



VALIDATION OF PROFESSIONAL ETHICS SCALE (PES)

S. Manikandan¹ and Dr. C. Anbuchelvan²

¹Ph.D. Research Scholar (Part-Time), Alagappa University College of Education, Alagappapuram, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India.

²Assistant Professor & Research Guide, Alagappa University College of Education, Alagappapuram, Karaikudi, Tamil Nadu, India.

ABSTRACT:

Ethical conduct of teacher educators makes them accountable for their behaviour towards teaching and research profession in higher education institutions where it involves their actions towards their colleagues, their pupils, towards society and the community which entrusts its young ones to their care, education and most importantly towards their own self. At present, there are only a few tools available to measure teachers' professional ethics and an urgent need for the valid research tool to measure the professional ethics of teacher educators at higher education institutions. So, an attempt has been made by the researcher among 100 teacher educators as a sample who is working from different colleges of education in the academic year 2018-19 in order to construct and validate a suitable professional ethics scale. At first, the researcher prepared a primary draft research tool with 72 statements based on the Likert's summated rating scale concerning five different degrees of opinion Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree Nor Disagree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. After item analysis, 60 statements have been retained and standardized by using t-test with respect to 27% Upper and Lower group dichotomy. The further validation of the scale has been carried out with split-half reliability as well as content and intrinsic validity measures. The final draft of the tool consisted of 60 statements after item analysis and validation. This research paper helps the different stakeholders of education to develop and validate a scale to measure professional ethics among teacher educators.

KEYWORDS: Professional Ethics, Teacher Educators.

ETHICS

Ethics is a societal concern in recent days that refers to a set of rules that describes acceptable code of conduct in our society. Ethics serve as a guide to moral daily living and helps us judge whether our behaviour can be justified. Ethics refers to society's sense of the right way of living our daily lives. Etymologically ethics is a normative phenomenon which deals with the conduct of behaviour of humans performed at every stage in various situations, and environmental circumstances throughout one's own life.

PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

A code of professional ethics is basic rights and duties for the protection of professional autonomy and freedom of professionals in teaching and other jobs. Therefore, professional ethics serve as a guide to laypersons for understanding professional conduct (Saba Hasan & Fazli Samina, 2009). Professional ethics for teacher provides a framework of principles to guide them in discharging their obligation towards students, parents, colleagues and community. Increased awareness of the ethical principles governing profession is

essential to ensure 'professionalism'. Like all other professions, the teaching profession should also move towards self-regulation, which implies that every teacher educator should have the inner urge to adhere to the ethical principles listed in the code of professional ethics for teachers given by NCTE (2010). Proficient ethics helps a professional to think of what to do when faced with an issue at work that raises an ethical issue.

DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS

- **Professional Ethics:** According to the researcher, professional ethics refers to some standard code of conduct towards self, students, colleagues, institution, parents, society, and research.
- **Teacher Educators:** According to the researcher, ones who are working in the teacher education institutions that offer B.Ed. and M.Ed. courses.

OBJECTIVE

- To construct and validate a research scale to measure professional ethics among teacher educators.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

For the research scale, simple mean, SD for the grouped data and unpaired t-test statistics applied for the selection of items. Spearman-Brown prophecy formula has been employed to arrive reliability values for the validation of the research tool. Mean \pm 1SD (Standard Deviation) distribution property of the normal probability curve has been computed for developing norms.

CONSTRUCTION OF PRIMARY DRAFT

At first, the researcher framed a board of experts comprising teachers, teacher educators, senior professors and HOD's from the education department to consult about available base tools from **Barjees Jeelani & Krishna Kumar, R. (2015)** in the respective area to frame professional ethics with six dimensions such as professional, ethical conduct towards self, students, colleagues, institution, parents, and society. Later seventh dimension ethical conduct towards research has been formulated and added in order to fulfil the research gap arises from the old research tools that are lapsing and mandatory to the present context in order to retain the uniqueness and measure the research ethics of teacher educators of the present tool. So, a preliminary research tool with 72 positive statements based on the Likert's five-point summative rating scale with strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, and strongly agree. The tool was given to the board of experts for general opinion in order to remove the conceptual errors and ensure the nature of 72 statements that reflects different ethical conducts for item analysis and pilot study. This scale with seventy items has been administered to the sample of one hundred teacher educators who has worked in the different teacher education institutions in Salem, Namakkal, Dharmapuri and Krishnagiri districts of Tamil Nadu.

