

A Study of Developing an Organizational Reputation Management Scale for Schools*

Sinan Tümtürkⁱ
Robert College

Levent Denizⁱⁱ
Marmara University

Abstract

This study aims to develop a scale to measure the organizational reputation of especially private schools and foreign private schools in today's increasingly competitive environment. The study group of the research consists of 320 individuals who are 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade students receiving education in private and foreign private schools and teachers from different branches. In the development phase of the scale, exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted to ensure validity and reliability. As a result of validity and reliability studies, the Organizational Reputation Management Scale for Schools was obtained. The analysis result has revealed a scale structure that consists of 7 dimensions and 38 items. Accordingly, the dimensions to determine the organizational reputation of private schools are "Social Responsibility, Commitment to School, Relations with Alumni, School Environment, Leadership, School Management, and Financial Performance". It is expected that the scale to be used by researchers and private schools will significant contributions to the literature on organizational reputation management.

Keywords: Reputation Management, Organizational Reputation, Scale Development

DOI: 10.29329/ijpe.2021.375.3

* This study has been derived from the first author's doctoral thesis completed at Marmara University Graduated Institute of Educational Sciences.

ⁱ **Sinan Tümtürk**, Dr., Education, Robert College, ORCID: 0000-0002-7635-0918

Correspondence: stumturk@robcol.k12.tr

ⁱⁱ **Levent Deniz**, Prof. Dr., Educational Sciences, Marmara University, ORCID: 0000-0002-5786-215X

INTRODUCTION

The word reputation, like some other abstract words (love, quality, success, etc.), is a concept that is quite difficult to understand and define. The word reputation is etymologically derived from the word “reputen” in English and “reputer” in Old French and is based on the Latin word “reputare” which means, “to think about a topic”. Merriam-Webster's dictionary defines reputation as “The guess in a person's mind; a character attributed to a person, thing or action in terms of society in general” (Davies, Chun, Silva, & Roper, 2003; Marconi, 2001; Sherman, 1999). The Turkish Language Institution (TDK) expresses the word reputation as the equivalent of the words “being respected, being valuable or trustworthy, respectability, prestige”. Reputation is also used as the equivalent of the word “respect”, which is expressed as a perception of a person or an object formed over time by outsiders or a community.

Organizational Reputation

On the other hand, when the researches in the literature examined, it is observed no generally accepted definition of organizational reputation consequently, there are numerous definitions of organizational reputation and great differences in terms of meaning among these definitions. Due to multiple definitions and differences, some classifications of organizational reputation and the ambiguity about the concept were tried to be eliminated. Barnett, Jermier Lafferty (2006) stated that the publications on reputation management in 2001 were five times more than those between 1990-2000. Therefore they prepared a table that sum up the definitions of organizational reputation made in the last fifty years and discussed these definitions in three main groups: (1) Reputation as a state of awareness, (2) Reputation as an evaluation, (3) Reputation as an asset. Considering the definitions that of awareness, it has been observed that the most common term is “perceptions”. Within this grouping, organizational reputation is expressed as “gathering perceptions”, “hidden perceptions”, “clear perceptions”, “universal perceptions”, “perceptual representations” and “common representations”. As organizational reputation within such a grouping includes awareness about the organization, it is considered as a kind of “representation of knowledge or emotions”. One of the most widely accepted definitions is that regards organizational reputation as an “evaluation”. These definitions regard organizational reputation as an assessment of the organization's status in society. Accordingly, organizational reputation is expressed with the concepts of “judgment”, “estimation”, “evaluation” or “measurement”. “Opinions” and “beliefs” about an organization are also included in this grouping as they include subjective judgments in accordance with the nature of the concept of reputation. The third and last grouping is the approach that considers reputation as an asset for organizations and accepts reputation as “valuable” and “important” for organizations. In this grouping, the terms “source” or “intangible”, “financial or economic asset” are used regarding reputation. Approaches that define reputation as “awareness” or “evaluation” ignore that reputation means a real value for the organization. Many researchers have argued that such grouping about reputation is only an approach to consequences rather than the reputation itself. Moreover, when literature reviewed, it can be argued that reputation generally consists of two dimensions: (1) Stakeholders' perception of an organization that can produce quality products and (2) Organizations' perception of priority in the minds of stakeholders (Rindova, Williamson, & Antoaneta, 2005). In other words, the organizational reputation is affected by the interaction of each unit, department and employee in the organization with another stakeholder (Gotsi & Wilson, 2001). Scientific circles and most researchers argue that reputation is an important intangible asset that is rare, valuable, sustainable and difficult to imitate by others (Schwaiger, 2004). Organizational reputation is also defined as a collective structure that defines the total perceptions of multiple stakeholders about an organization's performance. In addition, in the literature, organizational reputation management is accepted as a result of long-term evaluations about organizations together with incomplete information in the society (Lloyd & Mortimer, 2006). Although organizational reputation was initially conceptualized and measured one dimensionally (Anderson & Robertson, 1995; Doney & Cannon, 1997; Safon, 2009), it was addressed multi-dimensionally in later studies (Dowling, 2001; Fombrun, Gardberg & Bernett., 2000; Rose & Thomsen, 2004; Walsh, Beatty, & Shiu, 2009; Walsh & Wiedmann, 2004).

