Vol. 3 *No. 2* *March, 2015* *ISSN: 2320 - 2653*

CONSTRUCTION AND STANDARDIZATION OF THE HIGHER SECONDARY TEACHERS' DECISION MAKING ABILITY SCALE

S. Rebeckal Ranjitham[1] and Dr.N.L.N.Jayanthi[2]
[1]Ph.D Research Scholar, Department of Education
[2]Associate Professor, Department of Education,
Annamalai University, Chidambaram

Abstract

An attempt has been made to construct and standardize the Decision Making Ability scale among the higher secondary school teachers. A well structured scale was administered among them. The sample consists of 100 school teachers randomly selected from the higher secondary schools situated in *Nagapattinam District. Initially it was constructed with* 70 *statements posing a question which* is *related to Decision Making Ability generally. The scale was standardized using* 'r' *test and finally* 35 *statements were retained for the final study. The present research discusses about the development of the scale to measure the level of Decision Making Ability among the higher secondary teachers.*

Key words*: Decision Making Ability, Higher secondary teachers*

Introduction

Decision Making Ability

As breathing is to living, Decision Making Ability is to management decision making is an integral part of the management process. It is the quality of decision that either makes or breaks the organization.

Decision Making Ability is a condition whereby one suffers from unpleasant psychological, social or physical effects of a given career or job. It is exhibited in any physiological, physical or mental response that depicts undesirable changes in one's state of well-being.

Decision making means to make a decision take a decision, or simply 'to decide' a course of action. The verb 'decide' is derived from the Latin prefix 'de' which the means 'off' and the word, 'cacdo' means 'to cut'. Thus both the prefix 'de' and the 'cacdo' taken together means' to cut off' a particular course of action from among a set of possible alternatives. In other words, decision making refers to making a choice among alternative course of action. It is a process through which a course of action is selected as the solution to a specific problem. From this point of view, Shull, De Long and Cummings (1970) defined decision making as follows:" Decision- making is a conscious and human process, involving both individual and social phenomenon based upon factual and premises which concludes with a choice of one behavioural activity from among one or more alternatives with the intention of moving toward some desired state of affairs."

Ability grouping the practice of sectioning pupils into relatively homogeneous groups according to their scholastic ability (Sharma, A.S (2005). Ability: The power to

perform an act. An ability may be innate or it may be the result of practice. Ability, as distinguished from aptitude, implies that an act can be performed how, whereas aptitude implies that training or education will be necessary before an act can be performed at some future time. Capacity, often used as a synonym for ability usually implies an ability that only under optimal conditions of training.

Types of decision making ability will be follow:

- Technical decision
- Managerial decision
- Institutional decision

Need for Construction of the Tool

The decision making process includes social, cognitive and cultural obstacles to successfully negotiating dilemmas. It has been suggested that becoming more aware of these obstacles allows one to better anticipate and overcome them, every decision making process produces a final choice that may or may not prompt action. Hence, for the present study the investigator intended to construct the decision making ability tools of higher secondary school teachers, as no other tools is available.

Objective

The main objective of the study is to develop a research tool which measures the level of Decision Making Ability among the higher secondary school teachers.

Methodology

From the 70 items 35 items have been selected. The Decision Making Ability final scale consists of 35 items. The tool can get a maximum score of 35 and a minimum score of O. After having constructed the Decision Making Ability scale, the investigator administered it to a sample of 100 teachers working in the higher secondary schools of Nagapattinam District in Tamil Nadu. The respondents were asked to put a tick mark (✔) within the brackets which is against the statement's answers. Then all the test papers of 100 higher secondary teachers were scored carefully and the test papers were arranged in the descending order from highest to lowest score and subjected to statistical treatment.

Item analysis

Item analysis is an important step in the standardization of a scale. A pilot study is to find out the items which form the basis for item selection in order to build up the final study. Then 27% of the subjects with the highest total scores and 27% of subjects with the lowest total scores were sorted out for the purpose of the item selection. Decision making ability scale for higher secondary school teachers has been constructed by the investigator. A lot of literature on Decision making ability, test construction procedures were used for

the construction of the tool. The Decision making ability was constructed after having discussion with teachers of schools and colleges, psychologists and experts in the field of education.

The test has been prepared on two -point rating scale based on yes or no type. Initially 70 positive and negative statements were prepared in both Tamil and English medium. The scoring procedure for the tool with the option Yes 1 and No 0 for positive statements. For negative statements it is reversed as No 1 and Yes 0. The minimum score for the tool is '0' and maximum score of the tool is 70.

Positive Statements	Negative Statements
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30,31, 32, 33, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 67, 68, 69, 70	8, 9, 10, 24, 25, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 44, 52, 59, 64, 65, 66

Item Analysis

The tool prepared by the investigator was administered to a sample of 100 higher secondary school teachers. Teachers were asked to mark their opinion among the given alternatives. Each statement has two alternative responses; namely Yes or No, the values given to these two alternatives are 1, 0 respectively. Scoring was done for all the statements.

