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Current study aims to develop a scale to identify the universal values of school administrators in school management. In order to develop the scale, academic resources were reviewed and a 40-item draft data collection instrument was created by taking the views and suggestions of 5 school administrators, 5 academicians and 5 education inspectors with the help of semi-structured interview form. The draft data collection instrument was scaled down to 34 items following the expert views and pilot implementation (N=52). The finalized data collection instrument was implemented on 304 teachers to obtain reliability and validity analyses and the obtained data were analyzed. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the data collection instrument was found to be 0.972. Rotation: Varimax analysis, one of the factor analysis methods, was utilized to identify statistically related items. According to the results, factor load values changed between 0.40 and 0.81 and were composed of three dimensions. Test-retest analysis of the study was undertaken with 65 teachers and Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was found to be 0.970. The scale was found applicable in identifying school administrators’ commitment to universal values in school management.
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INTRODUCTION

Most probably the reason why civilizations struggle with each other is not economic or ideological ones but cultural ones (Huntington 1993). Although Huntington argues about the struggle between civilizations and explain its reason with cultural differences; today order to reach a sustainable world peace some common values have already emerged. There are six components for sustainable future 1) cosmological context, 2) ecological integrity, 3) social equity, 4) economic justice, 5) democracy, 6) non-violence and peace (Turker 2012). These six components are seen as essential to establish a sustainable world peace.

We are experiencing a period in which local values are replaced by universal ones as a consequence of the rapid globalization which has accelerated along with the recent advances in technology and communicating technologies. It is believed that the values in question affect not only individuals but also organizations since human beings are social and organized entities. Values develop not only in the individual but also in the organizational level (Aydin 2010: 15). One fundamental characteristic that both employees and organizations share is ‘values’
(Finegan 2000). Hence it is believed that those emerging values do not only affect the individuals but also affect the organizations. Values determine the foundation which is required to understand human behavior and motivation along with our perceptions (Robbins and Judge 2012: 146). The concept of value which was first introduced to social sciences by Znaniecki is derived from the Latin root “valere” which means “be valuable” or “be strong” (Bilgin 1995: 83). “Values are basic ethical principles and beliefs accepted as true or necessary by the majority of the members of a social group or a community to provide and continue their existence, unity, operation and continuity and that reflect their common emotions, goals and interests (Kızılçelik and Erjem 1994: 99). Kluckhohn (1961) defined value as “a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable outcome which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action”. Rokeach (1973) who had significant studies on the topic of values identified the concept of value as “an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence”. He defined a value system as “an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance” (Rokeach 1973: 5). Feather (1975) explained the cognitive structures of value systems and defined values as the organized summaries of experiences and associative networks.

There is diversity in the world in terms of value. Diversity is a feature of most cultures in the world. 

The practice of democracy that has won out in the modern West is largely a result of a consensus that has emerged since the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolutions and not particularly in the last century or so (Sen 1999: 15). Values are in both daily life and the whole life (Deveci and Ay, 2009). So that such an important part of life can be classified in many ways. However, values can be divided into two as traditional and universal ones prior to the expansivity of values on human beings. (Koca 2009). Traditional values are the ones that are special to one’s own society and let him to exist in his own society. Universal values, on the other hand, are the ones that are accepted by many other societies and based on human rights (Keskin et al. 2012, Altunay and Yalçınkaya 2011, Devrani 2010). Universal values based on the necessity to respect every human life and shaping life, itself, on this necessity (Altunay and Yalçınkaya 2011). 

One of the most comprehensive studies on values was undertaken by Rokeach in 1973 and he listed the values as instrumental and terminal values as shown in Table 1. Values influence institutional decision making as they contain a judgmental element in that they carry an attribute as to what is right, good or desirable. Values have both content and intensity (Prashar et al., 2004: 144).

Hence, it is inevitable for school administrators’ existing values to affect the decisions they make regarding their organizations. Therefore, it is believed that school administrators’ existing values are crucial in school management. Commitment to universal values by school administrators is expected to help facilitate the generation of a common school management culture since universal values are common products of humanity.

### School Management and Universal Values

Schools are environments in which educational services are generated and rendered and learning takes place (Unal 1996, Sisman and Turan 2004, Turan 2004). Educational services generated are the endeavors undertaken by the school to educate students according to educational programs provided to them (Basaran 1996: 32). As institutions that include highly qualified individuals with the capacity to educate, schools are obliged to take the responsibility to process and develop the human resources in the society (Aydin 2004: 173). The purpose of the schools is to educate individuals to be free, think multi directionally, have strong social characters, be mentally and physically healthy, have entrepreneurship skills and vision and internalize the social culture (Can 2004: 128). Therefore, schools are highly important educational organizations that can never be ignored by the society (Ataunal 2004).

