

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SCHOOL ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH IN PUNJABDr. Shahla Tufail¹, Dr. Saira Irfan², Dr. Umbreen Khizar³, Dr. Wizra Saeed⁴**Original Article**

1. Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan
Email: shahla.tufail11@gmail.com
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Psychology, University of Sahiwal
Email: sairairfan@uosahiwal.edu.pk
3. Assistant Professor/HoD, Department of Psychology, Institute of Southern Punjab, Multan
Email: umbreenkhizar@gmail.com
4. Assistant Professor, Department of Professional Psychology, Bahria University Islamabad
Email: wizrasaeed@gmail.com

Abstract

Schools are the most important organizations of any society. A conducive learning environment of school helps learners to enhance their skills because they spend a lot of time in school under the supervision of teachers. This study seeks to compare public and private secondary school teachers' perceptions of their school's organizational health. School organizational health was studied under the four dimensions (goal focus, communication adequacy, resource utilization, and cohesiveness). Demographic variables of sector, gender and district were also examined. This study applied a quantitative research approach to conduct the survey. The sample consisted of 250 teachers from different schools in Punjab province. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used to analyze data. Findings revealed significant differences in public and private secondary school teachers' perceptions of four sub-factors of school organizational health. Findings also showed significant differences in teachers' perceptions based on all demographic variables. These intriguing findings may have ramifications for future research and school reforms.

Keywords: School Organization Health, Secondary Level, Public School, Private School, Teachers' Perceptions

Introduction

Organizational health is related to the environment of any organization, to the strength and adjustment of an organization and their capacity enhancement for further changes (Bauer et al., 2014). Doganay and Dagli (2020) discussed that the concept of organizational health addresses the organization's harmony with all its environment, internal mechanisms, and its capacity to accomplish its purposes and goals. The concept of organizational health is related

to any administrative organization, its natural necessities to cultivate and grow as well as work efficiently to overcome the problems and enhance performance; at the same time, it can complete personal and administrative purposes and provide a creative environment for long term success (Yamama, 2021).

A school's organizational health is a powerful concept that is defined as an environment equipped with physical and psychological units to increase teachers, students, and staff's optimum level of functioning (Hoy & Miskel,

1991; Parsons's, 1967 & Miles, 1965). School organizations should be goal-directed, whose environment has psychological impacts on students' aptitude towards study and well-being to meet high expectations of achievement (Omoyemiju & Adediwura, 2011). Teachers' and students' acceptance levels towards the school organization goal can be elevated with the help of efficient communication, positive behavior towards each other, and role modeling of the teachers to reduce the stress level and enhance the efficiency of the student's work (Tsui & Cheng, 1999). Parsons (1967) conceptualized two categories of organizational needs: instrumental and expressive needs. Instrumental needs are the organization's objectives, and expressive needs need to support a set of standard positive norms and values to promote their common objective (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Parsons, 1967). Technical (teaching-learning process), managerial (internal administration function), and institutional (connects the school with the environment) are the three levels of influence schools have on these needs (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Parsons, 1967). Similarly, according to Miles (1965) approach, by matching the three levels of influence to meet its instrumental and expressive demands, as well as coping with and adapting to a constantly changing environment, a school with positive organizational school health is successfully pursuing its objective of educating students (Hoy et al., 1991).

Many researchers have worked on school organizational health in different components in the last thirty years, i.e., school culture, climate, and environment. Nevertheless, school organizational health also requires continuous improvement for effective and attractive teaching methods plus a learning environment. Now a days, school health education is seen at the same time as a 'broad health curricula.' It is a blend of society, schools, and practice. It significantly differs according to the school levels (Köse, 2018;

Chambers, 2011; Akyurek, 2019; Yıldız, 2014).

Educational organizations play an important role in the transformation and improvement of societies (Busch & Fernandez, 2019). Lin and Lin (2014) exposed that there was a substantial effect on the effectiveness of planning through organizational health culture. A healthy school environment creates a positive learning environment and circumstances for increasing school effectiveness and efficiency (Borkar, 2016). Akbaba conducted a Study of teachers' and principals' perceptions of organizational health in secondary schools. Findings revealed significant differences in teachers and administrators perceptions of school organizational health. Researcher suggested that administrators can use the organizational health profile of schools to get clues regarding problems and changes required, and schools with low health scores can develop improvement plans (Akbaba, 1997).