Item analysis was adopted for the final selection of statements. The total scores were calculated separately and they were arranged in the descending order. The top 27 % and the bottom 27% of scores alone were taken into account. The difference in means of the high and low groups for each item was tested for significance by computing the t-ratios. Items with 't' value of 1.96 and above were selected for the final tool. Thus, the final tool contains seventy items; the list of items with the 't' value is presented in Table.
3.3 - Split -half method also used to find out the consistency of the test. It has been given in table.

Table 1: Shows Item Analysis Decision Making Ability Scale

Statement Number	t	Selected / Not Selected
1.	1.000	Not Selected
2.	1.803	Not selected
3.	2.387	Selected
4.	1.803	Not selected
5.	1.442	Not selected
6.	1.000	Not selected
7.	1.000	Not selected
8.	1.991	Selected
9.	1.081	Not selected

10.	1.705	Not selected
11.	1.803	Not selected
12.	1.000	Not selected
13.	1.B03	Not selected
14.	2.726	Selected
15.	3.362	Selected
16.	4.561	Selected
17.	2.126	Selected
18.	1.442	Not selected
19.	2.431	Selected
20.	2.126	Selected
21.	1.000	Not selected
22.	1.019	Not selected
23.	2.975	Selected
24.	3.309	Selected
25.	2.975	Selected
26.	1.000	Not selected
27.	1.803	Not selected
28.	1.442	Not selected
29.	1.442	Not selected
30.	1.000	Not selected
31.	2.431	Selected
32.	1.442	Not selected
33.	3.911	Selected
34.	1.081	Not selected
35.	2.726	Selected
36.	3.606	Selected
37.	2.153	Selected
38.	1.803	Not selected
39.	2.975	Selected
40.	4.228	Selected
41.	2.126	Selected
42.	1.000	Not selected
43.	1.803	Not selected
44.	2.975	Selected
45.	1.803	Not selected
46.	1.408	Not selected
47.	1.000	Not selected
48.	1.442	Not selected
49.	5.701	Selected
50.	2.623	Selected
51.	1.803	Not selected
52.	1.749	Not selected
53.	2.431	Selected
54.	1.803	Not selected

55.	1.442	Not selected
56.	1.749	Not selected
57.	0.280	Not selected
58.	3.309	Selected
59.	3.017	Selected
60.	2.934	Selected
61.	3.606	Selected
62.	2.431	Selected
63.	4.371	Selected
64.	3.080	Selected
65.	2.431	Selected
66.	3.606	Selected
67.	0.585	Not selected
68.	3.908	Selected
69.	2.431	Selected
70.	3.26	Selected

Reliability

A test score is called reliable when one has reasons for believing the score to be stable and trust worthy. Stability and trust worthiness depend upon the degree to which the score is an index of "true-ability" - is free of chance error. Test-retest (repetition) method has been used to arrive the reliability of the tool. Repetition of a test is the simplest method of determining the agreement between the two set of scores, the test is given and repeated for the same group, and the correlation is computed between the first and second set of scores. Given sufficient time between the two tests the decision making ability results show the stability of the test scores. The value of correlation co-efficient shows that there is high positive degree of correlation between the two tests and are given in Table 2.

Table 2: Shows reliability co-efficient of Decision Making Ability

S. No.	Method of Reliability	Values
1.	Test-retest (Repetition)	0.81
2	Split - Half	0.72

Validity

The first essential quality of valid test is that it should be highly reliable. Besides, the content or face validity, the investigator intended to arrive intrinsic validity. Guilford (1950) defined the intrinsic validity as “the degree to which a test measures what it measures". The square root of reliability gives the intrinsic validity. Therefore, the intrinsic validity of Decision Making Ability scale in 0.81.

Final Tool

Description of the Final Tool

The final tool with 20 positive and 15 negative statements was prepared in both Tamil and English medium.

The scoring procedure for the tool with the option Yes 1 and No 0 for positive statements. For negative statements it is reversed as No 1 and Yes O. The minimum score for the tool is '0' and maximum score of the tool is 35.

Positive Statements	Negative Statements
1,3,4,5,7,12,13,18,19,21,22,23,24,26, 27,28,29,33,34,35	2,6,8,9,10,11,14,15,16,17, 20,25,30,31,32

Conclusion

The scale will be very useful to measure the level of Decision Making Ability among the higher secondary school teachers.

References

1. Guilford J.P. and Benjamin Fruchter (1973) Fundamental Statistics in psychology and Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
2. Garrett, H.E. (1973) Statistics in Psychology and Education. Bombay: Vakils, Pfeffer and Simons Pvt Ltd.
3. Minas, C. (Feb 2000) Stress at Work: a Sociological Perspective: The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology. 37(1) 119.
4. Best John (1977) Research in education Research in Education (10th Edition) 435 pages.
5. Best J.W. & Kam. (1992), research in education (VI edition), New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited.
6. Sharma, A.S (2005) Dictionary of psychology Published, ISBN (vol.1.).