School management is the implementation of educational management to a limited field; school management is composed of the implementation of educational management in the school (Bursalıoğlu 1994: 5). School management is an educational community that includes students, teachers and administrators and the educational institution in which various knowledge, skills and habits are taught or provided according to identified aims (Erdoğan 2000: 79). School management is the process in which material and human resources in the school are mobilized and coordinated in such a manner to facilitate the acquisition of specified purposes (Bayrak 2001: 207).

A major part of our values are passed to us in our youth by parents, teachers and others (Robbins and Judge 2012:146). Several writers have tried to identify core or universal values. Their lists are typically created through informal search for recurrent themes found within major sacred books like the Bible or the Koran (Kinnier et al., 2000: 8). Both philosophers and social scientists agree that all men in society have some common values. These values are called “universal values” (Yılmaz 2008: 70). It can be argued that formation of universal values were accelerated as a result of the humanist movement that transpired due to understanding of the destructive effects of World War II for all humanity and as a result of the adoption of Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Advances in communication and transportation technologies facilitated the spread of these universal values...
throughout the world in a rapid manner. Universal values have started to take shape around concepts such as human rights, democracy, transparency and professional ethics since the second half of the 20th century.

Schools are now organizations that educate individuals for the global world. Therefore schools target to educate individuals who internalize global values and can integrate with the global world and can take part in world labor force, in fact schools are trying to educate individuals to be citizens of the world. In order to be world citizens, individuals need to adopt universal values and reshape their behaviors in the direction of these values.

Universal values born with the process of globalization have affected educational organizations as well and caused changes in their functions to a large extent. Now educational organizations are teaching “learning to learn”, “learning to think” and “learning to unlearn” in order to minimize the resistance to change that accelerated with the help of globalization process rather than flowing their previous general function of teaching. In addition, today’s educational organizations have undertaken the role of educating individuals to be world citizens so that they can take part in the global labor market in the world which is now a global village.

Therefore, the previous role of educational organizations to educate individuals who internalize only local values has changed to educating individuals to be world citizens who have skills to integrate with the world community and have knowledge of universal values. In order for the schools to provide students with universal values, they themselves are expected to have some universal values.

Values provide a basis for organizational culture, but perceptions of an organization’s values may vary across hierarchical levels, functional departments and geographic locations (Quinn and Rohrbaugh 1983). Thus, governing people equipped with universal values will be done with the schools that are designed with universal values. Much values research has focused on how individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures differ in the values they hold, and how these differences affect behavior (Abbott et al. 2005). Current study aims to identify the universal values in school management.

METHOD

Participants

Study group of this research was composed of 304 teachers employed in Sanlurfa Province of Turkey. Teachers who participated in the study were selected by using “Simple Random Sampling” method. There are many different teachers from 10 primary and 10 secondary schools with various backgrounds by terms of age, gender, degree and seniority in our sampling group. It was especially considered to choose different secondary schools running different programmes. Data collecting was carefully done with 304 out of 360 teachers who were eager and all the data collected was analysed. 42, 1% of the participants were females (N=128) and 57, 9% were males (N=176). The ratio of participants who
worked in primary and secondary schools are 50% in each category (N=152). 83, 2% of the teachers had undergraduate degrees (N=253) and 16, 8% had graduate degrees (N=51). Professional seniority of the participating teachers were as follows: 1-5 years of seniority 44, 7% (N=136); 6-10 years 28, 9% (N=88), 11-15 years 16, 8% (N=51)%; and 16 years or more 9,6% (N=29). Moreover, in order to confirm data collected before, four weeks after the first collection, selected by “Simple Random Sampling” method; some 65 teachers’ data out of 304 sampling group was collected again for test-retest study.

**Scale Development Process**

Teacher views regarding school administrators’ commitment levels to universal values were collected with the help of “Universal Values in School Management Scale (UVISMS)”. 6-phase process proposed by Lester and Bishop (2000) was taken into account during the development of the scale. The first step involved the review of academic literature (Yilmaz 2008; Schwartz 1994; Schwartz and Bilsky 1987; Rokeach 1973; Kluckhohn 1962) and a data collection instrument item pool was generated by identifying the universal values. 5 school head teachers, 5 lecturer and 5 inspectors were asked to confirm whether the universal values in our survey items are suitable for the values that are in school management or not. Later 10 school administrators were given semi-structured interview forms to gather their ideas about universal values in school management. The questions below were included in the interview form:

1. In your opinion, what universal value accompanies the globalization process?
2. What do you think of the universal values that accompany the globalization process?
3. In your opinion, what reasons require commitment to universal values in school management?