Measurement of Organizational Reputation

Especially since the 20th century, with a great interest in organizational reputation, a great increase has been observed in researches on this subject (Hasanbegovic, 2011; Mishina, Block, & Mannor, 2011). The current problems with reputation management are how to define reputation and reputation structures, including image and identity (Fombrun & van Riel, 1997; Chun, 2005) and how each should be measured. The debate on measuring reputation is profound, and whether the measurements will be formative or reflective must be considered (Helm, 2005). It is acknowledged that there has been a long-standing debate about the nature of the links between reputation and performance and what these links are (Fombrun, 1996). Some researchers in the literature state that what we measure shows who we actually are (Van Riel, Stroecker, & Maathuis, 1998). Considering the researches about the measurement of organizational reputation over the years, it would be appropriate to consider each measurement method separately, since there is no one standard and common method for measuring organizational reputation.

Some Organizational Reputation Measurement Methods

It is seen that there are different approaches and suggestions on the measurement of organizational reputation depending on the changing conditions over the years. Some of these measurement models and recommendations are as follows.

Media Measurements

Davies and Miles (1998) found in a research project that very few of the fourteen major organizations they studied measure their reputation. Media measurements involve evaluating organizations according to the column size, their coverage in the media or their advertising value equivalents, which are generally included in press reports. In terms of reputation management measurement, this situation can be interpreted as that most reputation management studies focus on media activities and some organizations think that being in the media is the closest and easiest way to reputation.

Fortune Magazine's World's Most Admired Organizations Study

Fortune is a global business magazine published by Time Inc.'s Fortune Money Group, specializing in the listings of global companies. Each year, it publishes a "Global 500" list that gathers factors such as earnings per share, balance sheet, and total return to investors to create a list of America's most successful organizations. On the other hand, Fortune magazine announces the list of World's Most Admired Organizations as the most reputable organizations. This listing is based on a survey called "America's Most Admired Organizations" by Hay Group, going back to 1984 and has been conducted since 1997. Since 1995, the sampling frame has changed from America to World organizations.

Brand Value Scales

Brand value is the strength of a brand. What does the brand name add to the value of the organization? This situation can only be measured by looking at the differences between the true organizational value and the organizational balance sheet (Kerin & Sethuraman, 1998). Many reputation researchers try to relate brand value across the organization in order to measure certain factors that contribute to both. Keller and Aaker (1998) developed three dimensions: "organizational reliability", "organizational expertise", "reliability and probability" to establish connections with successful brands. Organizational reliability is discussed in relation to organizational reputation by Keller (2000). Caruana and Chircop (2000) developed an organizational reputation scale based on five criteria, expressed as Aaker's (1997) "brand value", to measure the reputation of a beverage company in Malta.

Comprehensive Measurements

For trademarks, this measurement model is based on measuring whether customers generally recognize organization names, in other words, an awareness of the organization that Keller (2000) sees as an important component of brand value. Participants in this measurement are taken from an online panel of more than one million people. The score obtained can range from 100 to -100 and is obtained by subtracting negative feedback from positive. Zero points equally mean positive and negative feedback. According to this measure, it means that an organization that customers are not aware of has no reputation, which cannot be considered as a very realistic approach.

Multidimensional Measurements

It is not possible to talk about a linear structure regarding reputation. For this reason, some researchers have proposed multidimensional measurements with semantic or Likert scales: Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither agree nor disagree, Agree, Strongly agree. Other methods used include Bernstein's (1984) spider web method, Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) multidimensional scaling model, and open-ended questions. Moreover, "Kelly Repertory Grid" developed by Kelly (1955) is another method applied in KRG. These methods are useful for identifying factors to be addressed in reputation measurements.

Reputation Quotient (RQ)

Fombrun et al. (2000) developed the reputation quotient measurement consisting of six dimensions and 20 items to measure internal and external stakeholder views. The first of these dimensions expresses emotional appeal, the degree of positive emotion and confidence inspired by the organization. Secondly, products and services express the perception of the value, quality, innovation and reliability of the products and services of the organization. The third dimension examines vision and leadership, a clear vision and strong leadership perceptions of the organization. Fourth, the workplace environment refers to the perception of how well the organization is managed, the working environment and the quality of its employees. Fifth, social and environmental responsibility expresses a good sense of citizenship in the organization's relationships with society, employees and the environment. Finally, the financial performance dimension measures the profitability of the organization, market expectations and perceptions of organizational risks (Fombrun et al., 2000).

Reputation Institute "RepTrak System"

The Reputation Institute has been working on the dynamics of reputation since 1997. In 2005, the Reputation Institute introduced the RepTrak system to monitor and analyse organizational reputation. The RepTrak system can be applied internationally, adapted to different target audiences and used in quantitative-qualitative research. The RepTrak system has 7 dimensions and twenty-three features grouped around these dimensions (Van Riel & Fombrun, 2007). These dimensions and features are developed on the basis of respect, trust, feelings and admiration.

