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Abstract:
An attempt has been made to construct and standardize the teacher's professional ethics scale among the higher secondary teachers. A well structured scale was administered among them. The sample consists of 100 higher secondary teachers randomly selected from the higher secondary schools situated in Cuddalore District. Initially it was constructed with 65 statements covering six areas related to professional ethics of higher secondary teachers. The scale was standardized using 't' test and finally 55 statements were retained for the final study. The present research discusses about the development of the scale to measure the level of professional ethics among the higher secondary teachers.
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Introduction:
Ethics is a system of moral principles. The term 'Ethics' is derived from the Greek word 'ethos' which means custom, habit, character or disposition. They affect how people make decisions and lead their lives. Ethics is concerned with what is good for individuals and society and is also described as moral philosophy.

Operational Definition:
Professional Ethics is a set of desired moral standards which each individual is expected to observe in his/her professional life. Professional ethics of teachers means the basic values and conception of good practice that constitute principles, guidelines or norms of morality which a teacher has to follow in teaching profession while dealing with students, parents, community and higher authorities. The Ethical principles provide the base to differentiate between desirable and undesirable conduct of behavior.

Objective:
The main objective of the study is to develop a research tool which measures the level of professional ethics among the higher secondary teachers.

Content Analysis:
In order to construct the tool the first draft was revised by an expert committee comprising of the research guide Dr. R. Krishna Kumar, Professor, Department of Education along with some other experts belonging to the field of Education and Sociology. The tool was analyzed by the experts for the relevance of areas, item difficulty, language accuracy and clarity. Each and every item was analyzed and the relevancy of the items was judged by the experts. Finally, after a careful scrutiny of the statements, on the basis of 95% agreement among the experts, 65 items were chosen to be included in the initial draft. Thus the initial format of Teachers Professional Ethics Scale having 65 items covering six areas namely Teacher-Profession Aspect, Teacher-Society Aspect, Teacher-Colleague Aspect, Teacher-Administration Aspect, Teacher-Parent Aspect and Teacher-Society Aspect were constructed on five point scale of Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. It included both the
positive and the negative statements.

**Preliminary Tryout:**

For the purpose of tryout the Teachers Professional Ethics Scale was administered on a sample of 100 higher secondary teachers by applying random sampling procedure selected from the higher secondary schools situated in Cuddalore District, Tamil Nadu. The respondents were asked to put a tick mark (√) in the appropriate column which they feel as the most appropriate one without leaving any statement unanswered.

**Scoring:**

The individual score for the 100 sample was found out. The scoring procedure as ‘5’ for ‘strongly agree’, ‘4’ for ‘agree’, ‘3’ for ‘undecided’, ‘2’ for ‘disagree’ and ‘1’ for ‘strongly disagree’ were assigned for the positive statements. It is in reverse order for the negative statements. Thus the maximum score for the statement is 5 and the minimum is 1.

**Item Analysis:**

Item analysis is an important step in the standardization of a scale. The test papers were arranged in the descending order from highest to lowest score. Top 27% of the subjects with the highest total score and the bottom 27% of the subjects with the lowest total score served as criterion groups were sorted out and subjected to statistical treatment for the purpose of the item selection. For all the 65 items ‘t’ values were calculated. Items with ‘t’ value above 2.58 and exceeding 2.58 (i.e., significant at 0.1 level) were accepted and those with below 2.58 were rejected. Finally, from the 65 items 55 items were selected for the final study as shown below in Table - 1.

**Table - 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>‘t’ – value</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.467</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1.940</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>2.294</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2.494</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>4.699</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>5.827</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>6.704</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1.760</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>5.707</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4.561</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2.745</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>6.907</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>3.918</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>5.781</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>5.648</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>3.900</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>5.030</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>3.780</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>8.293</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>3.619</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>4.696</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>5.259</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>6.364</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>6.488</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3.894</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>4.205</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>-1.692</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>3.800</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>7.139</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>4.013</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>6.280</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>2.259</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>5.750</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>5.190</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>5.458</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>5.692</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>4.618</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>5.669</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>4.820</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>3.364</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>4.121</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>4.183</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>6.964</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>6.717</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>5.631</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>4.506</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>6.285</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>4.699</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>7.019</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>5.593</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>7.870</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>5.237</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>3.968</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>5.321</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>5.896</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>5.996</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>7.586</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>4.883</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>-2.567</td>
<td>Not selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>6.062</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>6.548</td>
<td>Selected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability:
The concept of reliability suggests both stability and consistency of measurement. The reliability of the scale has been found out by using test retest method. The ‘r’ value has been found to be 0.95. Hence the test is reliable.

Validity:
The validity of the tool is ascertained by the expert’s opinion. They have ascertained the content validity, construct validity and face validity. The scale was given to the experts in order to find out its content validity. The experts agreed that the items in the scale provided adequate coverage about the concept. The scale has construct validity, as the items were selected using ‘t’-value according to Henry Garrett. The intrinsic validity of the tool was found to be 0.97.

Final Draft:
Finally, it has been found out that among 65 items, 10 items were rejected and 55 items were selected for the final format of Teachers Professional Ethics Scale (TPES).

Conclusion:
The scale will be very useful to measure the level of professional ethics among the higher secondary teachers.
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