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SUMMARY

Study of behaviour is not new. Behaviour may be overt or covert, and are assumed to be the result of instinct, need of some other factors. In Hindu systems, behaviour is considered as function of sense and action organs. There are five types of sense organs viz, sight, hearing, touch, small and taste. Action organs are also five namely, speech, hands, feet, excertory and generative organs. Functions of the sense and action organs are controlled by 'vivek' (discriminating wisdom) through manas (mind).

Indian philosophy also assumes that desire (Kama), wrath (Krodha), affection (moha), avarice (lobha), fear (bhaya) and envy (irsya) are the six enemies capture the mind. Interaction of captured mind and fascinated functions of organs generate various physical and physiological needs. However, at concrete level, needs are generated either by the physiological process of organs or by demands of some external factors. Our organs tend to satisfy the needs by involving in their loving objects. In other words, objects are attractive goals for the organs. Discriminating wisdom (DW) has a control over functions of the organs. DW analyses whether emerged need is rational, and whether a specific course of action is rational to achieve the rational goal. It is also assumed that DW exercises its control through mind.

This philosophical explanation exhibits following ideas:

1. Necessities are the root cause of all behaviours.

2. Occurrence to satisfy a specific need depends on the attractiveness of the behaviour.

3. A person tends to act an attractive behaviour or a behaviour that is related to an attractive goal. But DW continuously evaluates the rationale
of necessity of behaviour, and as a result, attraction of the goal is moderated, and decision to perform or not to perform the behaviour is taken.

This explanation is philosophical in nature but seems to be logical, intuitive and practical.

Singh (1997) has tried to verify the above ideas, by conducting two studies to define discriminating wisdom operationally and to explore the factors of DW. The attempt had also been made to explore the functions of the DW. On the basis of the study, he defined the concept of DW as a cognitive ability that analyses various behaviours, their situations and procedures, obstacles and impediments in the way to reveal their positive and negative impacts on oneself and others. Though, it control and regulates emotions and mood, it generally regulates non-habitual and non-emotional behaviours. Singh (1997) also discussed that DW covers a wide range of evaluations of behaviours. He identified for four factors of DW, i.e. valence, attitude, control belief and subjective norm.

Though, discriminating wisdom involves various dimensions on the basis of which one can evaluate whether he should participate in a particular action, studies on decision making reveals that people differ on the use of various dimensions of DW. Actually, the work of discriminating wisdom is to decide specific course of actions. In other words, its function is to make decisions. People do not evaluate in all respects, and thus, make errors. It is a difficult task to discriminate among all alternatives without any error. As a result outcomes of alternatives vary over time and situation. Existing literature indicated that different persons have different orientations while evaluating different alternatives.

Evaluation of all aspects of an alternative falls into the category of rationals decision making. But evaluation of all aspects of aspects of an alternative is not possible at many times due to various reasons. For example, students consider external influence, availability of financial aid and internal influence (Diamond, 1992)
advice of friends, advice of teachers, prospect of landing a job, academic reputation and reasonable cost (Smith & Mathews, 1991), good examination result and good learning facilities (West, Varlam & Scott, 1991) at the time of selecting their school for further studies. Parents consider some other factors like personal attention, strong curriculum and small classes (Tanner & Griffeth, 1991), discipline, good examination result, quality of teachers, distance from homes, pupil-teacher relationship and types of school, i.e. single sex and mix sex (West and Varlaam, 1991; Hunter, 1991) in selection of school for their children. In respect of contraceptive use, young unmarried girls evaluate partners influence, salience of pregnancy, positive side effect of contraceptive oral pills (Weisman, Plichta, Noothanson, Chase, et al, 1991), perception of pregnancy risk, knowledge of reproductive biology, knowledge of contraceptive options (Researchesky & Genrer, 1991). Researches indicate that purchasing is a complex behaviour includes evaluation of functional, conditional, social, emotional and epistemic use of material (Shefu, Newman & Gross, 1991). Size of price and discount, familiarity of the brand (Moone & Disharsky, 1989), and perceived satisfaction and price (Holjer & Chbbwalgran, 1988), etc.

A critical analysis of Singh (1997) and above studies indicates that people have different orientations at the time of evaluations of different alternatives. It may be concluded that people differ on discriminating wisdom orientations. On the basis of different dimensions of evaluations, one can be classified for his wisdom orientation.

Above description is hypothetical and has to be empirically tested. The present study, therefore was designed to explore the discriminating wisdom orientations, and to prepare a scientific measure to assess individual differences regarding wisdom orientation.