Organizational Personality Scales

Aaker (1997) developed a measure of five dimensions referred to as "brand personality" and this scale was used to measure the prominence of a brand among US organizations. Using the same personalization approach, Davies, Chun, Silva, and Roper (2001) developed the "Organizational Personality Scale" to simultaneously measure the reputation of an organization from both internal and external perspectives and to examine the gaps between the views of various stakeholders in an organization. These two measurement approaches are based on imagining the organization as a person and asking participants (both employees and customers) to evaluate the organization's personality accordingly.

Harris-Fombrun “Reputation Quotient”(RQ)

The most popular and widely used metric for measuring organizational reputation is the measurement called RQ. A model named “Reputation Institute Reputation Quotient / RQ” was developed by “Harris Interactive” in 1998 to measure the perceptions of the sector and different stakeholders related to the organization. In this model, mainly the answers to such questions like the names of the organizations, whether they like these organizations or not, whether they respect the organizations were sought. According to the results of the research, it was determined that people’s views on organizations emerged in six dimensions (Fombrun & Foss, 2001). These dimensions are as follows: (1) emotional appeal, (2) products and services, (3) vision and leadership, (4) social and environmental responsibility, (5) workplace environment (6) financial performance.

Organizational Reputation Measurement Approaches

Another issue discussed in the literature regarding the measurement of organizational reputation apart from the above-mentioned methods is whether reputation measurement should be based on a practitioner or an academic perspective. It is observed that there have been basically two different approaches in the measurement of organizational reputation: the practitioner perspective and the academic perspective.

Organizational Reputation Measurement According to Practitioner Perspective

Practitioners are the first group to propose measures and methods of organizational reputation to assess perceptions about organizations. Practitioners have provided several methods for evaluating individuals’ perceptions of organizations. For example, Fortune magazine asked financial analysts and executives to rate organizations based on the following eight attributes, and developed the following survey: (1) financial soundness, (2) value in terms of a long-term investment, (3) wise use of corporate assets, (4) innovation, (5) ability to attract, develop and retain talented people, (6) product and service quality, (7) management quality, and (8) community and environmental responsibility (Sobol, Farelly, & Tapper, 1992). This survey format is still used today to determine the ranking of Fortune’s Most Admired Companies (MAC) in America. Another proposal was made by Corebrand, a consulting firm, and the “Organizational Brand Index” was developed to evaluate the impact of organizational branding on financial performance. The index provided important data to organizational managers showing how much organizational advertising is reflected in the investments made (Corebrand, 2005). The “Wall Street Journal” currently explores the perceptions about reputation, management quality and investment potential of hundreds of organizations. On the other hand, although methods developed by practitioners to measure organizational reputation provide benefits to evaluate organizational reputation, there are also some downsides. First, these methods take the organizational perceptions of only one stakeholder group, especially financial analysts and investors into account. Therefore, there is a possibility of biased results, as the perspectives of other stakeholders are not taken into account in the results obtained regarding the organizational reputation. Second, these methods have not been scientifically tested for validity and reliability. These negativities have led researchers to develop better methods to measure organizational reputation.

Organizational Reputation Measurement According to Academic Perspective

In today’s highly competitive global market, the effort to gain competitive advantage by using intangible assets as well as tangible assets has made measuring organizational reputation a kind of necessity (Van het Hof, 2012). From this point of view, reputation based on an organizational background and organizational culture that cannot be imitated due to its nature; stands out as the most effective and rooted intangible asset. This approach has increased academic interest in the concept of reputation and reputation measurement, and afterwards, an increase has been observed in research on the subject. Since the 1980s, interest in measuring reputation in the business world has continued to increase, especially in the “Most Admired Companies List” (MAC) of Fortune Magazine. Apart from the methods developed by practitioners to measure organizational reputation, academic studies for

measuring organizational reputation can generally be classified as: (1) one-sided general measures of organizational reputation and (2) multi-faceted specific organizational reputation measures. In one-sided general measurement studies, all stakeholders are asked general questions that include their perceptions of an organization's overall reputation. For example, Wang, Kandampully and Shi (2006) present a general organizational reputation scale according to the following criteria: (1) perceptions about an organization based on general experiences, (2) perceptions towards other competitors, and (3) perceptions about the organization's future. However, researchers who have studied the subject have stated that using a single general measure of organizational reputation will not reflect the general perceptions of stakeholders about an organization's reputation. Furthermore, using a single item measurement during the measurement of organizational reputation may prevent the identification of specific factors that give positive or negative reputation to the organization. For this reason, it has been suggested to use multiple metrics to measure organizational reputation.