Previously, researchers focused on school organizational health under four dimensions: goal focus, communication adequacy, resource utilization, cohesiveness. The goal focus is the ability of individuals, groups or organizations to be transparent, adopt and support goals and objectives. Communication adequacy is where information is not distorted and goes both straight up across the boundaries of the organization. Human resources, especially, are utilized efficiently in a healthy organization (resource utilization). Healthy organizations have members who are attracted to them, take pride in being a member, and are willing to stick around. Cohesiveness is a sense of belonging participants have to an organization. A good match is made between the personal needs of participants and the requirements of the organization (MacNeil et al., 2009).

Researchers have reported the significance of this field of study because current academic

the impact of the school staff (teachers, principals and counselors) on student achievement is not direct, but indirectly mediated by school health (Leithwood et al., 2004; Witziers et al., 2003).

Since, all over the world young adults choose their careers at the secondary school level (Munir & Khalil, 2016). Most of the studies on secondary schools' organizational health have been conducted in foreign countries addressing the organizational health and teacher education (Klinge & Lyden, 2001), teachers' perception of school organizational health (Omoyemiju & Adediwura, 2011) and organizational health of secondary school teachers concerning their adjustment (Lenka, et al., 2017). In the Pakistani context, Munir and Khalil (2016) researched teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors and their academic performance at the secondary school level. However, there is a lack of research in Pakistan that focuses on teachers' perceptions of organizational health at the secondary school level. Therefore, the present research has embarked on examining teachers' perceptions of organizational health at the secondary school level in Punjab, Pakistan.

Hypothesis of the Study

Ho1: There would be significant differences in teachers' perception about school organizational health based on sector.

Ho2: There would be significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions of school organizational health.

Ho3: There would be significant differences in teachers' perception about school organizational health based on district.

Ho4: There would be significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perception about Goal Focus sub-factor of school organizational health.

Ho5: There would be significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers'

perception about communication adequacy sub-factor of school organizational health.

Ho6: There would be significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perception about resource utilization sub-factor of school organizational health.

Ho7: There would be significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions about cohesiveness sub-factor of school organizational health.

Methodology

This study was based on a quantitative research approach and a survey method was used to collect data. Secondary school teachers from three districts of the Punjab i.e., Lahore, Gujranwala and Hafiz Abad were randomly selected. The sample was comprised of 250 public and private secondary school teachers in which 87 were male and 163 were females.

Instrument

The Organizational Health Instrument (OHI) developed by Johnstone (1988) was used in this study. OHI measures 10 dimensions of organizational health conceptualized by Matthew Miles (1971). This study measured four dimensions (Goal focus, Communication adequacy, Resource utilization and Cohesiveness) associated with a healthy organization. Responses to 32 questions were recorded on a five-point Likert type scale from Strongly agree = 5 to Strongly disagree = 1. The Cronbach alpha value of the scale is 0.76.

Results

Table 1 reports the descriptive analysis of teachers' perceptions about sub-factors of school organizational health such as cohesiveness (M=3.85, SD=.730), resource utilization (M=3.77, SD=.816), communication adequacy (M=1.40, SD=.996), and goal focus (M=.909, SD=.435). The table also reveals that cohesiveness has the highest mean value while goal focus has the least mean value.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the scale dimensions

Teachers' perception about school organization health	Mean	SD
Cohesiveness	3.851	.730
Resource Utilization	3.779	.816
Communication Adequacy	1.408	.996
Goal focus	0.909	.435

Table 2 shows the comparison of two groups i.e. public and private. The mean value of public school teachers is 3.79 with a 0.57 standard deviation value and average value of private is 4.04 with a 0.47 standard deviation value. Further, the p-value of public and private groups for school organizational health is fairly less than 0.05, which indicates that there are significant differences in teachers' perception between public and private groups regarding school organizational health.

Table 2: t-values for teachers' perception of Organizational Health of schools based on sector.

Groups	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	t-value	Sig.
Public	152	3.793	.5749	-.2524	3.614	.001
Private	98	4.045	.4780			

$P < 0.01$

Table 3 shows the comparison of two groups such as boys and girls. The mean value of The boys and girls groups for school organizational health has a p-value of 0.014 with 2.37 t-statistics, significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions regarding school organizational health.

