care. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 42(3), 174-183.
65. Morris H.M. (1984). *The Genesis Record: A scientific and devotional commentary on the book of beginnings*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker House Books.
66. National Interfaith Coalition on Aging (NICA) (1975). *Spiritual well-being: A definition*. Athens, Georgia: Author. *Biology of Belief*. New York: Ballantine Books.
67. Newby, M. (1996). Towards a secular concept of spiritual maturity. In *Education, Spirituality and the Whole Child*. Edited by Ron Best. London: Cassell, pp. 99-107.
68. Nolan, P. & Crawford. P. (1997). Towards a rhetoric of spirituality in mental health care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 26, 289-294.
69. Pandya, S. K. (2011). Understanding brain, mind and soul: Contributions from neurology and neurosurgery. *Mens Sana Monographs* 9(1) 129-149. Retrieved on 15 April 2014 from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3115284/>
70. Piedmont, R. L. (2001). Spiritual transcendence and scientific study of spirituality. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 67(1), 4-14.
71. Principe, W. (1983). Toward defining spirituality. *Studies in Religion*, 12, 127-41.
72. Rovers, M. & Kocum, L. (2010). Development of a Holistic Model of Spirituality. *Journal of Spirituality in Mental Health*, 12(1), 2-24.
73. Saucier, G. & Skrzypińska, K. (2006). Spiritual but not religious? Evidence for two independent dispositions. *Journal of Personality*, 74(5), 1257-1292.
74. Schaeffer, F. (1972). *Genesis in Space and Time: The flow of Biblical History*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
75. Schneiders, S. M. (2003). Religion vs. Spirituality: A contemporary conundrum. *Spiritus*, 3, 163-185.
76. Scott, D. G. (2006). Spirituality and identity within/without religion. In *International Handbook of the Religious, Moral and Spiritual Dimensions in Education*. Edited by Marian de Souza et al. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, pp. 1111-1125.
77. Seaward, B. L. (2001). *Health of the Human Spirit: Spiritual Dimensions for Personal Health*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
78. Seligman, M. (2014). God comes at the end. *Spirituality in Clinical Practice*, 1(1), 67-70.
79. Seybold, K. S. (2005). God and the brain: Neuroscience looks at religion. *Journal of Psychology and Religion*, 24(2), 122-129.
80. Shelton, S. (2010). Spirituality, mental health and the new physics. *International Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 7(2), 161-171.
81. Sinnott, J. D. (2001). Introduction: Special Issue on Spirituality and Adult Development, Part 1. *Journal of Adult Development*, 8(4), 199-200.
82. Sire, J. W. (2009). *The universe next door: A basic worldview catalog 5th ed.* Downers Grove, IL, USA: InterVarsity Press.

83. Slife, B. D., Reber, J.S. & Lefevor, G.T. (2012). When God truly matters: A theistic approach to psychology. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 23, 213-236.
84. Sloan, J. A., Aaronson, N., Cappelleri, J.C., Fairclough, D.L., Varrichio, C. et al. (2002). Assessing the clinical significance of single items relative to summated scores. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings*, 77, 479-487.
85. Smith, D. (2000). Secularism, religion and spiritual development. *Journal of Beliefs & Values*, 21(1), 27-38.
86. Spilka, B. (1993). Spirituality: Problems and directions in operationalizing a fuzzy concept. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, August.
87. Sulmasy, D. P. (2002). A Biopsychosocial-Spiritual Model for the care of patients at the end of life. *The Gerontologist*, 42(special issue III), 24-33.
88. Turner, R. P., Lukoff, D., Barnhouse, R.T. & Lu, F.G. (1995). Religious or spiritual problem: A culturally sensitive diagnostic category in the DSM-IV. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 183, 435-444.
89. Urgesi, C., Aglioti, S.M., Skrap, M. & Fabbro, F. (2010). The spiritual brain: Selective cortical lesions modulate human self-transcendence. *Neuron* 65, 309-319.
90. Waaijman, K. (2006). What is spirituality? *Acta Theologica Supplementum*, 8, 1-18.
91. Waaijman, K. (2007). Spirituality – A multifaceted phenomenon. *Studies in Spirituality*, 17, 1-113. doi:10.2143/SIS17.0.2024643
92. Wikipedia. Spiritual evolution. Retrieved on 5 May 2014 from: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Spiritual_evolution
93. Wikipedia. Timeline of psychiatry. Retrieved on 12 May 2014 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_psychiatry
94. Wikipedia. Transhumanism. Retrieved on 12 May 2014 from <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transhumanism>
95. Wright, A. (2000). *Spirituality & Education*. Florence, KY, USA: Taylor & Francis.
96. York R. H. (2012). The concepts of the indwelling spirit and the self-critic in theistic theory and research. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion* 23, 151-170.
97. Zinnbauer, B. J., Pargament, K. I. & Scott, A.B. (1999). The emerging meanings of religiousness and spirituality: Problems and prospects. *Journal of Personality*, 67(6), 889-919.