Some studies have been carried out on the measurement of organizational reputation in Turkey. Karaköse, (2006) developed a questionnaire to measure the perceptions of internal and external stakeholders in educational organizations regarding organizational reputation in his doctoral thesis titled "Perceptions of Internal and External Stakeholders in Educational Organizations Regarding Institutional Reputation". However, the developed scale is not directly aimed at high school level, but has been developed in a way that can be applied at primary school level. Özpınar (2008) has developed a tool that can measure the organizational reputation in Turkey from the general public-consumer perspective in his PhD thesis called, "Corporate Reputation Measurement: Scale Development Study for Turkey". This scale developed is mostly aimed at measuring the organizational reputation of commercial enterprises and does not provide a structure suitable for measurement in educational organizations. Dülger (2017) also developed a scale in order to determine the organizational reputation level of Antalya Private Envar Schools, designed specifically for that school, in his master's thesis titled "Perception of Institutional Reputation in Private Schools: A Study on Stakeholders of Antalya Private Envar Schools" and the questions are limited to be specifically directed to the participants about Antalya Private Envar Schools. Another organizational reputation scale was developed in the master's thesis titled "Administrator, Teacher and Parent Views on the Institutional Reputation of Private Primary Schools: Malatya Sample" by Karakaş (2019). The related scale was designed and developed in a structure that can be used at the level of private primary schools. On the other hand, when the literature on organizational reputation is examined, it is seen that there is no measurement tool that will directly measure the organizational reputation of high schools and especially private schools at the high school level.

METHOD

This study is a validity and reliability study designed to develop a scale to measure the organizational reputation of foreign private schools and other private schools at high school level.

Study Group

The research was carried out in different private high schools in Istanbul. Systematic sampling method was used in the sample selection of the study. Accordingly, except for the preparatory grade students, who are expected to have more awareness of the organizational reputation of the school, 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th grade students and teachers working in these schools from different branches who have no internships were included in the study.

Table 1. Descriptive Values of Participants

		Frequency	Percentage
Participants	Male	140	43,8
	Female	180	56,2
	Student	202	62,3
	Teacher	118	37,7
	Total	320	100,0

As seen in Table 1, a total of 320 people, including 140 (43.8%) men and 180 (56.2%) women, participated in the study during the scale development process. Again, 202 of the participants (62.3%) were students and 118 (37.7%) were teachers.

Data Analysis

SPSS 21 and SPSS AMOS programs were used to analyse the data of organizational reputation management scale for schools. Factor analysis was conducted to determine the construct validity of the scale. The internal consistency of the scale was tested using reliability coefficient. During the scale development process, exploratory factor analysis to determine the factor structure of the scale depending on the relationships between variables; confirmatory factor analysis to test model-data fit and relational hypotheses between variables were performed.

Developing an organizational reputation management scale for schools

The scale development process is formulated in different ways in the literature. De Vellis, (2003) classifies the process of developing the scale into four stages as “conducting a literature review on the subject”, “determining the format for the measurement method and creating an item/question bank accordingly”, “getting expert opinion” and “evaluating the scale with validity and reliability analysis after the draft application”. In accordance with this, in the process of developing the scale, an item bank was created based on a large-scale literature review on organizational reputation in accordance with the aims of the research. Then, a total of seventy-three (73) items were determined for the “Reputation Management Scale for Schools”, which includes six dimensions related to organizational reputation discussed in the study.

In the next stage, seventy-three (73) items were sent to experts who are experts in scale development and knowledgeable in the relevant literature, and opinions and evaluations of the questionnaire items were collected through an expert opinion form. Afterwards, the draft form created was applied to a group of 20 people. Likert type scale was used for the scale in scoring the items. For the “Organizational Reputation Management Scale for Schools” draft form, participants were asked to mark one of the expressions, “Strongly Disagree”, “Partially Agree”, “Quite Agree” and “Strongly Agree” that express their own situation in the most appropriate way while determining their opinions about the items in the pool. The application time of the scale was determined as approximately fifteen (15) to twenty (20) minutes. In the literature, it is recommended that the average response time of a questionnaire should not exceed thirty minutes, and that this period should be around fifteen (15) minutes in mail application (Aiken, 1997). Finally, after the necessary adjustments were made in line with the expert and participant opinions, the scale was finalized and the pre-application phase started. At this stage, a pre-application study of the scale was carried out in different private schools in Istanbul.

FINDINGS AND COMMENTS

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

Data obtained from 320 participants in total within the scope of the research were used in the exploratory factor analysis. This number corresponds to approximately five times the number of items suggested in the scale. As a general approach in the literature, it is stated that the recommended number of items or the number of observed variables should be approximately five times the sample size for the use of the study group factor analysis technique (Child, 2006). On the other hand, according to Kline (1994), although it is recommended to keep the item (variable) ratio as 10:1 for the sample size in the literature, it is stated that this ratio can be reduced, but the ratio should be at least 2:1. Principal component analysis to reveal the factor pattern of the “Organizational reputation management scale for schools”, and maximum variability (Varimax) as the rotation method among the orthogonal rotation methods for the evaluation of dimensionality were chosen. After the initial stage of the factor analysis, the priority eigenvalues were examined. Eigenvalues are used to calculate the

variance explained by the factors and to decide the number of factors. While factor analysis is conducted as a general approval in the literature, only factors with eigenvalues of 1 and above are accepted as stable.