Table 3: t-values of Boys and Girls Secondary School Teachers' Perception of school Organizational Health

Group	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig.
School organizational health	Boys' School	87	3.826	.656	2.371	.014
	Girls' School	163	3.927	.486		

$p < .05$

Table 4 reports the estimations of one-way ANOVA analysis. Results indicate that F statistics is 2.30 at ($p < 0.05$), which truly confirms that there are significant differences in teachers' perceptions towards school organizational health across three districts.

Table 4: One Way Analysis of Variance of school organizational health across three districts

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	72.510	2	.157	2.30	.025
Within Groups	31.559	247	.306		
Total	104.069	249			

$p < .05$

Table 5, with the p-value of 0.040 shows that there are significant differences between the mean scores of boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions about goal focus as a sub-factor of school organizational health. Hence, proves that the hypothesis stating 'there are significant differences between the mean score of boys and girls secondary school teachers' perception about goal focus as sub-factor of organizational health is true.

Table 5: Comparison of Goal Focus sub-factor of School Organizational Health

Groups	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig.
Boys' school	87	.9426	.5657	2.153	.040
Girls' school	163	.8921	.3495		

P<0.05

Table 6 shows the p-value of reported estimations is 0.002 which is fairly less than 0.01 and confirms the significance of the results. Hence, the results show that there are significant differences between mean scores of boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions about communication adequacy as a sub-factor of school organizational health.

Table 6: Comparison of Communication Adequacy sub-factor of School Organizational Health

Groups	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig.
Boys' school	87	1.5295	1.09546	3.402	.002
Girls' school	163	1.3443	.93717		

P<0.01

Table 7 shows the comparison of two groups i.e. boys and girls secondary school in the context of resource utilization as a sub-factor of school organizational health. The boys and girls groups for school organizational health have $p < .05$. This value indicates that there are significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions regarding resource utilization sub-factor of school organizational health.

Table 7: Comparison of resource utilization sub-factor of School Organizational Health

Groups	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig
Boys' school	87	3.7816	3.7816	3.541	.001
Girls' school	163	3.7776	3.7776		

P<0.01

Table 8 shows the comparison of two groups (boys and girls secondary school) in case of cohesiveness sub-factor of school organizational health. The boys and girls school groups for cohesiveness sub-factor of school organizational health have a p-value of 0.02 ($p < .01$). This documents that there are significant differences in boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions regarding the cohesiveness sub-factor of school organizational health.

Table 8: Comparison of cohesiveness sub-factor of School Organizational Health

Groups	N	Mean	SD	t-value	Sig
Boys' school	87	3.7126	.83788	3.207	.002
Girls' school	163	3.9252	.65775		

P<0.01

Discussion

The basic aim of the research was to compare the public and private school teachers' perceptions about school organizational health. Findings showed significant differences in public and private secondary school teachers' perceptions about school organizational health. This finding is consistent with an earlier study which showed differences in public and private secondary school teachers' perceptions and revealed higher perceptions of public school teachers (Omoyemiju & Adediwura, 2011).

The results of boys' and girls' secondary school teachers' perceptions about school organizational health revealed significant differences, however, a study showed increased similarity between male and female secondary school teachers' perceptions (Omoyemiju & Adediwura, 2011). Another study revealed differences where female teachers' perception was more favourable for their school environments than male counterparts, having good interpersonal relations with fellows and students (Huang, 2001). Results also showed significant differences in teachers' perception of school organizational health across three districts of Punjab.

Secondary school teachers' perceptions about sub-factors of school organizational health were also analyzed. Findings showed significant differences in teachers' perceptions regarding four sub-factors of school organizational health. This is supported by the study which revealed significant differences in resource utilization, cohesiveness, morale innovativeness, autonomic and problem solving (Caldarella, Shatzer, & Richardson, 2009). Another study showed significant differences in goal focus, communication adequacy dimensions, while they were not significant in resource utilization and cohesiveness (Lenka, et al., 2017).