ВІД ПОЧАТКУ ЧАСІВ ДО ДОСЯГНЕННЯ ДУХОВНОГО БЛАГОПОЛУЧЧЯ

Джон В. Фішер

У статті надається характеристика можливої взаємодії Бога та людини з незапам'ятних часів до нинішніх днів на шляху до досягнення нею духовного благополуччя. Коротко згадуються альтернативні теорії походження, які перетинаються з питаннями ідеальної реальності, походженням людини і досягненням нею духовного благополуччя.

Надається характеристика природи духу і його зв'язку з душею і розумом, далі має місце огляд історії розвитку поняття духовність. Автор чотирьохсферної моделі стверджує, що духовне здоров'я / благополуччя відбивається у відносинах, які кожна людина має до чотирьох означених сфер, а саме – це відносини до самого себе, до інших людей, до природи і / або до Трансцендентального Іншого (зазвичай до Бога). Аналіз наявних методик виміру духовності і духовного благополуччя свідчить про зменшення кількості інструментаріїв для оцінки відносин людини з Богом від більш раннього періоду до недавнього часу.

На відміну від цього сучасні дослідники віддають перевагу більш гуманістичним акцентам в дослідженні духовності / благополуччя у підборі інструментарію дослідження. У статті на основі аналізу результатів недавно проведеного дослідження наводяться докази того, що саме відносини з Богом є найважливішими з чотирьох типів відносин для досягнення людиною духовного благополуччя. Далі надаються докази того, що саме Бог є найвпливовішим Трансцендентом, який здатний поліпшити відносини людини із самим собою та з іншими людьми. Хоча дослідники вільні вибирати характер питань, які їм піднімати у своїх проектах, результати дослідження, представлені в означеній статті, ясно дають зрозуміти, що будь-яке дослідження, з якого виключений аспект відносин з Богом, характеризується ярко вираженим порушенням основи духовності / благополуччя.

***Ключові слова:** дух, душа, розум, людські взаємовідносини з Богом, духовність, добробут*

ОТ НАЧАЛА ВРЕМЕН ДО ДОСТИЖЕНИЯ ДУХОВНОГО БЛАГОПОЛУЧИЯ

Джон В. Фішер

В статье дается характеристика возможного взаимодействия Бога и человека с незапамятных времен до нынешних дней на пути к достижению им духовного благополучия. Коротко упоминаются альтернативные теории происхождения, пересекающиеся с вопросами идеальной реальности, происхождением человека и достижением им духовного благополучия.

Дается характеристика природы духа и его связи с душой и разумом, дальше представлен обзор истории развития понятия духовность. Автор четырехсферной модели утверждает, что здоровье / благополучие отражается в отношениях, которые имеет каждый человек к четырем указанным сферам, а именно – это отношения к самому себе, к другим людям, к природе и / или Трансцендентальному Иному (обычно Богу). Анализ имеющихся методик измерения духовности и духовного благополучия свидетельствует об уменьшении количества инструментариев для оценки отношений человека с Богом от более раннего периода до недавнего времени.

В отличие от этого современные исследователи отдают предпочтение более гуманистическим акцентам в исследовании духовности / благополучия при подборе инструментария исследования. В статье на основе анализа результатов недавно проведенного исследования приводятся доказательства того, что именно отношения с Богом являются важнейшими из четырех типов отношений, необходимых для достижения человеком духовного благополучия. Далее представляются доказательства того, что именно Бог является самым влиятельным Трансцендентом, который способен улучшить отношения человека к самому себе и к другим людям. Хотя исследователи вольны выбирать характер вопросов, которые им поднимают в своих проектах, результаты исследования, представленные в указанной статье, ясно дают понять, что любое исследование, из которого исключен аспект отношений с Богом, характеризуется ярко выраженным нарушением основы духовности / благополучия.

***Ключевые слова:** дух, душа, ум, человеческие взаимоотношения с Богом, духовность, благополучие.*

John W. Fisher – MSc, MEd, PhD, EdD, PhD, Adjunct Associate Professor, Education & Arts, Federation University Australia, Honorary Senior Fellow, Faculty of Medicine, University of Melbourne, Honorary Academic Adviser, Centre for Religious & Spirituality Ed., Hong Kong Institute of Education, Visiting Professor, Institute of Health Medical Sciences & Society, University of Glyndŵr, Wales. Email: j.fisher@federation.edu.au

Джон В. Фішер – магістр природничих наук, магістр педагогіки, доктор філософії, д. пед. наук., доцент відділення освіти та мистецтв Федеративного університету Австралії, Почесний старший науковий співробітник медичного факультету Мельбурнського університету, Почесний академічний радник Центру релігійної та духовної освіти Гонг-Конгського Інституту освіти, запрошений професор Інституту здоров'язбереження, медицини та суспільства Глїндурського університету, Уельс. Email: j.fisher@federation.edu.au