Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Issue 42, Winter 2011, 187-206

Developing a School Institutionalization Scale: A Study on Validity and Reliability (Form for Private Schools)

Habib Özgan*

Suggested Citation:
Özgan, H. (2011). Developing a School Institutionalization Scale: A Study on Validity and Reliability (Form for Private Schools). *Egitim Arastirmalari-Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 42,* 187-206.

Abstract

Problem Statement: As institutionalization is a requisite in all organizations, so it is in all schools. Institutionalization enables schools to operate in line with their objectives and managerial processes (planning, decision making, organizing, directing, coordination and evaluation) more effectively. The spread of private schools introduced competition to the education sector. As a natural consequence of heightened competition, it became a requirement for schools to be more efficient and effective.

Purpose of Study: The purpose of the present research is to develop, as well as perform, validity and reliability analyses of the School Institutionalization Scale (SIS), which can be employed to evaluate the institutionalization of private schools.

Methods: The research population consists of private schools in the city center of Gaziantep, and the study group is composed of seven randomly selected private schools (223 teachers). Based on relevant literature, an item pool has been prepared. The content validity of the scale has been established by consulting field experts. The construct validity of the scale has been set through a factor analysis.

Findings and Results: The scale consists of a total of 45 items and six factors. The general reliability coefficient of the scale is a Cronbach Alpha of .96, which is rather high. Reliability coefficients calculated with the Cronbach Alpha vary in all sub-scales between .74 and .94. Considering the fact that the projected level of reliability for all measurement tools in research is .70, it can be stated that the scale's level of reliability for all its sub-dimensions

*Assist. Prof. Dr. Gaziantep University, Faculty of Education Department of Educational Sciences, Gaziantep-Turkey, ozgan@gantep.edu.tr

is sufficient. The sub-dimensions of the scale have been named as Cultural Strength, Specialization, Social Responsibility, Adaptability, Formalizing and Consistency. Explained variance is at an acceptable level with a ratio of 62.82%. Accordingly, it can be asserted that each item has a discrimination index in detecting the institutionalization levels of their schools.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The School Institutionalization Scale is highly reliable and possesses sufficient internal consistency. Hence, the findings support the theory that the Institutionalization Scale has sufficient validity to detect the institutionalization levels of schools. It is suggested that future studies focus on developing and testing through different samplings the validity of the internal consistency of the scale.

Keywords: School Institutionalization Scale, private schools

In order for the organizations to adapt to the external changes (economical, technical, legal, social, etc.), to give quick reactions and to perform fast adaptations, they are expected to go through a reconstruction and functionalize the organizational mechanisms that shall adapt to this process. One of the most noteworthy tools of such organization development is institutionalization. Selznick (1957) explains the term institutionalization as 'the process of development of the unique qualities of an organization through the contributions of its own personnel and the characteristics of its environment' (cited in Alpay et al., 2008). According to Colyvas and Powell (2006), institutionalization is the formalization of a practice within a legal framework, reestablishing its application style and reevaluating the application resources. Kshetri (2009) defines institutionalization as the process of attributing legitimacy and value to any practice. In the view of Dilbaz (2005), institutionalization is managing an organization according to certain rules and procedures known by everyone in the organization from the bottom to the top grades. In this way, the organization adopts a distinct identity and turns into a whole piece that is composed of interactive parts acknowledged by the whole environment. Flores-Kastanis (2009) used the term "institutionalization" to refer to the process by which social practices and arrangements become sufficiently regular and continuous in a given context to be considered as relatively permanent features of the environment in which they take place.

There are two institutionalization approaches: rational institutionalization and institutionalization analysis. The rational institutionalization approach is merely related to rules and procedures. The institutionalization analysis approach, on the other hand regards, organizations as social entities. Rather than on laws and policies, it focuses on human resources and the need to provide utmost contribution of these resources to the organization (Ak, 2010). Theories of rational institutionalization and institutionalization analysis have emphasized the relations of organizations with their environment and the effect of environmental culture in the formation of organizational structure. Once again, both theories advocate the necessity for an organization to be rational, and both underline the adoption of institutionalization as

the common style of behavior amongst all personnel (Kangal, 2007). According to Colyvas and Powell (2006), in any organization, responsibility awareness of the personnel is the primary requisite to institutionalize its principles and practices.

In relevant literature dimensions of institutionalization, it is analyzed in different ways. As stated by Apaydın (2007), dimensions of institutionalization are: formalizing, professionalization, accountability, cultural strength, and consistency. On the other hand, according to Arslan (2009), these dimensions are autonomy, adaptability, internal dynamism and consistency. Çiftçi (2006), however, analyzed organizational institutionalization in a single dimension.

Professionalization is establishing in an organization practice fields where the professionals can work--structuring a management system free from the decisions of company founders and family members and providing a suitable working environment for professionals. Unless such an environment can be provided, the professionals shall not be employed long-term in the organization, and they shall fail to be efficient in the organization.

Social responsibility is the compliance of organization activities and behaviors with relevant legislation and social ethical values. While executing their activities, organizations should prioritize social benefits. Accountability necessitates a clear definition of rules and responsibilities relevant to the management (Kiracı & Alkara, 2009). Social responsibility attributes legitimacy to the organization and creates a feeling of trust in the environment.

Adaptability is the constant analysis of transforming environmental conditions and the adaptation of organizational goals, organizational structure, employee qualities, organizational technology and service methods and styles to this transformation (Çiftçi, 2006). Adaptability is the capability of an organization to adapt to changes in the environment, or more significantly, the capacity to reshape a particular environment.

Formalizing is the written record of the preset definitions within an organization regarding who shall execute what in which manner. Formalizing establishes stability, control and coordination within an organization. Through formalization, organizations attain structures that enable a better-coordinated execution of rules and procedures.