The present research included its two parts. Part I included the study to examine (i) whether discriminating wisdom is an enduring characteristics, (ii) whether factors of the wisdom are normally distributed, and (iii) whether
subjects would show any wisdom orientation. Part II was based on the results of part one. It was assumed that wisdom orientation is a normally distributed psychological attribute, and thus, is could be measured. The second study, therefore, was an attempt to develop a psychological tool to measure the wisdom orientations. A brief description of both the parts is given below:

STUDY: PART ONE

In part one, 300 subjects were taken from heterogeneous groups formed on the basis of different age, sex and occupations. The tool prepared by Singh (1997) was used that consisted of 18 items related to 9 family and 9 work related situations. Each item is presented with 28 evaluative dimensions (variables). Subjects had to rate themselves how much they consider various variables (evaluative dimensions) at times of taking decisions in different situations. A six point rating scale ranging from 'very much' to 'not at all' was used with each variable. In scoring procedure "5" is assigned to the response 'very much' and a score of "0" is assigned to the response 'not at all'. Scores of 4, 3, 2 and 1 are assigned to the response of 'much', 'average', 'less', and 'very less' respectively.

Singh (1997) has explored that all 28 variables were related to four factors. A brief description of the factors is given below:

FACTOR-I VALENCE OF THE WORK

Variables

1. Necessity of the work
2. Importance of the work
3. Beneficial/harmful for self at present

FACTOR-II ATTITUDE

Variables

1. Right/ wrong
2. Appropriate/inappropriate
3. Moral/immoral
4. Good/bad
5. Like/dislike
6. Interest/lack of interest
7. Useful/useless.

**FACTOR-III  CONTROL BELIEF**

**Variables**

1. Self ability
2. Estability of the situation
3. Effective working/Control over the procedure
4. Knowledge
5. Facilities available
6. Difficulties
7. Expectation of success
8. Standard of the work/thing
9. Far/near (place)
10. Ability to pay cost of the work.

**FACTOR-IV  SUBJECTIVE NORM & SOCIAL CONCERN**

**Variables**

1. Need for others
2. Beneficial/harmful for others
3. Violent/non violent
4. Whether follows social norms
5. Whether others like
6. Importance of the instigator or person concerned
7. Social approval.

First of all, subjects were contacted individually and informed about the purpose of the study. A copy of the tool was supplied to the subjects for their perusal. Proper instructions were given to the subjects after seeking their willingness to participate in the study. Subjects were provided the test with a request to spare some time per day and response on the test within 3-4 days. Subject were supplied the copies of the test that were collected from the subjects after few days.

Item wise scoring was done for each of the 28 variables in first step of the scoring. Singh (1997) has shown that items given in the tool were significantly internally consistent. The scoring, therefore, was done for the four factors by adding the score of related variables for all the 18 items. As a result, scores for the valence factor was ranged from 0 to 360 (18 item x 4 variables x 5). The range of total scores for attitude factor was 0 to 630 (18 items x 7 variables x 5). Similarly, range of total scores were 0 to 900 (18 items x 10 variables x 5) for control belief and 0 to 630 (18 items x 7 variables x 5) for subjective norm and social concern.

To examine the first problem whether discriminating wisdom is an enduring characteristics, internal consistencies were calculated by considering the individual score on each variable separately across various situations. For this purpose 3-3 Cronbach alphas' (α) were calculated for each variable considering three types of combinations of 18 items, i.e. related to family, organization and total. Obtained results indicated that responses of the subjects on each of the 28 variables were consistent across various situation. It was, therefore concluded that discriminating wisdom is an enduring attribute.

To examine whether factors of the wisdom are normally distributed factor wise individual scores were calculated, and were arranged in frequency
distributions. Taking range of raw score on the four factors into considerations, class intervals were decided and frequencies of scores were counted separately for the four factors. Mid point of class interval, mean and standard deviation were calculated. Mid scores were converted into standard scores. Further, expected frequency for different Z scores were calculated. On the basis of mid point of different class interval and frequencies (obtained and expected) separate figures were sketched for the four factors. For this purpose mid scores were taken on 'x' axis while frequencies were taken on 'y' axis, and thus, two separate curves of observed and expected frequencies were drawn. Then skewness and kurtosis of the distribution was calculated to examine the nature of normality of the distribution.

Another analysis Chi-square ($\chi^2$) analysis was also employed separately for the four factors to examine deviation of the obtained frequencies from the normal distribution.

A close perusal of the results indicated that four factors were found to be either normally distributed or near to normal distribution.

To examine the third problem whether subjects would differ on different wisdom orientations, total scores of the subjects for the four factors were given weight. Since number of variables for the different factors are different, it was decided to divide total scores for a factor by number of items X number of variables in the factor. Obtained scores were become comparable. Since about all obtained scores were in decimal which might create some problems in the calculation, it was, therefore, decided to round the scores. The rounded figures for the four factors ranged from 0 to 5. A score of 5 indicated very much consideration and, thus, very strong orientation. A score of 4 indicated strong whereas scores of 3, 2, 1 and 0 indicated average, weak, very weak and non-orientation, respectively.