Suggestions

The findings of the present study have several educational implications. Response information based on teachers' perceptions can be used as a basis to be considered, to discuss systematic efforts to improve the health of the school organization. School administrators may update their organization's health profiles on a case-by-case basis to identify what features should be present changed and improved. Although the descriptive and correlational nature of this data do not allow causal explanations. This study suggests a few important issues that need further investigation. Future research needs to explore all aspects of organizational health and include relationships between leadership styles and teachers' perceptions about school organization health. Future studies may also examine the relationship between school health and student achievement that can help focus efforts to improve student achievement.

Conclusion

The results from this study can be used by school administrators and teachers to improve the overall health of the organization. In addition, factors that affect the health of the school organization should be given greater importance. Schools can help improve student learning and academic achievement by improving the quality of health of their organization.

References

- Akbaba, S. (1997), Organizational health of secondary schools (Bolu Province Case) (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Ankara University Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Akyurek, M. I. (2019). *Social capital and organizational health in schools* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University, Ankara.

- Apipalakula, C., & Kummoonb, D. (2017). The Effects of organizational climate to conflict management amongst organizational health personnel. 7th International Conference on Intercultural Education "Education, Health and ICT for a Transcultural World, EDUHEM.
- Barksdale, C., Peters, M. L., & Corrales, A. (2019). Middle school students' perceptions of classroom climate and its relationship to achievement. *Educational Studies*, 47(1), 1-24.
- Bahramian, A., & Saeidian, N. (2013). The relationship between organizational health, teachers' organizational commitment and their perception of elementary schools' principals at Region 2, Esfahan in the -Academic Year 2012-2013. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Science*, 2 (3), 2388–2396.
- Bauer, G. F., Lehmann, K., Blum-Rüegg, A., & Jenny, G. J. (2014). Systemic consulting for organizational health development: Theory and practice, a transdisciplinary approach. In G. F. Bauer & O. Hammig (Eds). *Bridging occupational organizational and public health*, (pp. 117-132). Springer.
- Borkar, V. N. (2016). Positive school climate and positive education: Impact on students well-being. *Indian Journal of Health & Wellbeing*, 7(8), 861–862.
- Busch, S., & Fernandez, J. (2019). Influencing high student achievement through school culture and climate: A quantitative approach to organizational health-based leadership. Routledge.
- Chambers, J. H. (2011). The relationship between secondary school teachers' perceptions of principal ethical leadership and organizational health (Doctoral dissertation). https://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2248&context=utk_graddiss
- Farahani, F. M., Mirzamohamadi, M. S., Afsouran, N., R & Mohammadi, S. S. (2014). The study of the relationship of organizational health of the schools and that of the student's' academic achievement (A case study of high schools of Kohkilouie and Boierahmad Province, Iran 2011). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 628–633.
- Gray, C., Wilcox, G., & Nordstokke, D. (2017). Teacher mental health, school climate, inclusive education and student learning: A review. *Canadian Psychology/psychologiecanadienne*, 58(3), 203-210.
- Hagenauer, G., Hascher, T., & Volet, S. E. (2015). Teacher emotions in the classroom: Associations with students' engagement, classroom discipline, and the interpersonal teacher-student relationship. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 30(4), 385-403.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, J.C. & Kottkamp, B. (1991). *Open school/healthy Schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Sage.
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*. 93(4), 355–372.
- Huang, S. (2001). Teachers' perceptions of high school environments. *Learning Environments Research*, 4(2), 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1012415400807>
- Janice, T. S. (2000). Managing organizational health and performance in junior colleges. *International Journal of*