Autonomy is the capacity of organizations to make and implement their own decisions. That means it is possible to claim the institutionalization of an organization with respect to its dependency on another organization or autonomy. Internal dynamism refers to the capacity of an organization to form microstructures for the aim of object achievement and environment control (Arslan, 2009).

There are certain indicators pointing to the formation of institutionalization which are as follows: organization constitution, professionalization, effective organizational structure, delegation of authority, authorization, management approach, decision making style and establishing a useful communication system (Yazıcıoğlu & Koç, 2009). According to Karpuzoğlu (2002), the criteria employed in detecting institutionalization levels of organizations are simplicity, differentiation,

flexibility and independency. Gafney and Varma-Nelson (2008), on the other hand, advocate that institutionalization indicators are attachment, financing, perceived success, appropriateness of institution missions and practices, and skeleton crew.

Institutionalization or un-institutionalization is significant in terms of both integral unity of organizations themselves and their integration with the external environment (Özler et al., 2007). Institutionalized organizations (1) go through a transformation with the environment, (2) gain knowledge regarding this change, and (3) develop applicable standards specific to the new situation (Bilgin, 2007). Through institutionalization, organizations can systematize their activities and perform their applications within a certain set of rules. Systematization of activities covers presetting all policies regarding organizational activities and systematic order of these policies through regulations, declarations and similar procedures to guide the practice stage (Hacısalihoğlu, 2007). Furthermore, through institutionalization, organizations find an opportunity to work with professionals, make long term plans, use their resources more efficiently, keep updated about modern and advanced technologies more quickly, and make better use of modern and advanced technologies.

As institutionalization is a requisite in all organizations, so it is in all schools. Institutionalization enables the schools to operate in line with their objectives and managerial processes (planning, decision making, organizing, directing, coordination and evaluation) more effectively. Institutionalization ensures detection, adoption and application of the operation principles of all sub-units at the school to secure that these principles are fixed regardless of people, giving prominence not to people but the school, creating a periodic and systematic working environment as well as a hierarchical, tolerant and democratic atmosphere (Türkoğlu, 2009).

Institutionalization is necessary both for private and state schools. However, in state schools, it has happened in a limited way. Public institutions' frame for work that is arranged according to laws, prevents any studies about institutionalization. Things to do for institutionalization are blocked by laws and regulations. The fact that teachers, managers and other workers are assigned according to appointments; decisions are made from the center; and workers do not take part in decision-making prevents studies on institutionalization. These handicaps caused this study to be done for private schools.

Private schools are a kind of family corporation. The board of trustees and founders are directly effective in the school's management. That the board of trustees and managers are effective in management may cause emotional behaviors and flexibility in carrying out the assignments and decision-making process. Assignments at private schools, people's responsibilities, hiring and firing are determined according to relationships. Running of the private schools, culture, and conflicts among members may affect the schools' success and progression. The schools having a strong culture, standardization of applications, and responsibility towards its workers should be determined by certain rules. Therefore, this study was carried out by thinking that problems in the institutionalization of private schools are significant.

Many institutionalization studies have been conducted on family businesses and SMEs (small- and medium-scale enterprises) (Ulukan, 2005; Çiftçi, 2006; Apaydın, 2008; Apaydın, 2009; Ak, 2010). However, no research has been found measuring institutionalization levels in education institutions where institutionalization bears great significance. Consequently, the need for a scale measuring the institutionalization level of education institutions has surfaced. Within the framework of this requisite, the purpose of present research is to develop a measurement tool to detect institutionalization levels of private schools.

Method

Sample

The population is twelve private primary and high schools in the city center of Gaziantep in the 2009-2010 educational year. The sample was chosen randomly. The scale was applied to all the teachers in seven schools. Deficient and incorrect questionnaires were not evaluated. Two hundred twenty-three teachers (female 114, male 109) were evaluated. One hundred thirty-four of the teachers are working at primary schools, 47 of them in Anatolian high schools, and 42 of them in science high schools.

Developing a Measurement Tool

The purpose of this research is to construct a measurement tool detecting institutionalization levels of private schools. In the research, below-stated steps have been taken in the process of developing a measurement tool.

Formation of an item pool. To form an item pool, a literature scan has been conducted at first (Bayer, 2005; Ulukan, 2005; Çiftçi, 2006; Apaydın, 2008; Apaydın, 2009; Ak, 2010). Subsequently, the measurement tools developed by Wallace (1995), Çiftçi (2006), Türk (2007) and Arslan (2009) to detect institutionalization levels of companies and Small- and Medium-Scale Enterprises (SMEs) have been examined, and items have been constructed through these measurement tools. Additionally, interviews have been made with five school principles about the expected qualities in an institutionalized school. At the end of this whole process, a draft form consisting of a total of 88 items has been prepared.

Content validity. In the present study, a content validity of scale has been established by consulting field experts. A draft form has been evaluated by professionals in the field of educational sciences (Measurement and Evaluation, Program Developing, Education Management). Subsequent to evaluations, the scale of which draft form consisted of 88 items was decreased to 58 items. Turkish syntax and semantics of the items in the measurement tool have been checked and corrected by experts.

Validity and reliability. In determining the suitability of the data set in terms of factor analysis, correlation coefficients between variables have been analyzed.