There were different combinations of the scores on the 4 factors. A total of 15 combinations were possible for the 4 factors. These combinations were:

(i) Valence (V) / Attitude (A) / Control Belief (C) / Subjective norm (S) [VACS],
(ii) VAC, (iii) VAS, (iv) VCS, (V) ACS, (vi) VA, (vii) VC, (viii) VS, (ix) AC (x) AS, (xi) CS (xii) V, (xiii) A (xiv) C and (xv) S: Some subjects showed very strong orientation towards all the four factors while some showed very strong orientation towards 3 or 2 or only one factor. Subjects in different numbers showed average or week or very weak orientation towards the different factors in different combinations. There were some subjects who showed "non-orientation" towards any factors.

Part one of the study has established that discriminating wisdom is enduring and normally distributed characteristic. Individuals showed different discriminating wisdom orientations and they differ significantly on the wisdom orientation. The second part of the study was designed to prepare a tool to assess discriminating wisdom orientations.

**STUDY: PART TWO**

A brief description of the procedure in this regard is as under:

- **SELECTION OF ITEM AREAS AND ITEMS**

First of all item areas were decided. It was decided to edit item to be related to real life situations. For this purpose, choice of curriculum, choice of school, selection of rental house, loaning, purchasing, selection of hospital, seeking help, amusement, taking advantage of promotion, making relationship, taking adventure were taken as item areas and items were written related to these areas. Each item is a statement pasing a specific problem situation and a decision has to be taken. The statement is followed by four alternatives related to the four factors of the discriminating wisdom i.e. valence, control belief, attitude, subjective norm. A question is asked to the subjects in the end of the statement: "how much will you consider the following four variables when you are going to decide a course of action for solution of the problem. Subjects had to give their responses on 6-point rating scale ranging from 'very much' to 'not at all'. In the initial stage, about 75 items were memographed.
PRE-TRY OUT

In this stage, all edited items were carefully analysed for their languages and suitability. For this purpose, 20 subjects taken from clarks, officers and students were administered the first draft. Subjects were requested to have a critical vision in the matter and give suggestions whether items were clear to them and how it could be changed to be come easy and clear. Suggestions of the subjects were sought and their responses were recorded.

On the basis of the suggestions language of some items were changed while some items were dropped as they could not served the purpose. Ultimately 32 items were selected for the further analyses.

TRY-OUT

To establish discrimination power of the items item-analyses were done. For this purpose, 400 subjects were taken from the groups of student, clarks, executives, teachers, labours women interpnours, and housewifes. Subject's educational levels were ranged from higher school to doctorat while age were ranged from 16 to 76 years. Addited 32 items were administered to the subjects. Item wise scoring was done and factor-wise totals (for the four factors) were work out by adding scores on the 32 items. Thus, four scores were obtained for a subjects. Discriminating power of each item was calculated separately for the four factors of the wisdom.

To established discrimination power, 25 per cent upper and 25 per cent lower extream groups were formed separately, on the basis of total scores on the four factors and item wise 't' ratios (taking upper and lower groups) were calculated separately for the four factors. Obtained "t" ratios were found to be significant for 30 items that indicated their significant discrimination power, and thus, they were retained in the final set of the scale. Remaining two items were dropped from the scale.
RELIABILITY, VALIDITY AND NORMS

Reliability of the scale was established by employing three methods. i.e., test-retest, split-half and rational-equivalent methods. The test-retest (after 4 months) reliability were found to be .96, .92, .90 and .79 for valence, attitude, control belief and subjective norm respectively. The split-half reliability were establish .89, .83, .85 and .81 for valence, attitude, control belief and subjective norm, respectively. Similarly Chronback alpha for the four factors (i.e. valence, attitude, control and subjective norm) were found to be 70, 62. 56. and .39, respectively.

Since the factors of the DW were taken on the basis of factor analysis, the scale has factorial validity. Item of the scale were also selected on the basis of item analysis that indicated item validity of the scale. Another method was employed to establish validity of the scale. Known groups were compared on the scale. For this purpose successful and relatively unsuccessfull persons in the society were compared on the discriminating wisdom orientation. It was found that successful persons had different orientations from the unsuccessful individuals. The scale has convergent and discriminant validity as successful individuals scored upper stanine on all the four factors while unsuccessful persons scored lower stanine.

Stanine norms were established on 400 persons separately for the four factors.

Wisdom Orientation Score of the Subjects

To obtained wisdom orientation score of a subject raw scores of the subjects on the four factors are converted into stanine, and are arranged in the sequence of valence attitude, control belief and subjective norm. This is the wisdom orientation scores of an individual in which the first number is indicative of valence orientation, and second is of attitude orientation. Similarly, third and fourth numbers are indicative of control belief and social norm orientations.