- Educational Management*, 14 (2), 62-73.
- Klinge, W. E., & Lyden, J. A. (2001). Organizational health and teacher education. *Teacher Educator*, 37(2), 100–116.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730109555285>
- Kose, A. (2018). *The relationship between the strategic leadership behaviours of private school principals and organizational health*. (Unpublished Master Thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.
- Lafta, H. A., Man, N. B., Salih, J. M., Samah, B. A., Nawi, N., & Yousof, R. (2016). A need for investigation organization climate and its impact on the performance. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 8 (3), 136–142.
- Leithwood, K., Louis, K., Anderson, S. and Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *How leadership influences student learning*. The Wallace Foundation.
- Lenka, K. S., & Kant, R. (2017). Organizational health of secondary school teachers in relation to Their Adjustment. *Journal of Educational & Psychological Sciences*, 18(1), 662–679.
<https://doi.org/10.12785/jeps/180120>
- Lin, Y. W., & Lin, Y. Y. (2014). A multilevel model of organizational health culture and the effectiveness of health promotion. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 29 (1).
<https://doi.org/10.4278%2Fajhp.121116-QUAN-562>
- MacNeil, A. J., Prater, D. L., & Busch, S. (2009). The effects of school culture and climate on student achievement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 12(1), 73–84.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120701576241>
- Meng, F. J., Zhang, & Huang, Z. (2014). Perceived organizational health as a mediator for job expectation (A Multidimensional Integrated Model). *Public Personnel Management*, 43 (3), 355–370.
- Miles, M.B. (1965). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In R. O. Carlson, A. Gallaher, M. B. Miles, R. J. Pellegrin, & E. M. Rogers, (Eds.). *Change processes in the public schools*, (pp. 11-34). McGraw-Hill.
- Miles, M. B. (1969). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In Carver, E. A., Sergiovanni, T. J. (Eds.). *Organizations and human behaviour*, (pp. 375-391). McGraw-Hill.
- Munir, F., & Khalil, U. (2016). Secondary school teachers' perceptions of their principals' leadership behaviors and their academic performance at secondary school level. *Bulletin of Education and Research*, 38(1), 41–55.
- Nair, H. A. P., Kumar, D., & Ramalu, S. S. (2014). Organizational Health: Delineation, constructs and development of a measurement model. *Asian Social Science*, 10 (14), 145–157.
- Omoyemiju, M. A., & Adediwura, A. A. (2011). A study of teachers' perception of schools' organizational health in Osun State. *World Journal of Education*, 1(1), 165–170.
<https://doi.org/10.5430/wje.v1n1p165>

- Ozgenel, M., Aksu, T. (2020). The power of school principals' ethical leadership behaviour to predict organizational health. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9 (4). 816-825.
- Parsons, T. (1967). Some ingredients of a general theory of formal organization. In A.W.
- Rahman, A. K., & Ashraf, P. (2020). A Study on the influence of school organizational climate and attitude of teachers. *Our Heritage*, 68(1), 3709-3712.
- Savas, A. C., & Karakus, M. (2012). The relationships between school organizational health and teachers' in-role and extra-role behaviours. *International Journal of Social Sciences & Education*, 3(1). 67-74.
- Sezgin, F. (2009). Examining the relationship between teacher organizational commitment and school health in Turkish primary schools. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 15(2), 185-201.
- Shen, J., Zhang, N., Zhang, C., Caldarella, P., Richardson, M. J., & Shatzer, R. H. (2009). Chinese elementary school teachers' perceptions of students' classroom behaviour problems. *Educational Psychology*, 29(2), 187-201.
- Tattah, I. A., Khan, A. M., Ali, Z., Amin, M., Saleem, K., & Quraishi, U. (2015). School Organizational Health and Students' Academic Achievement Relationship: Gender and Locale based Comparison.
- Tsui, K. T., & Cheng, Y. C. (1999). School organizational health and teacher commitment: A contingency study with multi-level analysis. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 21(1), 249-268.
<https://doi.org/10.1076/edre.5.3.249.3>
- 883
- U-senyang, S., Trichandhara, K., & Rinthaisong, I., I. (2017). Antecedents of organizational health in Southern Thailand. *International Journal of Behavioral Science*, 12 (1), 79-94.
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J. & Kruger, M. L. (2003). Educational leadership and student achievement. The elusive search for an association. *Educational Leadership Quarterly*, 39(3), 398-425.
- Yamama Mudhher Al-Salami. (2021). Organizational health and its relationship to improving the job performance of employees - An applied study on the Health Department of Babylon Governorate. *Turkish Journal of Physiotherapy and Rehabilitation*, 32(3). 15267-15280.
- Yıldız, C. (2014). Relationship between school administrators' crisis management attitudes and perceived organizational health: The case of Uskudar District (Unpublished master thesis). Yeditepe University, İstanbul.
- Yuner, B., & Burgaz, B. (2019). Evaluation of the relationship between school governance and school climate. *Education and Science*, 44(199), 373-390.
- Zhang, Y. M., & Zhang, X. H. (2017). Decision Model of diversification choice in agricultural enterprises: Based on the case study of Longping high-tech. *Journal of Management Case Studies*, 10(5), 523-535.