The higher the correlations between variables, the higher the factor of possibility of shared form (Kalaycı, 2008). Construct validity of scale has been established via factor analysis. To detect the applicability of data-to-factor analysis and sufficiency of sampling, Barlett Sphericity and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) tests have been conducted. If KMO is above .60 and the Barlett Sphericity test is meaningful, the data are suitable for factor analysis (Büyüköztürk, 2008). In the study, to establish clearance and meaning in the interpretation factor has been exposed to an axis of rotation. As a result of the axis of rotation, while the weights of items increase in one factor, their weights in the other factor decrease; hence, the factors determine the items that have a strong correspondance, and the factors can be interpreted more comfortably (Büyüköztürk, 2008). Consequently, during the rotation phase of factor analysis, the Varimax technique has been applied. In the present study, item weight value has been found to be 0.35 and above. In this study, if one item has a high weight value in both factors, then it is eliminated from the scale. The expectation is to obtain the highest difference between the highest and second-highest weight value of an item. The projected difference of the high weight value is at least 0.10 (Büyüköztürk, 2008). Accordingly, the items in which the differences between weight values on both factors are below 0.10 have been eliminated from the scale.

To detect internal consistency, or in other terms, the homogeneity of the scale items of SIS, the Cronbach Alpha coefficient has been employed. The Cronbach Alpha coefficient has been calculated for the whole scale and for all the individual factors on the scale. This method investigates if the items on the scale represent a unity possessing a homogenous structure (Kalaycı, 2008). Additionally, a discrimination index of SIS items and their inter-factorial correlation have been calculated.

Data Collection

Based on the volunteerism of teachers, the School Institutionalization Scale has been performed by the researcher after class hours. Completion of the scale lasted seven to eight minutes.

Findings

Construct Validity

Factor analysis has been made for the 58 items on the research scale. Suitability of the data for factor analysis and sufficiency of the sampling have been tested. At the end of the analyses, the KMO value of SIS has been found to be 0.89; the Barlett Sphericity result is 5813.77 ($p<0.05$). A KMO value of 0.60 and meaningfulness level of 0.05 in the Barlett Sphericity Test result ($p=0.00$) prove that the obtained data and research sampling are sufficient. Prior to factor analysis, the 17th item of which total item correlation is below 0.30 has been eliminated. Subsequent to the KMO and Barlett Sphericity Tests, factor analysis has been performed. In factor analysis, a number of factors have been determined via a percentage of the total variance method. In this method, when each additional factor's contribution to the

explanation of total variance falls below 5%, it means a maximum factor number is attained (Kalaycı, 2008). In factor analysis made via the total variance method, SIS has been detected as six factors.

The total-item correlation, common variance, factor analysis and Cronbach Alpha values of the School Institutionalization Scale are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1

Total-Item Correlations, Variance, Factor Analysis and Cronbach Alpha Values of the School Institutionalization Scale

					Weight Values after Rotation					
Factor name	Scale Item no	Item no	Total-item correlation	Common variance	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6
1.Cultural Strength	1	Item 9	.66	.75	.80					
	2	Item12	.67	.73	.79					
	3	Item 30	.69	.75	.78					
	4	Item 4	.68	.69	.75					
	5	Item 31	.73	.77	.72					
	6	Item 3	.73	.65	.67					
	7	Item 1	.46	.58	.65					
	8	Item2	.61	.57	.63					
	9	Item 7	.65	.58	.62					
	10	Item 40	.74	.66	.60					
	11	Item 6	.69	.58	.56					
	12	Item 29	.69	.64	.52					
	13	Item 42	.67	.53	.49					
			Cronbach Alpha: .9							
			Explained variance: 17.89							
2.Specialization	14	Item 33	.59	.62		.72				
	15	Item 43	.69	.69		.72				
	16	Item 35	.62	.64		.69				
	17	Item 20	.66	.62		.66				
	18	Item 41	.59	.50		.61				
	19	Item 28	.62	.62		.59				
	20	Item 38	.70	.67		.57				
	21	Item 44	.78	.72		.56				
	22	Item 37	.62	.46		.46				
	23	Item 5	.77	.68		.46				
	24	Item 45	.58	.39		.44				
	25	Item 8	.51	.39		.43				
			Cronbach Alpha: .92							
			Explained variance: 13.62							
3.Social Responsibility	26	Item 24	.63	.64			.67			
	27	Item 22	.63	.64			.66			
	28	Item 23	.66	.63			.65			
	29	Item 17	.65	.64			.59			
	30	Item 14	.59	.59			.58			
	31	Item 18	.52	.53			.55			
	32	Item 16	.58	.69			.53			
	33	Item 15	.56	.51			.50			

	34	Item 13	.77	.66	.40	
			Cronbach Alpha: .88			
			Explained variance: 11.23			
	35	Item 39	.51	.66	.70	
	36	Item 27	.55	.52	.59	
4.Adaptability	37	Item 26	.74	.77	.55	
	38	Item 25	.69	.72	.54	
			Cronbach Alpha : .84			
			Explained variance: 8.06			
	39	Item 19	.56	.70	.72	
	40	Item 21	.56	.68	.65	
5.Formalizing	41	Item 34	.41	.54	.62	
	42	Item 35	.48	.63	.60	
	43	Item 32	.61	.60	.58	
			Cronbach Alpha: .81			
			Explained variance: 7.29			
	44	Item 11	.70	.73		.52
6.Consistency						
	45	Item 10	.66	.64		.49
			Cronbach Alpha:.74			
			Explained variance: 4.71			
	Cumulative reliability coefficient of the scale Cronbach Alpha: 96.					
	Cumulative Explained variance: 62.82%					

As Table 1 indicates, the scale consists of six factors and 45 items. The first factor of the scale is of thirteen items: items 13, 19 and 50. They have been disqualified, since they received similar weight values in other factors. Item weight values of the factor vary between .80- .49. At the end of the reliability calculation based on the Cronbach Alpha value, the Alpha value of this factor for thirteen items has been found at .94. If the Cronbach Alpha value is $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$, the scale is highly reliable (Kalaycı, 2008). According to this value, the reliability of the first factor of the scale is rather high. Items related to the first factor have been examined, and since the contexts of these items are related to school culture assets like norm, value, loyalty, principle, etc., they have been termed "cultural strength." The Cultural Strength sub-dimension of the scale consists of items 9, 12, 30, 4, 31, 3, 1, 2, 7, 40, 6, 29, and 42.