In the exploratory factor analysis, regarding the common factor variance values (communalities), Seer (2015) stated that the common variance value explained by each item should be at least 0.10, whereas okluk, ekercioglu, and Bykztrk (2012) stated that a decision should not be made to remove items based on the common variance results. In addition, Bykztrk (2003) states that it is a proper choice to have the factor load values of the items as 0.45 or higher, but in practice, this class value can be reduced to 0.30 for a small number of items. Accordingly, in the exploratory factor analysis, the difference between the factor load values of the same item in different factors was taken as at least 0.10. Field (2009), on the other hand, suggests that the factor load values should be greater than 0.364 for a sample size of 200, 0.298 for a sample size of 300, and 0.21 for a sample size of 600 in order to be considered significant.

For the validity analysis of the “organizational reputation management scale for schools”, KMO (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin) coefficient and Bartlett values were examined first in order to evaluate the suitability of the data for factor analysis, then the principal component analysis was performed, and the vertical rotation operations were performed. The factorability of the “organizational reputation management scale for schools” was evaluated before proceeding with the evaluation of data reduction and potential factor structure solutions. For the final factor solution, the communality value was accepted as minimum .30 and it was decided not to include items below this value in the factor analysis process. According to the analysis results, it was seen that the common load values of the items varied between .54 and .88 and it was decided that there was no need to eliminate any item (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In the factor analysis processes of the “Organizational reputation management scale for schools”, first of all, KMO and Bartlett values of sphericity were examined to evaluate the suitability of the data for factor analysis. For factorability, the KMO value must be greater than .60 and the Bartlett Sphericity test must be significant ($p < .05$) (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

Table 2. KMO and Bartlett Sphericity Test Results

Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin (KMO) Sampling Measurement Value Validity		,933
	χ^2	5476,662
Bartlett' Test of Sphericity	sd	703
	Sig.	,000

As seen in Table 2, KMO value was found to be excellent (, 93). According to this value, the suitability of the data structure for factor analysis is excellent. It is seen that the Bartlett Sphericity test performed also gave significant results [$\chi^2 = 5476,66$, $p < .001$]. In line with this value, it was accepted that the data came from multivariate normal distribution.

After the Varimax vertical rotation technique analysis, the factor analysis was carried out until there were no items with the factor load value of the items below .30 and the load difference from two different factors below .10. As a result of the analyses made in this direction, the analysis was repeated continuously by removing the items one by one from the scale respectively, 44th, 35th, 63rd, 10th, 9th, 4th, 28th, 43rd, 25th, 36th, 18th, 29th, 22nd, 11th, 17th, 46th, 14th, 12th, 42nd, 75th, 74th, 40th, 61st, 60th, 20th and 68th. Following the 4 repetitions conducted, 38 items remained and as a result of the factor analysis performed with these 38 items, it was determined that 7 factors explained 58.077% of the total variance. The variance amounts explained for eigenvalues and dimensions are included in Table 3.

Table 3. Factor Eigenvalues of the Organizational Reputation Management Scale for Schools and the Amount of Variance Explained

Factors	Total Variance Explained		
	Total	Initial Eigenvalues Variance %	Cumulative %
1	12,102	31,847	31,847
2	2,779	7,31	39,161
3	2,040	5,36	44,529
4	1,642	4,32	48,851
5	1,305	3,43	52,286
6	1,146	3,01	55,301
7	1,055	2,77	58,077

As seen in Table 3, when the eigenvalue is taken as 1, a 7-factor structure emerges in line with the continuous analysis. When we look at the amount of variance explained by each factor, it can be determined that the variance percentages are as follows: 31,847% of the first factor, 7,314% of the second factor, 5,36% of the third factor, 4,32% of the fourth factor, 3,43% of the fifth factor, 3,01% of the sixth factor, and 2,77% of the seventh factor. Item loads of the factors are included in Table 4.

Table 4. Item Loads of Factors (Rotated Component Matrix)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
m51	0,790						
m55	0,731						
m54	0,714						
m52	0,714						
m50	0,698						
m57	0,691						
m49	0,681						
m53	0,680						
m58	0,631						
m48	0,599						
m59	0,559						
m64		0,751					
m67		0,661					
m65		0,638					
m66		0,625					
m71		0,615					
m72			0,790				
m70			0,761				
m73			0,745				
m69			0,588				
m62			0,509				
m24				0,706			
m26				0,671			
m30				0,633			
m34				0,580			
m27				0,578			
m3					0,707		
m8					0,647		
m6					0,628		
m5					0,623		
m7					0,617		
m19						0,705	
m15						0,678	
m23						0,588	
m13						0,566	
m33							0,725
m31							0,699
m32							0,645

According to Table 4, the first factor has 11 items (items 51, 55, 54, 52, 50, 57, 49, 53, 58, 48, 59) and the second factor has 6 items (items 64, 67, 65, 66, 26, 71), the third factor has 5 items (items 72, 70, 73, 69 and 62), the fourth factor has 5 items (items 24, 26, 30, 34, 27), the fifth factor has 5 items (items 3, 8, 6, 5, 7), the sixth factor consists of 4 items (items 19, 15, 23, 13) and the seventh factor consists of 3 items (items 33, 31, 32).