PRE-TRY OUT AND ITEM ANALYSIS

After getting prior permission from the heads of teacher education institutions, the researcher administered the research scale among the teacher educators in selected colleges in different districts and their responses have been scored carefully based on grading norms. All the items in the scale are designed and developed as positive items. The scale calls for a graded response to each item on a five-point scale for positive statements with respect to the degree of opinion as "Strongly Agree" response gets 5 marks, "Agree" response gets 4 marks, "Neutral" gets 3 marks, "Disagree" response gets 2 marks and "Strongly Disagree" response gets 1 mark. Then they were subjected to item analysis.

The response sheets were scored for respondents wise and the score is arranged in the descending order from the highest to the lowest score. Then 27% of the subjects with the highest total scores and 27% of the subjects with the lowest total scores, served as the criterion groups, were sorted out for the purpose of item selection. The upper 27% and lower 27% dichotomy groups of the protocols were taken to find out

the t-value for all the 72 statements with the help of the formula suggested by Allen L. Edwards (1957) by using unpaired sample t-test statistics with respect to the small sample. Each Statement with 't' value equal or greater than 1.98 was accepted and retained for the development of the professional ethics scale and those statement with t-value below 1.98 were rejected and omitted from the scale for further process.

Based on significant t-values, only sixty statements are retained and twelve statements were rejected from the preliminary draft. Therefore, the final draft consisted of sixty statements. The obtained t-values for each item was given in the following Table-1.

Table 1: t-values for the Statements of the Professional Ethical Scale (PES)

Statements	Higher Group						Lower Group						t-value	Remarks	Statement Selection
	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	DA (2)	SDA (1)	Total	SA (5)	A (4)	N (3)	DA (2)	SDA (1)	Total			
I	Dimension (10 Statements)												Ethical Conduct Towards Self		
1	9	14	4	0	0	27	0	6	8	5	8	27	6.26	S	1
2	6	10	5	3	3	27	0	3	5	10	9	27	3.99	S	2
3	12	4	9	1	1	27	12	11	1	1	2	27	3.01	S	3
4	18	4	3	2	0	27	8	8	1	5	5	27	2.85	S	4
5	12	7	2	2	2	27	8	0	12	3	4	27	1.56	NS	-
6	23	4	0	0	0	27	13	9	0	3	2	27	2.99	S	5
7	22	5	0	0	0	27	15	3	3	4	2	27	3.10	S	6
8	14	5	7	1	0	27	9	5	6	4	3	27	3.01	S	7
9	6	12	7	2	0	27	3	7	5	4	8	27	2.99	S	8
10	18	5	2	2	0	27	8	12	2	3	2	27	4.01	S	9
II	Dimension (21 Statements)												Ethical Conduct Towards Students		
11	25	2	0	0	0	27	14	7	0	6	0	27	3.16	S	10
12	17	6	2	2	.	27	10	4	3	7	3	27	2.88	S	11
13	13	4	1	7	2	27	2	4	5	9	7	27	1.22	NS	-
14	14	10	0	3	0	27	7	20	0	0	0	27	1.09	NS	-
15	12	11	0	4	0	27	6	6	6	2	7	27	2.99	S	12
16	3	3	8	4	9	27	2	13	12	0	0	27	0.99	NS	-
17	17	5	3	2	0	27	10	2	3	7	5	27	3.12	S	13