At the end of the factor analysis made for the second factor of scale, item 5 on the Cultural Strength factor has been agreed to be placed on a second factor, since it received a high item weight value on the Item Professionalism factor and was suited in meaning to the Professionalism factor. The second factor of scale consists of twelve items. Items 24, 27, 29 and 51 on this factor have been discarded from the scale, since they received similar weight values in different factors. Item weight values of the factor vary between .72- .43. At the end of the reliability calculation based on the Cronbach Alpha value, this factor's alpha value for the twelve items has been detected as .92. According to this value, the reliability of the second factor of the scale is rather high. Items pertaining to the second factor have been analyzed, and since the contexts of these items are related to the management of the school by professional administrators, professional application, and management of rules and procedures, it has been defined as "Professionalism." The Professionalism sub-dimension of the scale consists of items 33, 43, 36, 20, 41, 28, 38, 44, 37, 5, 45 and 8.

The third factor of the scale is composed of nine items. Items 16 and 21 on this factor have been disqualified due to receiving similar weight values in different factors. Item 14 on the cultural strength factor has been agreed to be placed on the third factor, since it received a high item weight value on the social responsibility factor and was suited in meaning to the social responsibility factor. Item weight values of the factor vary between .67- .40. At the end of the reliability calculation based on the Cronbach Alpha value, this factor's alpha value for eight items has been found at.88. If the Cronbach Alpha value is $0.80 \leq \alpha < 1.00$, the scale is a highly reliable one. Items of the third factor have been analyzed, and since the contexts of these items are related to the interaction of the school with its environments, adaptation to environmental changes, and social values and norms, it has been termed "Social Responsibility." The Social Responsibility sub-dimension of the scale is made up of items 24, 22, 23, 17, 14, 18, 16, 15 and 13.

The fourth factor of scale consists of four items. Items 45, 48 and 52 on this factor have been disqualified due to receiving similar weight values in different factors. Item weight values of the factor vary between .70- .54. At the end of the reliability calculation based on the Cronbach Alpha value, this factor's alpha value for eight items has been found at .84. According to this value, the reliability of the scale's fourth factor is rather high. Items of the fourth factor have been analyzed, and since the contexts of these items are related to the development of school and personnel in line with scientific and technological innovations, it has been named "Adaptability." The Adaptability sub-dimension of scale consists of items 39, 27, 26 and 25.

The fifth factor of scale consists of five items. Item weight values of the factor vary between .72- .58. At the end of the reliability calculation based on the Cronbach Alpha value, this factor's alpha value for three items has been found at .81. According to this value, the reliability of the scale's fifth factor is rather high. Items of the fifth factor have been analyzed, and since the contexts of these items are related to the executing the works at the school within a system and standardization, it has been named "Formalization." The Formalization sub-dimension of scale consists of items 19, 21, 34, 35 and 32.

At the end of factor analysis made for the sixth factor of scale, item 11 in the cultural strength factor has been agreed to be placed on the sixth factor, since it received high item weight value on the consistency factor and was suited in meaning to the professionalism factor. The fifth factor of scale consists of three items. Item weight values of the factor vary between .52- .49. At the end of the reliability calculation based on the Cronbach Alpha value, this factor's alpha value for three items has been found at .74. According to this value, the reliability of the scale's sixth factor is rather high. Items of the sixth factor have been analyzed, and since the contexts of these items are related to sustaining school activities in accordance with plans and objectives, it has been named "Consistency." The Consistency sub-dimension of scale consists of items 10 and 11.

Table 1 exhibits that the first factor explains 17.89% of the scale-specific total variance, the second factor 13.62% of the scale-specific total variance, the third factor 11.23% of the scale-specific total variance, the fourth factor 8.06% of the scale-specific

total variance, the fifth factor 7.29% of the scale-specific total variance and the sixth factor 4.71% of the scale-specific total variance. The scale explains 62.82% of total variance on institutionalization.

Relationships of Sub Dimensions

Arithmetical average, standard deviation and correlation matrices of the sub-dimensions of the School Institutionalization Scale are indicated in Table 2.

Table 2

Arithmetical Average, Standard Deviation and Correlation Matrices of the Sub-Dimensions of the School Institutionalization Scale

Variables	$\overline{X}$	Sd	1	2	3	4	5
1. Cultural Strength	54.46	9.50					
2. Specialization	44.73	9.72	.71*				
3. Social Responsibility	37.17	5.54	.70*	.71*			
4. Adaptability	16.04	3.42	.64*	.68*	.62*		
5. Formalizing	20.38	3.32	.49*	.58*	.62*	.63*	
6. Consistency	8.26	1.52	.70*	.68*	.66*	.58*	.50*

N = 223, *P = .00 ($p<0.05$)

As Table 3 is analyzed, it surfaces that amidst sub-dimensions of SIS, there is a positive and meaningful relation to the medium and high levels. There is a high connection between the Cultural Strength sub-dimension and Professionalism, between Social Responsibility and Consistency. There is a medium connection between Adaptability and Formalization. There is a high connection between the Professionalism sub-dimension and Social Responsibility and a medium level of connection amongst Adaptability, Formalization and Consistency. There is a medium level of correlation amidst the Social Responsibility sub-dimension and Adaptability, Formalization and Consistency. Amongst the Adaptability sub-dimension and Formalization and Consistency, a medium level of relationship exists. Between the Formalization sub-dimension and Consistency, a medium level of connection is present.