Answers to interview form were used in the item pool as well. The first item pool included 45 items but the items were reduced to 40 after first assessment by eliminating similar items and reviewing the statements. These items were implemented on 52 teachers to ensure intelligibility. Teachers provided feedback with an interview about the intelligibility of the items and the period of implementation and their suggestions were taken into account to make adjustments. In this phase (pilot implementation) Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of the scale was found to be 0, 88. The 40-item scale was represented to 5 school administrators, 5 academicians and 5 education inspectors to get feedback for content validity. These individuals assessed intelligibility and shared their ideas about the sub dimensions which the scale items belong to as well as providing feedback about the items that needed to be eliminated or added. 6 items were eliminated from the scale in line with expert views. The finalized scale used for reliability and validity assessment included 34 items.

Draft data collection instrument was implemented on 304 teachers employed in Sanliurfa Province. The 5 Likert type (never, hardly, partially, usually and completely) data collection instrument of containing 34 statements was then finalized. The lowest score that can be obtained from the scale is 34 and the highest total score is 170. Low scores indicate incompetence in universal values in school management and high scores show competence in the area. The scale can be implemented individually or in a group and takes about 20 minutes to complete.

In order to obtain UVISMS validity values, construct validity was examined. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) were undertaken to present construct validity of the scale. While CFA is used to evaluate the extent of overlap between the factors composed of different variables based on a theoretical foundation and the actual data, EFA is used to create a limited number of meaningful constructs from many items (variables) which can define the created constructs (Buyukozturk, 2007).

**Reliability Analysis**

In order to undertake reliability analysis, internal consistency and test-retest methods were used and the Cronbach Alpha value for the total scale was found to be 0,972; Spearman-Brown split half reliability coefficient was calculated to be 0,943 and test-retest reliability value was found to be 0,970.

R matrix was examined to observe the adequacy of data for factor analysis and data was found to be adequate for factor analysis due to meaningful relationships that were detected. Later, sample adequacy (Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Sample Adequacy Analysis) and Barlett Sphericity analyses were undertaken and KMO Sample Adequacy Coefficient 0,962; and Barlett Sphericity test $\chi^2$ value 8379,655 (p=0,000) were obtained. In order for data to be adequate for factor analysis, KMO value should be higher than 0, 60 and Barlett test should be significant (Buyukozturk, 2007). The fact that KMO value was higher than 0, 90 shows perfect fit for factor analysis (Hutcheson and Sofroniou 1999).

**Construct Validity**

Varimax, an exploratory factor analysis method, was implemented to present the construct validity of UVISMS and the obtained load values are presented in Table 2.

Examination of Rotated Component Matrix table shows that factor load values change between 0,462 and 0,812.
Table 2. Rotated component matrix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Factor 1 Human Relations</th>
<th>Factor 2 Job Discipline</th>
<th>Factor 3 Social Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Load Value</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Load Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.812</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.779</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Goodness-of-fit indices for UVISMS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>TLI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691,914</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0,000</td>
<td>0,857</td>
<td>0,847</td>
<td>0,086</td>
<td>3,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Human relations in school management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>School Administrator is democratic in school management</td>
<td>3,29</td>
<td>0,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School Administrator values human relations in school management</td>
<td>3,45</td>
<td>1,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School Administrator values the ideas of others in school management</td>
<td>3,16</td>
<td>1,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School Administrator provides morale for stakeholders at the school</td>
<td>3,06</td>
<td>1,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>School Administrator does not discriminate among teachers</td>
<td>3,24</td>
<td>1,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>School Administrator values kindness</td>
<td>3,02</td>
<td>1,15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>School Administrator motivates the teachers</td>
<td>3,03</td>
<td>1,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>School Administrator respects different ideas at school</td>
<td>3,26</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>School administrator is fair to stakeholders at the school</td>
<td>3,07</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>School Administrator instills trust in the stakeholders at the school</td>
<td>3,21</td>
<td>1,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School Administrator helps in problems school employees and students face</td>
<td>3,28</td>
<td>1,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>School Administrator speaks privately with the individual when there is an unfavorable situation</td>
<td>3,59</td>
<td>1,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>School Administrator is honest to stakeholders at the school.</td>
<td>3,51</td>
<td>0,99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>School Administrator approaches students and other stakeholders at the school with love</td>
<td>3,38</td>
<td>1,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3,25</td>
<td>0,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 3-factor structure with eigenvalues of 17,979, 1,850 and 1, 55 was obtained as a result of factor analysis. These factors are titled as 1st factor Human Relations, 2nd factor Professional Discipline and 3rd factor Social Responsibility (Table 4 to 6). These three factors explain 62,602% of the total variance about the scale. Therefore, the 3-factor structure obtained at the end of the analysis explains a major part of the total variance in the items.
and in the scale. Items with load values 0.40 and higher are collected in the same factor. Factor load value of 0.45 or higher is a good selection criterion. However this value can be decreased to 0.30 for a limited number of items during practice (Buyukozturk, 2007). At the end of the factor analysis, the scale was found to be composed of three factors which were named Human Relations, Professional Discipline and Social Responsibility (Table 4 to 6).