18	13	6	8	0	0	27	10	3	4	3	7	27	2.88	S	14
19	6	0	11	0	10	27	2	6	0	10	9	27	1.11	NS	-
20	9	12	4	2	0	27	2	18	0	3	4	27	1.98	S	15
21	9	2	12	4	0	27	4	7	3	10	3	27	2.01	S	16
22	12	4	7	4	0	27	3	5	10	3	6	27	2.99	S	17
23	7	12	4	2	2	27	3	10	2	5	7	27	2.86	S	18
24	4	2	7	4	10	27	1	7	0	12	7	27	1.23	NS	-
25	16	11	0	0	0	27	7	6	2	5	7	27	3.99	S	19
26	11	3	8	0	5	27	10	4	7	2	4	27	1.21	NS	-
27	17	3	7	0	0	27	7	9	4	0	7	27	3.99	S	20
28	12	4	4	4	3	27	7	3	8	2	7	27	1.55	NS	-
29	9	7	7	1	3	27	0	4	5	6	12	27	3.14	S	21
30	25	2	0	0	0	27	14	9	0	4	0	27	3.99	S	22
31	10	7	3	2	5	27	4	12	1	4	6	27	1.77	NS	-
III	Dimension (6 Statements)												Ethical Conduct Towards Colleagues		
32	8	13	1	3	2	27	1	9	0	11	6	27	4.01	S	23
33	16	11	0	0	0	27	7	8	0	5	7	27	3.98	S	24
34	5	14	4	2	2	27	2	6	5	3	11	27	4.12	S	25
35	6	16	5	0	0	27	3	4	6	5	9	27	3.99	S	26
36	13	4	1	7	2	27	2	4	5	9	7	27	3.42	S	27
37	6	12	5	2	2	27	2	5	5	7	8	27	4.22	S	28
IV	Dimension (12 Statements)												Ethical Conduct Towards Institution		
38	9	8	4	5	1	27	1	2	2	15	7	27	4.99	S	29
39	8	6	7	5	1	27	1	2	2	15	7	27	3.84	S	30
40	8	6	7	4	2	27	2	4	0	12	9	27	4.57	S	31
41	12	13	2	0	0	27	10	15	2	0	0	27	1.19	NS	-
42	5	14	4	2	2	27	2	6	5	7	7	27	3.21	S	32
43	10	11	2	4	0	27	4	5	7	7	4	27	3.71	S	33
44	18	2	3	4	0	27	8	6	1	5	7	27	2.65	S	34
45	4	16	5	1	1	27	3	2	6	9	7	27	4.13	S	35

46	7	3	6	6	5	27	2	4	1	11	9	27	2.21	S	36
47	5	6	11	0	5	27	4	12	1	6	4	27	0.17	NS	-
48	10	9	4	3	1	27	4	6	7	4	6	27	5.95	S	37
49	13	11	3	0	0	27	3	16	0	4	4	27	3.12	S	38
V	Dimension (6 Statements)											Ethical Conduct Towards Parents			
50	11	7	5	2	2	27	2	1	9	11	4	27	4.24	S	39
51	10	9	4	3	1	27	4	6	7	4	6	27	2.81	S	40
52	14	1	9	2	1	27	2	8	8	2	7	27	3.99	S	41
53	15	3	7	2	0	27	5	5	2	13	2	27	2.72	S	42
54	10	9	2	4	2	27	5	4	3	12	3	27	2.59	S	43
55	10	11	2	4	0	27	5	4	3	12	3	27	3.58	S	44
VI	Dimension (7 Statements)											Ethical Conduct Towards Society			
56	7	12	4	2	2	27	2	5	7	3	10	27	3.61	S	45
57	8	13	6	0	0	27	3	2	3	7	12	27	4.39	S	46
58	12	11	2	0	2	27	8	10	3	2	4	27	1.62	NS	-
59	19	4	4	0	0	27	7	8	5	2	5	27	2.87	S	47
60	12	6	4	2	3	27	6	5	5	4	5	27	5.12	S	48
61	13	3	7	4	0	27	4	5	2	13	3	27	3.99	S	49
62	15	6	3	1	2	27	3	11	8	2	3	27	2.76	S	50
VII	Dimension (10 Statements)											Ethical Conduct Towards Research			
63	13	9	3	1	1	27	2	20	1	2	2	27	2.01	S	51
64	13	9	3	2	0	27	2	20	2	1	2	27	2.86	S	52
65	6	5	5	4	7	27	1	1	7	3	15	27	2.86	S	53
66	11	10	2	4	0	27	11	8	6	2	0	27	3.51	S	54
67	17	7	4	4	0	27	0	0	0	18	9	27	6.26	S	55
68	9	4	7	5	2	27	3	7	5	2	10	27	3.88	S	56
69	3	3	9	2	10	27	1	7	2	12	5	27	4.01	S	57
70	11	4	3	5	4	27	2	3	5	7	10	27	3.56	S	58
71	9	8	5	2	3	27	10	4	2	6	5	27	2.98	S	59
72	7	1	7	2	10	27	1	7	0	12	7	27	3.56	S	60