Item Discrimination Index

To detect the institutionalization level of schools, a discrimination index of the items forming the scale has been calculated. While calculating the discrimination index of items initially, the total score of each subject received was calculated and numbered from the highest to the lowest. Twenty-seven percent (60) of the group formed the upper group and 27% (60) the lower group. To detect if there is a meaningful difference between the upper and lower groups, an Independent Groups t Test has been conducted.

The Item Discrimination Index of the School Institutionalization Scale is exhibited in Table 3.

Table 3

Item Discrimination Index of the School Institutionalization Scale (Lower-Upper Group T Values)

Item No	T	Item No	T	Item No	T
1	8.54*	16	9.58*	31	9.36*
2	8.79*	17	11.90*	32	6.48*
3	9.46*	18	10.40*	33	6.30*
4	10.50*	19	13.10*	34	16.49*
5	11.54*	20	14.28*	35	6.90*
6	13.00*	21	13.86*	36	8.29*
7	5.23*	22	12.38*	37	11.61*
8	9.75*	23	19.75*	38	9.30*
9	10.69*	24	10.10*	39	7.80*
10	12.17*	25	13.98*	40	8.70*
11	10.99*	26	8.66*	41	5.01*
12	12.82*	27	8.10*	42	7.96*
13	9.52*	28	9.00*	43	8.98*
14	12.16*	29	9.20*	44	12.38*
15	15.61*	30	9.31*	45	11.24*

*p=0.00 (p<0.05)

As Table 4 reveals, all the items composing SIS are meaningful on a .05 level (p=0.00). The meaningfulness of the t values in the SIS items indicates that they are a discrimination index in detecting the institutionalization levels of schools.

Scoring

In SIS, five Likert Type scales have been employed. "One" is used to score the "I absolutely disagree" option, 2 scores the "I disagree" option, 3 scores the "I am in-between" option, 4 scores the "I agree" option and 5 scores the "I totally agree" option. In this five-scale grading system, according to the calculated interval coefficient (4/5=0.80) for the four intervals (5–1=4), the option intervals have been arranged.

Scoring methods of the scale and their explanation are given in Table 4.

Table 4

Scoring Methods of the Scale and Their Explanation

Weight Score	Options	Score Average	Score intervals	Explanation
1	I absolutely disagree	1.00-1.79	45-81	Very low
2	I disagree	1.80-2.59	82-117	Low
3	I am in-between	2.60-3.39	118-153	Medium
4	I agree	3.40-4.19	154-189	High
5	I totally agree	4.20-5.00	190-225	Very high

Scoring according to the average: The institutionalization level of the school with a score average between 1.00-1.79 is very low, between 1.80-2.59 is low, between 2.60-3.39 is medium, between 3.40-4.19 is high and between 4.20-5.00 is very high. According to the attestable score, the school having a score of 45-81 has a very high level of institutionalization. A score of 82-117 indicates a low level, 118-153 is medium, 154-189 is high, and a score of 190-225 has very high levels of institutionalization.

Conclusion and Discussion

The purpose of this research is to develop SIS, which can be used as a scale to evaluate the institutionalization of private schools as well as conduct its validity and reliability analyses. The sampling of research is an insufficient number projected for scale-development activities. Also, the findings obtained from research have proven that SIS is equipped with high levels of validity and reliability criteria.

Construct validity performance has been executed via the factor analysis method. In selecting the items to place on the final form of scale, the Component Factor and item test correlations have constituted the base. The scale consists of a total of 45 items and six factors. The factor weights of all the items included in the final form of the School Institutionalization Scale are above .40, which meets the .40 minimum sub-criteria of the factor weight condition to include an item into a measurement tool. For a medium and high level, a positive and meaningful relationship has been detected amidst the factors of scale.

The cumulative reliability coefficient of scale is Cronbach Alpha .96, which is rather high. Reliability coefficients calculated with the Cronbach Alpha vary in all sub-scales between .74 and .94. Considering the fact that the projected level of reliability for all measurement tools in research is .70 (Tezbaşaran, 1996), it can be stated that the scale's level of reliability for all its sub-dimensions is sufficient. Sub-dimension 6 of the scale is rather reliable, and the other sub dimensions are highly reliable. As item-total correlations of the scale are examined, it surfaces that the change is between .41 and .78. Those correlation coefficients pertaining to each item

of scale are an indicator of the internal consistency of the whole scale and its sub-dimensions (Tavşancıl, 2002).

The sub dimensions of scale have been named Cultural Strength, Specialization, Social Responsibility, Adaptability, Formalizing and Consistency. Explained variance is in an acceptable level with a ratio of 62.82%. A discrimination index of scale items within 27% of lower and upper group averages is meaningful for test items. Accordingly, it can be asserted that each item has a discrimination index in detecting the institutionalization levels of their schools.

The lowest possible score to receive from the scale is 45 and the highest score is 225. The increase in the scores received from scale indicates a high level of institutionalization. While making evaluations for each sub-dimension, average scores obtained from the particular sub-dimension are taken into account. The higher scores obtained from each dimension mean that the level of that particular institutionalization is good, while low scores indicate that the level of that particular institutionalization dimension is insufficient.

As a result, the School Institutionalization Scale is highly reliable and possesses sufficient internal consistency. Hence, the findings support the theory that the Institutionalization Scale has sufficient validity to detect the institutionalization levels of schools. It is suggested that future studies focus on developing and testing the validity of the internal consistency of the scale through different samplings.