Items included in each factor were examined and sub-dimensions were named. In this context; the sub-dimensions of the factors were named as follows: the first factor as “social responsibility”, the second factor as “commitment to school”, the third factor as “relations with alumni”, the fourth factor as “school environment”, the fifth factor as “leadership”, the sixth factor as “school management” and the seventh factor as “financial performance”.

Internal consistency analysis

After determining the sub-dimensions, reliability analyses of each sub-dimension were made. Cronbach's Alpha values calculated over the items included in each factor are given in Table 5.

Table 5. Reliability Values Obtained for Sub-Dimensions of the Organizational Reputation Management Scale for Schools

Factor	Cronbach's Alfa
Social Responsibility	.941
Commitment to School	.940
Relations with Alumni	.945
School Environment	.943
Leadership	.947
School Management	.946
Financial Performance	.947
Reputation Management Scale for Schools (Total)	.933

According to Table 5, it was seen that all reliability values were above the critical value of .70 and the reliability levels were high. Considering the reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions, Cronbach's Alpha value for the first sub-dimension was $\alpha=.941$, for the second sub-dimension, it was $\alpha=.940$, for the third sub-dimension, it was $\alpha=.945$, for the fourth sub-dimension, it was $\alpha=.943$, for the fifth sub-dimension, it was $\alpha=.947$, for the sixth sub-dimensions, it was $\alpha=.946$, for the seventh dimension, it was $\alpha=.947$ and the total Cronbach's Alpha value of the scale was calculated as $\alpha=.933$. These results show that the scale has high values in terms of internal consistency.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA)

The sample size is a significant factor for the estimation method to give accurate results in confirmatory factor analysis, but there is no definite consensus about the accurate number of samples in the literature (Waltz, Strickland and Lenz, 2010). According to Kline (2005), the sample should have 10 times higher number of the items, or this number should not be less than 200. In order to ensure the construct validity of the designed “organizational reputation management scale for schools”, the scale was administered to a different sample group consisting of students and teachers studying and working in private schools in Istanbul, and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was carried out with 235 questionnaires. Descriptive values of the sample group are as follows:

Table 6. Descriptive Values of Confirmatory Factor Analysis Sample Group

	Frequency	Percentage
Participants	Male	120
	Female	115
	Student	145
	Teacher	90
	Total	235
		51,9
		48,1
		61,7
		38,3
		100,0

As seen in Table 6, the confirmatory factor analysis was carried out with a total of 235 participants, 120 of whom were men (51,9%) and 115 of whom were women (48,1%). 145 of the participants (61,7%) are students while 90 of them (38,3%) are teachers. Confirmatory factor analysis was carried out using the SPSS AMOS program. The results and values for the confirmatory factor analysis are as follows:

Table 7. Confirmatory Factor Analysis Fit Values and Fit Ranges

Model Fit Criterion	Good Fit	Acceptable Fit	Research Fit Results
χ^2 / df	$0 \leq \chi^2 / df \leq 2$	$2 \leq \chi^2 / df \leq 3$	$\chi^2 / df (1181,945/644 = 1,835 < 2$
IFI	$0,95 \leq IFI$	$0,90 \leq IFI$	$IFI = 0,90 \leq 0,93$
CFI	$0,97 \leq CFI$	$0,95 \leq CFI$	$CFI = 0,922 \leq 0,95$
RMSEA	$RMSEA \leq 0,05$	$RMSEA \leq 0,08$	$RMSEA = 0,057 \leq 0,08$
GFI	$0,90 \leq GFI$	$0,85 \leq GFI$	$GFI = 0,90 \leq 0,916$
RMR	$0 < RMR \leq 0,05$	$0 < RMR \leq 0,08$	$RMR = 0 < 0,074 \leq 0,08$

Source: Engel, Moosbrugger ve Müller, 2003.

As seen in Table 7, according to the confirmatory factor analysis fit values, the model conforms to the predicted data in the literature. Accordingly, the validity of the “organizational reputation management scale for schools” attained by exploratory factor analysis was also confirmed by confirmatory factor analysis.

RESULTS AND SUGGESTIONS

In this research, a scale development study was carried out to determine the organizational reputation of private schools and foreign private schools at high school level. The developed scale was prepared as a 4-point Likert type scale and was expressed with the following statements: Strongly Disagree (1), Partially Agree (2), Quite Agree (3), Strongly Agree (4) to determine the suitability of the items to the participants.