Factor structure was defined as three-factor according to eigenvalues and this can be observed in the scree plot graphic based on eigenvalues (Figure 1). The graphic shows a high accelerated decrease after the first factor. This fact shows that the scale has a general factor.

The facts that the obtained percentage to explain the total variance is high and that factor loads are high in three factors in the research show that UVISMS can measure what it sets out to measure and therefore it is valid. The scale was analyzed both by exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis.

CFA was undertaken in AMOS program for the three factor UVISMS obtained as a result of CFA earlier. Current CFA showed that all items in the scale were compatible with the three-factor structure and the goodness-of-fit indices also provided good values. Findings related to CFA results for UVISMS are provided in Table 3 and Figure 2.

The fact that \( \chi^2/df \) ratio calculated in the analysis was smaller than 5 and that RMSEA value was lower than 0.10 are regarded as lower limits for model-data fit (Anderson and Gerbing, 1984; Marsh at al., 1988). Accordingly, values for model-data fit display that the generated model is compatible with the data which provides the scale with construct validity.

**DISCUSSION**

Local values are replaced by universal values as a result of today’s globalization process and the advances in communication and transportation technologies. These universal values that rapidly spread orient the behaviors of individuals as they affect organizations and cause them to form new attitudes and behaviors. One of the
Figure 1. Scree Plot Graphic Based on Eigenvalues.

Figure 2. CFA Diagram.
organizations affected by universal values is the school organization whose main aim is to educate individuals.

There are not many studies in literature about the dominant universal values in school management. In their research about universal moral values, Kinnier et al. (2000) presented the universal moral values in four dimensions as “Commitment to something greater than oneself”, “Self-respect but with humility, self-discipline and acceptance of personal responsibility”, “Respect and caring for others” and “Caring for other living things and the environment”. In his research Swartz (1994) presented the world the universal values world “at peace”, “wisdom”, “social justice”, “world of beauty”, “inner harmony”, “protect evirmonet”, “unity with nature”, equality and “board minded”. Khazanachi at al. (2007) Subsequent studies might suggest how managers can foster shared values, while identifying practices that reinforce those values to fuel innovation. Abbott at al. (2005) and Finegan (2000) found that common values affect organizational commitment in positive means. Posner and Schmidt (1993), on the other hand, found that both individual and organizational values affect individual work performance in positive way. All these researches show that organizational values affect work life in positive. Current study has set forth a total of 34 universal values combined in three dimensions as “Human Relations”, “Professional Discipline” and “Social Responsibility”.

CONCLUSION
Universal values are the common products of humanity and whether universal or local they are one of the elements shaping human behavior. Just like local values, universal values also affect the decisions made in private, social and work life. Therefore, it can be argued that school administrators’ values play determinant roles in their managerial duties. The current study identified three dimensions of universal values that are taken into consideration by school administrators while performing administrative tasks: “Human Relations”, “Professional Discipline” and “Social Responsibility” (Table 4 to 6).

The analysis of research data shows that UVISMS can be used to identify school administrators’ commitment to universal values in school management. Moreover, I think that the results of this study will help universal values to expand in schools and managing schools with regard to universal values.

RECOMMENDATIONS
The fact that universal values are the common products of humanity, existence of an international labor market, ongoing discussions about the concept of world citizenship and existence of teachers and students from various nations in many schools necessitate commitment to universal values by school administrators. Therefore, school administrators can be encouraged to adopt universal values in their administrative tasks. Also, effects of universal values in school management can be studied in terms of different variables.
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