References

Ak, B. G. (2010). *Aile işletmelerinde kurumsallaşmanın işletme başarısına olan etkileri: Aydın ilinde faaliyet gösteren aile işletmeleri örneği* [Institutionalization's effects on business accomplishment in family business: the case of family businesses which remain actively in aydın province]. Unpublished master's thesis. Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Aydın.

Alpay, G., Bodur, M., Yılmaz, C., Çetinkaya, S. & Arıkan, L. (2008). Performance implications of institutionalization process in family-owned businesses: Evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of World Business*, 43, 435–448.

Apaydın, F. (2007). *Örgütlerde kurumsallaşma ve adaptif yeteneklerin pazarlama eylemlerine ve örgütsel performansa etkileri* [The effects of organizational institutionalization and adaptive capabilities on marketing activities and organizational performance]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Gebze.

Apaydın, F. (2008). Kurumsallaşmanın küçük ve orta ölçekli işletmelerin performansına etkileri [Effects of institutionalizatıon on the performance of small and medium size firms]. *ZKÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 4(7), 121-145.

Apaydın, F.(2009). Kurumsal teori ve işletmelerin kurumsallaşması [Institutional theory and ınstitutionalization of organizations].*Çukurova Üniversitesi. İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, 10(1), 1-22.

Arslan, Y. (2009). *Kurumsallaşma ve örgütsel güven ilişkisi* [Institutionalization and Organizational Trust Relationship]. Unpublished master's thesis. Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. Gebze.

Bilgin, N. (2007). *Aile şirketleri kurumsallaşma eğilimleri: Ankara kobi örneği* [Family Firm and Institutionalization of Inclination]. Unpublished master's thesis. Atılım Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.

Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2008). *Sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı* [Manual data analysis for social sciences] Ankara: Pegem A Yayıncılık:

Colyvas, J. A. & Powell, W. (2006). Roads to institutionalization: the remaking of boundaries between public and private science. *Research in Organizational Behavior,* 27, 305–353.

Çiftçi, M. (2006). *KOBİ'lerde kurumsallaşma: Sivas ili mobilya sektöründe bir araştırma* [Instituonlization to smses the research to sivas industry furniture sector]. Unpublished master's thesis. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sivas.

Dilbaz, S. (2005). *Büyüme ve kurumsallaşma sürecinde aile şirketlerinde yönetim-Karaman örneği* [The management of family business in the growing and institutionalizing period: the case of Karaman]. Unpublished master's thesis. Selçuk Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Konya.

Flores-Kastanis, E. (2009). Change at big school and little school: institutionalization and contestation in participatory action research. *Educational Action Research,* 17(3), 391–405.

Gafney, L. & Varma-Nelson P. (2008*). Peer-led team learning: Evaluation, dissemination, and ınstitutionalization of a college level ınitiative.* Springer Netherlands. Retrieved May 10 2010 from http://www.springerlink.com/content/j72601565w3328j1/

Hacısalihoğlu, U. (2007). *İç girişimcilik iklimi ve kurumsallaşma algısı ile iş tatmini ve bağlılık düzeyi arasındaki ilişkiler* [Relationship between intrapreneurial climate, institutionalization perception and job satisfaction and commitment level]. Unpublished master's thesis. Gebze Yüksek Teknoloji Enstitüsü, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Gebze.

Kalaycı, Ş. (2008). *SPSS uygulamalı çok değişkenli istatistik teknikleri.* [Discriminant analysis. multivariate analysis using SPSS]. Ankara: Asil Yayın Dağıtım Ltd. Şti.

Kangal, G. F. (2007). *Küçük işletmelerin kurumsallaşmasında değişim süreci ve bir araştırma* [Change process at institutionalization of small enterprises and a research]. Unpublished master's thesis. Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sivas.

Karpuzoğlu, E. (2002). *Büyüyen ve gelişen aile işletmelerinde kurumsallaşma.* [Growing and growing family businesses institutionalization]. Ankara: Hayat Yayınları.

Kiracı, M. & Alkara, İ. (2009). Aile şirketlerinde kurumsallaşmaya verilen önem ve turizm sektöründeki konaklama işletmeleri üzerine bir araştırma: Alanya-Eskişehir örneği. [Importance of corporation in family companies and a researchon hospitality business in tourism sector: xample of Alanya and Eskişehir]. *Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi İİBF Dergisi,* 11(1), 167-197.

Kshetri, N. (2009). Institutionalization of intellectual property rights in China. *European Management Journal,* 27, 155-164.

Özler, H., Ergün D.,& Gümüştekin, E. (2007*).* Aile işletmelerinde nepotizmin gelişim evreleri ve Kurumsallaşma. [Family businesses nepotizmin developmental stages and institutionalization]. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi,* 17, 437-450.

Tavşancıl, E. (2002) *Tutumların ölçülmesi ve SPSS ile veri analizi.* [Measurement of attitudes and data analysis with SPSS]. Ankara: Nobel Yayınları.

Tezbaşaran, A. A. (1996) *Likert tipi ölçek geliştirme kılavuzu.* [Likert-type scale development guide]. Ankara: Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.

Türk, U. (2007). *KOBİ'lerde kurumsallaşma ve kurumsallaşma düzeyinin belirlenmesi KOBİ'lerde kurumsallaşma ve kurumsallaşma düzeyinin belirlenmesi (Sakarya 1. ve 2. Osb Uygulaması)* [Instituonalization in SMEs and determining of the instituonalization level (field study on the 1st and 2nd organized industrial zone located in Sakarya)]. Unpublished master's thesis. Sakarya üniversitesi, Sosyal bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.

Türkoğlu, K. (2009). *Kurumsallaşma ve TKY* [Institutionalization and TQM]. Retrieved June 1 2010 from http://www.cagdasegitimci.net/kurumsallasma.html.