The results of the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses reveal that the scale has a structure of 7 dimensions and 38 items. Accordingly, the organizational reputation of private schools are “Social Responsibility, Commitment to School, Relations with Alumni, School Environment, Leadership, School Management and Financial Performance”. While the dimensions of “Leadership and School Management” were handled together in the scales previously developed by Dülger (2017) and Karakaş (2019), the related dimensions in this study were identified as “Leadership” and “School Management” as separate dimensions. Apart from this, it has been observed that the School Environment, Commitment to School, Social Responsibility and Financial Performance dimensions that emerged in the study are compatible with the scales developed by Dülger (2017) and Karakaş (2019). On the other hand, it is observed that the Service Quality dimension, which is common in the scales developed by Dülger (2017) and Karakaş (2019), did not appear as a dimension in the measurement of organizational reputation in this study, but the Relations with Alumni Dimension came to the fore instead of this dimension. When the significance of the achievements of graduate students and the relationship they establish with the school are considered about the establishment and stability of the organizational reputation of private schools, it can be argued that the Relations with Alumni is a dimension that should inevitably be taken into account in measuring the organizational reputation of private schools. On the other hand, this scale, which was developed to measure the organizational reputation of private schools and foreign private schools at high school level, was created in line with the organizational reputation perceptions of students and teachers. Different measurement tools can be developed to measure the organizational reputation of private schools by ensuring the participation of parents in further studies.

The use of the currently developed scale towards the organizational reputation of private schools and foreign private schools at the high school level by the private schools and private foreign schools in Turkey is thought to be possible.

The developed scale is expected to contribute to the private schools as well as the literature in terms of the measurement of the organizational reputation of private schools in today's circumstances under which competition is increasing day by day and, accordingly, the practices to be administered regarding the organizational reputation management.

REFERENCES

- Aaker, J. L. (1997). Dimensions of brand personality. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 34, August, 347-56.
- Aiken, L. (1997). *Questionnaires and inventories: Surveying opinions and assessing personality*. New York; John Wiley.
- Anderson, E. & Robertson, T.S. (1995). Including multi-line salespeople to adopt house brands. *Journal of Marketing*, 59(1), 16-31.
- Barnett, M. Jermier, J. & Lafferty, B. (2006). Corporate reputation: the definitional landscape. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(1), 26-38. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550012>.
- Bernstein, D. (1984). *Company image and reality: A critique of corporate communications*. Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Ltd.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş. (2003). *Sosyal Bilimler İçin Veri Analizi El Kitabı*. PegemA Yayıncılık.
- Caruana, A. & Chircop, S. (2000). Measuring corporate reputation: A case example. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 3(1), 43-57. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540098>.
- Child, D. (2006). *The essentials of factor analysis*. Continuum, London.
- Corebrand, (2005). *Our services*. Retrieved from <http://www.corebrand.com/services/services.html>. Erişim Tarihi: 26.06.2019.
- Çokluk, Ö. S., Şekercioglu, G. ve Büyüköztürk, S. (2012). *Sosyal bilimler için çok değişkenli istatistik: spss ve lisrel uygulamaları*. Ankara: Pegem Akademi Yayıncılık.
- Davies, G. & Miles, L. (1998). Reputation management: theory versus practice. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 2(1), 16-27.
- Davies, G., Chun, R., Silva, R. V. D. & Roper, S. (2001). The personification metaphor as a measurement approach for corporate reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 4(2), 113-127. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540137>
- Davies, G., Chun, R., Silva, D. R. V. & Roper, S. (2003). *Corporate reputation and competitiveness*. Wiltshire: *The Cromwell Press*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203218112>.
- Doney, P. M. & Cannon, J.P. (1997). An examination of the nature of trust in buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 61(2), 35-51.
- Dowling, G. R. (2001). *Creating corporate reputations: Identity, image and performance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development theory and applications second edition*. SAGE Publications International Educational and Professional Publisher, 5, 60-96.