FINAL DRAFT, SCORING PROCEDURE, AND NORMS

After eliminating 12 statements, the final draft of the professional ethics scale has 60 statements with seven dimensions like ethical conduct towards self (9 statements), ethical conduct towards students (13 statements), ethical conduct towards colleagues (6 statements), ethical conduct towards institution (6 statements), ethical conduct towards parents (9 statements), ethical conduct towards society (6 statements), and ethical conduct towards research (10 statements). The statements of the present scale all are positive in nature. The scale has been allotted marks as 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1 for the responses Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. The total score is the summation of all the scores for sixty items. The minimum and maximum score limits of the research scale were 60 and 300. Norms are developed to transform the raw scores into meaningful interpretation, understandable score range, and universal acceptance. After consulting with the board of subject experts, the norms of the research tool have been arrived based on the Mean \pm 1SD based on the distribution properties of the normal probability curve that contributes 68.26% in its total distribution. Those respondents whose score less than Mean-1SD have lower professional ethics, those respondents whose scores in-between Mean \pm 1SD have average and those respondents whose scores more than Mean+1SD have higher professional ethics.

FINAL TRYOUT - PILOT STUDY AND VALIDATION

A pilot study was conducted to one hundred teacher educators to test the reliability and validity values as a validation process. The inter-item reliability of the Professional Ethics Scale was determined with the help of the split-half method of reliability measures. The scale was divided into two halves and each half was treated as separate test. The odd-numbered items were made into a test and the even-numbered items were made into another test. The reliability of the test by split-half technique (consistency) followed by the use of the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula is found to be 0.761.

The significance of the reliability was tested with t-test. The 't' value 20.11 was significant at 0.01 level. Thus, the reliability was highly significant at 0.01 level. The intrinsic validity is also called as the index of reliability (Guilford, 1954). The formula to be used to determine the intrinsic validity is the square root of its reliability. Thus, the validity of this test is 0.8120. The significance of the validity was tested with 't' test. The 't' value 26.12 was significant at 0.01 level. Therefore, the validity was significant at 0.01 level. Thus, from the two co-efficient, it may be inferred that this test is highly reliable and valid.

CONCLUSION

The researcher is very hopeful that this scale would be helpful to measure professional ethics among teacher educators.

REFERENCES

1. Allen L. Edwards (1957). Techniques of Attitude Scale construction. Bombay: Vakils, Feffer and Simons Private Ltd.
2. BarjeesJeelani& Krishna Kumar, R. (2015). Construction and Standardization of the Teachers Professional Ethics Scale (TPES). International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education, 1(1), 46-49.
3. Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric Methods. New York: McGraw-Hill.
4. National Council for Teacher Education (2010). Competency Based and Commitment Oriented Teacher Education for Quality School Education, New Delhi.
5. Saba Hasan &Fazli Samina. (2009). Professional Ethics in Teacher Education. Indian Journal of Teacher Education Anweshika, 6(2), 1-12.