Ulukan, C. (2005). Türkiye'ye Özgü Kurumsallaşma Anlayışı ve Sonuçları [Understanding institutionalization policies in Turkey: Problems and Prospects] *İktisat işletme ve Finans dergisi,* 231(20), 88-96.

Wallace, J. E. (1995). Organizational and professional commitment in professional and nonprofessional organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 40(2), 228-255.

Yazıcıoğlu, İ. & Koç, H. (2009). Aile işletmelerinin kurumsallaşma düzeylerinin belirlenmesine yönelik karşılaştırmalı bir araştırma. [A comparative study into the level of institutionalisation of family-run enterprises].*Selçuk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi.* 21,497-507.

Okul Kurumsallaşma Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması (Özel Okul Formu) (Özet)

Problem Durumu

Kurumsallaşma; bir örgütün kişilerden ziyade kurallara, standartlara, prosedürlere sahip olması, iş yapma usul ve yöntemlerini içermesi ve diğer örgütlerden farklı ve ayırt edici bir kimliğe bürünmesi sürecidir. Kurumsallaşma örgütlerin hem kendi içsel bütünlükleri hem de dış çevre ile entegrasyonları açısından önemlidir. Kurumsallaşmış örgütler; çevre ile birlikte değişirler, değişimi öğrenirler ve yeni duruma uygun standartlar geliştirirler. Örgütler kurumsallaşma ile profesyonel kişilerle çalışma olanağı bulabilir, uzun vadeli planlar yapabilirler ve kaynaklarını daha etkin bir şekilde kullanabilirler. Tüm örgütlerde olduğu gibi okullarda da kurumsallaşmaya ihtiyaç vardır. Özel okulların yaygınlaşması eğitim sektöründe rekabeti ortaya çıkarmıştır. Rekabetin artmasının doğal sonucu olarak da okulların daha etkin ve verimli olması bir zorunluluk haline gelmiştir. Kurumsallaşma okulların amaçları doğrultusunda çalışmasını ve yönetim süreçlerinin (planlama, karar verme, örgütleme, yöneltme, eşgüdümlüme ve değerlendirme) daha etkin bir şekilde işlemesini sağlar. Okuldaki bütün alt birimlerin çalışma esaslarının belirlenmesini, benimsenmesini, uygulanmasını, bu çalışma esaslarının kişilere göre değişmemesini, kişilerin değil okulun hep ön planda tutulmasını, periyodik ve sistemli bir çalışma ortamının ve hiyerarşik, ılıman ve demokratik bir atmosferin oluşması daha da önemli hale gelmiştir. Bu nedenle kurumsallaşma özel okulların önemli bir sorunu olarak düşünülmektedir.

Araştırmanın amacı

Kurumsallaşma ile ilgili olarak aile şirketleri ve KOBİ'ler üzerinde birçok çalışma yapılmıştır. Fakat kurumsallaşmanın önemli olduğu özel eğitim kurumlarının kurumsallaşma düzeylerini ölçecek bir çalışmaya ulaşılamamıştır. Bundan dolayı eğitim kurumlarının kurumsallaşma düzeyini belirleme yönelik bir ölçeğe ihtiyaç duyulmuştur.

Araştırmanın yöntemi

Araştırma evreni Gaziantep il merkezindeki özel ilköğretim ve ortaöğretim okullardır. Örneklem rastgele seçilen 7 özel okuldaki 223 (kız 114, erkek 109) öğretmenden oluşmaktadır. Madde havuzu oluşturmak için öncelikle literatür taraması yapılmıştır. Daha sonra şirket ve KOBİ'lerin kurumsallaşma düzeylerini ölçmeye yönelik olarak geliştirilen ölçme araçları incelenmiştir. Okul müdürleri ile görüşmeler yapılmıştır. Tüm bu süreçler sonunda 88 maddelik madde havuzu oluşturulmuştur. Ölçme aracının maddeleri uzmanlarca Türkçe söz dizini ve anlam yapısı açısından kontrol edilmiş ve düzeltilmiştir. Uzman incelemesi ve Türkçe açısından gözden geçirildikten sonra 58 maddelik taslak forum oluşturulmuştur.

Ölçeğin yapı geçerliliği faktör analizi ile yapılmıştır. Verilerin faktör analizine uygun olup olmadığını ve örneklemin yeterli olup olmadığını anlamak amacıyla Barlett Sphericity ve Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) testleri kullanılmıştır. KMO'nun .60'dan yüksek ve Barlett Sphericity testinin anlamlı çıkması verilerin faktör analizi için uygun olduğunu göstermektedir. Araştırmada değişkenler arasındaki ilişkilerden hareketle faktörleri bulmak için açımlayıcı faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Çalışmada faktörü bağımsız ve yorumlamada açıklık ve anlamlılık sağlamak amacıyla eksen döndürmesine tabi tutulmuştur. Bu doğrultuda faktör analizinin rotasyon aşamasında Varimax tekniği kullanılmıştır. Çalışmada madde yük değeri 0.35 ve üzeri olarak belirlenmiştir. Çalışmada bir madde her iki faktörde de yüksek yük değerine sahip ise ölçekten çıkarılmıştır. Bu doğrultuda bir maddenin iki faktördeki yük değeri farkı 0.10'nun altında olanlar ölçekten çıkarılmıştır. Ölçeğin iç tutarlılığını yani ölçekteki maddelerin homojen bir yapıya sahip olup olmadığını ölçmek için Cronbach Alpha kat sayısı kullanılmıştır. Cronbach Alpha katsayısı ölçeğin tümü ve ölçekteki faktörlerin her biri için ayrı ayrı hesaplanmıştır.