- Dülger, G. (2017). *Özel okullarda kurumsal itibar algısı: antalya özel envar okulları paydaşları üzerinde bir araştırma*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Isparta.
- Engel, K.S., Moosbrugger, H. & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the fit of structural equation models: tests of significance and descriptive goodness-of-fit measures. *Methods of Psychological Research Online*, 8, 23-74.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using spss*. 3rd Edition, London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: an introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Fombrun, C. J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing value from the corporate image*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, MA.
- Fombrun, C. J. & van Riel, C. B. M. (1997). The reputational landscape. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(1/2), 6-13.
- Fombrun, C. J., Gardberg, N. A. & Bernett, M. L. (2000). Opportunity platforms and safety nets: corporate citizenship and reputational risk. *Business and Society Review*, 105(1), 85-106.
- Fombrun, C. J. & Foss, C. B. (2001). Developing a reputation quotient. *The Gauge*, 14(3).
- Fortune. (2019, 3 Eylül). Available from: <http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/mostadmired/2011/index/html>.
- Gotsi, M. & Wilson, A. M. (2001). Corporate reputation: seeking a definition. *Corporate Communications*, 6(1), 24-30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13563280110381189>
- Hasanbegovic, D. (2011). Corporate reputation and the brand architecture: the debate. *South East European Journal of Economics and Business*, 6(2), 37-43.
- Helm, S. (2005). Designing a Formative Measure for Corporate Reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review* 8, 95–109 doi: 10.1057/palgrave.crr.1540242
- Karakaş, N. N. (2019). *Özel ilkokulların kurumsal itibarı konusunda yönetici, öğretmen ve veli görüşleri: Malatya örnekleme*. (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). İstanbul Üniversitesi-Cerrahpaşa Lisansüstü Eğitim Enstitüsü, İstanbul.
- Karaköse, T. (2006). *Eğitim örgütlerindeki iç ve dış paydaşların kurumsal itibara ilişkin algılamaları*. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Elâzığ.
- Keller, K. L. & Aaker, D. A. (1998). Corporate level marketing: the impact of credibility marketing on brand extensions. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(4), 356–378.
- Keller, K. L. (2000). Building and managing corporate brand equity. In Larsen, M.H. (Ed.), *Expressive organization: linking identity, reputation and the corporate brand*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, G. A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs*. I (II). New York: Norton.
- Kerin, R. A. & Sethuraman, R. (1998). Exploring the brand value-shareholder value nexus for consumer goods companies. *Journal of Academy of Marketing Science*, 26(4), 260- 73.
- Kline, P. (1994). *An easy guide to factor analysis*. New York: Routledge.

- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Methodology in the social sciences. Principles and practice of structural equation modeling*, (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Lloyd S. and K. Mortimer. (2006). Corporate reputation: Seeing through the eye of the beholder, AUT University. Retrieved from http://anzmac.info/conference/2006/documents/Lloyd_Stephen2.pdf (Erişim Tarihi; 9 Ağustos 2019).
- Marconi, J. (2001). *Reputation marketing. Building and sustaining your organization's greatest asset*. Black lick OH, USA: McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Merriam–Webster. *Reputation*, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reputation> (Erişim Tarihi: 22.08.2020).
- Mishina, Y., Block, E. & Mannor, M. (2011). The path dependence of organizational reputation: how social judgment influences assessments of capability and character. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41411182>.
- Özpinar, Ş. (2008). *Kurumsal itibarın ölçümü: Türkiye'ye yönelik ölçek geliştirme çalışması*. (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Rindova, V., Williamson, I. & Antoaneta, P. (2005). Being good or being known: an empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2005.19573108>.
- Rose, C. & Thomsen, S. (2004). The impact of corporate reputation on performance: Some Danish evidence. *European Management Journal*, 22(2), 201-10.
- Safón, V. (2009). Measuring the reputation of top US business schools: A MIMIC modelling approach. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 12(3), 204-228.
- Seçer, İ. (2015). *Spss ve Lisrel ile pratik veri analizi: analiz ve raporlaştırma*. Anı yayıncılık.
- Schwaiger, M. (2004). Components and parameters of corporate reputation-an empirical study. *Schmalenbach Business Review*, 56, 46-71.
- Sherman, M. L. (1999). *Reputation: Rhetoric versus reality*. London: Limited by Director Publication Ltd.
- Sobol, M. Farelly, G. E. & Tapper, J. S. (1992). *Shaping the corporate image: an analytic guide for executive decision makers*. New York: Quorum Books.
- Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*, (5th ed.). Allyn & Bacon/Pearson Education.
- Van het Hof, S.D. (2012). Models in reputation measurement. Baybars, B. & Samast, O. (1. Baskı) içinde (s. 29-43). *New challenges, new opportunities: Interdisciplinary perspectives on reputation management*. Reputation Management Institute of Turkey. Pozitif Matbaacılık. Ankara.
- Van Riel, C. B. M. (1997). Increasing effectiveness of managing strategic issues affecting a firm's reputation. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(2), 135-40.
- Van Riel, C. B. M., Stroecker, N.E. & Maathuis, O.J.M. (1998) Measuring corporate images. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 1(4), 313–26.

Van Riel, C. ve Fombrun, C. (2007). *Essentials of corporate communication*. Oxon:
Routledge.

Walsh, G. & Wiedmann, K. P. (2004). A conceptualization of corporate reputation in Germany: an evaluation and extension of the RQ. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 6(4), 304-12.

Walsh, G., Beatty, S. E. & Shiu, E. M. K. (2009). The customer-based corporate reputation scale: replication and short form. *Journal of Business Research*, 62(10), 924-30.

Waltz, C., Strickland, O. & Lenz, E. (2010). *Measurement in nursing and health research*.
New York: Springer Publishing Company, 176-8.

Wang, Y., Kandampully, H. P. L., & Shi, G. (2006). The role of brand equity and corporate reputation in crm: a chinese study. *Corporate Reputation Review*, 9(3), 179-197.
<https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.crr.1550027>.

Worthington, R. & Whittaker, T. (2006). Scale development research. *Counseling Psychologist-Couns Psychol*. <https://doi.org/34.806-838>. 10.1177/0011000006288127.