Araştırmanın bulguları

Ölçek toplam 45 madde ve 6 faktörden oluşmaktadır. Okul Kurumsallaşma Ölçeğinin son şekline alınan tüm maddelerin faktör yükü 0,40'ın üstündedir. Bu değer ise bir maddenin ölçme aracına alınabilmesi için öngörülen 0,40 faktör yükü alt ölçütünü karşılamaktadır. Ölçeğin faktörleri arasında orta ve yüksek düzeyde, pozitif ve anlamlı bir ilişki bulunmuştur. Ölçeğin genel güvenirlik katsayısı Cronbah Alpha ,96'dır. Genel güvenirlik katsayısı oldukça yüksektir. Cronbach Alpha ile hesaplanan güvenirlik katsayıları, tüm alt ölçekler için ,74 ile ,94 arasında değişmektedir. Araştırmalarda kullanılabilecek ölçme araçları için öngörülen güvenirlik düzeyinin 0,70 olduğu dikkate alınırsa, ölçeğin tüm alt boyutlarına ilişkin güvenirlik düzeyinin yeterli olduğu söylenebilir. Ölçeğin 6. alt boyutu oldukça, diğer alt boyutları ise yüksek derecede güvenilirdir. Ölçeğin madde-toplam korelasyonlarına bakıldığında ise ,41 ile ,78 arasında değiştiği görülmüştür. Ölçeğin her bir maddesine ait bu korelasyon katsayıları ölçeğin bütünü ve alt boyutlarındaki iç tutarlılığın bir göstergesidir. Ölçeğin alt boyutları Kültürel Güç, Uzmanlaşma, Sosyal Sorumluluk, Adapte Olabilirlik, Formalleşme ve Tutarlılık olarak adlandırılmıştır. Açıklanan varyans %62,82'dir. Bu oran kabul edilebilir düzeydedir. Ölçek maddelerinin ayırt edicilik güçleri %27 alt ve üst grup ortalamaları arasında tüm test maddeleri için anlamlıdır. Bu göre her bir maddenin okulların kurumsallaşma düzeylerini belirlemede ayırt edici olduğu söylenilebilir. Ölçekten alınabilecek en düşük puan 45 en yüksek puan ise 225'tir. Ölçekten alınan puanların artması kurumsallaşma düzeyinin yüksek olduğunu göstermektedir. Her alt boyut için değerlendirmeler yapılırken söz konusu alt boyuttan alınan puan ortalamaları dikkate alınır. Her bir boyutta elde edilecek puanların yüksekliği, ilgili kurumsallaşma boyutunun iyi, puanların düşük olması ise ilgili kuramsallaşma boyutunun istenilen düzeyde olmadığını belirtir.

Sonuç ve öneriler

Okul Kurumsallaşma Ölçeği yüksek derecede güvenilir ve yeterli bir iç tutarlılığa sahiptir. Dolayısıyla bulgular okul kurumsallaşma ölçeğinin okulların kurumsallaşma düzeylerini belirlemede yeterli bir geçerlik taşıdığını desteklemektedir. Bundan sonra yapılacak çalışmalar için, farklı örneklemler üzerinden ölçeğin içsel tutarlılığının geliştirilmesi ve geçerliliğinin sınanması önerilmektedir

Anahtar Sözcükler: Okul Kurumsallaşma Ölçeği, özel okul, kurumsallaşma

Appendix: SCHOOL INSTITUTIONALIZATION SCALE

		I absolutely disagree (1); I disagree (2); I am in between (3); I agree (4); I absolutely agree (5)
1	Factor 1	The **school** has an institutional vision and mission.
2		The school has its own institutional values and principles
3		Our school has a different institutional identity from the other schools.
4		Our school possesses future-oriented goals and strategies.
5		Our school is a trademark in its own activity field.
6		All activities at school are executed within a preset plan and program.
7		School management expects the personnel to act in line with professional norms.
8		The school takes responsibility for the consequences of its actions.
9		The personnel care about the needs and demands of parents and students.
10		Our school has a unique culture of its own.
11		All school personnel have written duty definitions.
12		School personnel are highly devoted to school
13		School management expects the personnel to act in line with social values.
14	Factor 2	School personnel are rewarded according to their job performance and skills
15		Punishments and rewards are the same for everyone given the same circumstances.
16		The promotion system at school is manipulated according to the task performance and skills of personnel
17		There is a participative management approach in our school
18		Similar reactions are given to identical situations.
19		It is easy to arrive at a consensus amongst personnel even in tough matters.
20		New personnel recruitments to school are handled by professionals.
21		Our school has a transparent operational system.
22		The school is managed in line with certain laws and rules safe from arbitrary decisions.
23		Our school is directed by professional directors.
24		In taking significant managerial decisions the professional directors in our school are more effective than the founders and school owners.
25		There is a handbook stating school procedures and rules.
26	Factor 3	Our school has accountability
27		Ethical rules and values are adopted by the personnel
28		Personnel from different stages all share the same institutional perspective.
29		The acts of our school are compatible with social values
30		The rules and regulations in our school are transparent.
31		In our school there is an open consensus regarding the right and wrong actions amongst the personnel.
32		School management expects the personnel to stick to ethical rules
33		School personnel know the common values they share
34		Our school gives a feeling of trust around.
35	Fac.. 4	Our school offers an innovative training system for the personnel
36		Our school follows the activities of leader schools regarding certain actions
37		Our school pays regards to team work.
38		Our school personnel continuously develop themselves
39	Factor 5	School personnel are devoted to their jobs.
40		School personnel are respectful towards laws, norms and business ethics
41		Our school supervises the actions of school personnel
42		The duties to do at school are standardized
43		School personnel make decisions that comply with the principles and rules of their professions
44	6	The processes at school are handled in line with strategic goals
45		School personnel know how to execute the duties