ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL HEALTH OF BASIC EDUCATION SCHOOLS

Naung Ye Zaw[1], Khaing Yee Mon[2], Theingi Nwe Oo[3]

Abstract

The main aim of this study is to study the organizational health of Basic Education Schools in Hlegu Township. Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used in this study. by using the proportionate stratified sampling method, (307) teachers nested in fifteen schools were selected as sample from three strata – senior teachers, junior teachers and primary teachers in Hlegu Township. The organizational health of school questionnaire, open-ended questions, interview, and observation checklist were used to collect the required data. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of questionnaire was (0.91). Descriptive statistics, Independent Samples *t* test, and One-way ANOVA were used to analyze the quantitative data. According to organizational health index, one school had low organizational health index, eleven schools had average organizational health index, two schools had above average organizational health index and one school had high organizational health index. The organizational index was not significantly different between urban school and rural schools as a result of *t* test. In accordance with type of schools, the organizational health indexes were significantly different among three types of schools (post primary schools, middle schools, and high schools) according to one-way ANOVA result. In line with qualitative study, it was found that teachers notably pointed out the problems of unreasonable parental demands, insufficient resource support and low students' interest in learning. At low organizational health index school, the teachers pointed out that the principal's managerial functions are the most important ones to be an organizational healthy school.

Keywords: Organizational health

Introduction

In the present global competition era, a nation's success relies basically on the knowledge, skills, competencies, and attitudes of its public. The investment in education is the key for substantial long-term benefits of countries. Education enables the individuals to improve their lives, become effective members of their communities and contribute to socio-economic development of nation. Consequently, every nation attempts to upgrade their education system. Myanmar is also trying to implement quality education system, especially making implementation of KG+12 new education system in Basic Education Sector. Miles (1969) found that most innovation and changes in schools had faced failure. This is because of giving most attention to the content of these innovation and changes only and least attention to the context in which innovation and changes take place. Attention to the organizational health is to be first priority one for any administrators seriously concerned with innovativeness in today's educational environment. The school workplace, Basic Education Schools, need to be organizational healthy schools to adapt these educational reforms.

By examining the organizational health of schools, Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991) recommended that it is able to know what is needed before change efforts, to improve instructional effectiveness indirectly through the development of an open, organizational healthy and trustful climate, to continue assessments of principals' administrative practice, to promote the conditions for organizational healthy and open schools, and to find the elements that combine or intervene for the organizational health of schools. The researchers recommend to use the concept of organizational health in schools because of two reasons. The first is that school is regarded as a social system in which the principals, teachers and students take part. Thus, organization health

---
[1] Senior Teacher, MEd, B.E.H.S (Kyaipi), Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education
[2] Dr, Lecturer, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education
[3] Dr, Lecturer, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education

can reflect the social interaction between these key representatives (Cheng, 1987; Tsui, Leung, Cheng, Mok, & Ho, 1994). The second is that organizational health is necessary for schools for the purpose of efficiency in performing certain functions. A reasonably clear conception of organization health would seem to be an important prerequisite to a wide range of activities such as attempts to improve the organization as a place to live, work, and learn. Therefore, it is needed to reveal the organizational health of Basic Education Schools so that educational reforms of Myanmar education system are to be effective changes.

Aims of the Study

Main Aim

The main aim of this study was to study the organizational health of Basic Education Schools in Hlegu Township.

Specific Aims

1. To investigate the levels of organizational health index in Basic Education Schools

2. To explore the variations of organizational health index of schools according to their location and types of schools

Research Questions

1. What are the levels of organizational health index in Basic Education Schools?

2. What are the variations of organizational health index of schools according to their location and types of schools?

Limitations of the Study

This study is geographically restricted to Hlegu Township, Yangon Reagion. The participants in this study are only teachers from Basic Education Schools in Hlegu Township.

Theoretical Framework

For this study, organizational health of schools is studied with seven dimensions based on organizational health dimensions of Hoy and Feldman (1987) and Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991).

Institutional Integrity: It is the school's ability to cope with its environment in a way that maintains the educational integrity of its program. Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands (Hoy & Feldmen, 1987). According to Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991), the school which has institutional integrity is not vulnerable to narrow, vested interests of community groups. Moreover, the school is able cope successfully destructive outsides forces.

Initiating Structure: It is the principal behavior that is both task- and achievement- oriented. Work expectations, standards of performance, and procedures are clearly articulated by the principal (Hoy & Feldmen, 1987). The principal makes his or her attitudes and expectations clear to the faculty and maintains definite standards of performance (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Consideration: It is the principal behavior that is friendly, supportive, open and collegial. It presents a genuine concern on the part of the principal for the welfare of the teachers (Hoy & Feldman, 1987). Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991) stated consideration of principal as the principal looks out for the welfare of faculty members and is open to their suggestions.

Principal Influence: It is the principal's ability to influence the actions of superiors. Being able to persuade superiors, to get additional consideration, and to unimpeded by the hierarchy are important aspects of school administration (Hoy & Feldman, 1987). The influential principal is persuasive, works effectively with the superintendent, simultaneously demonstrates independence in thought and action (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Resource Support: It refers to a school where adequate classroom supplies and instructional materials are available and extra materials are readily supplied if requested (Hoy & Feldman, 1987; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991). Hoy and Forsyth (1986) referred resource support that teachers are providing with the basic materials they need to do an outstanding teaching job, and instructional materials and supplies are readily available. If extra or supplementary materials are needed or requested, they are quickly supplied. In brief, teachers have access to the materials that they need.

Cohesiveness: It is a collective sense of friendliness, openness, enthusiasm, and trust among faculty members. Teachers like each other, like their jobs, and help each other; and they are proud of their school and feel a sense of accomplishment in their jobs (Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991; Hoy & Feldman, 1987). Hoy and Forsyth (1986) referred cohesiveness to a collective sense of friendliness, openness, and trust within the faculty.

Academic Emphasis: It refers to the schools press for achievement. High but achievable academic goals are set for students; the learning environment is orderly and serious; teachers believe in their students' ability to achieve; and students work hard and respect those who do well academically (Hoy & Feldman, 1987; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp, 1991).

Definition of Key Term

Organizational Health of School: An organizational healthy school is one in which the technical (concerning with teaching-learning process, managerial (controlling the internal administrative functions of the organization), and institutional (protecting school from undue pressure of individuals and groups outside the school) levels are in harmony and the school is meeting both its instrumental and expressive needs as it successfully copes with disruptive external forces and directs it energies toward its mission (Hoy & Feldman, 1987; Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp, 1991).

Operational Definitions

Organizational Health of Schools: Organizational health of schools was operationally defined as the level of mean values showing the degree of agreement on organizational health descriptive items measured by organizational health questionnaire which comprised of forty-four (four-point Likert-type) items in seven dimensions: institutional integrity, initiating structure, consideration, principal influence, resource support, cohesiveness and academic emphasis.

Organizational Health Index of Schools: Organizational health index of schools was defined as the level of standardized mean values showing the degree of agreement on organizational health descriptive items measured by organizational health questionnaire which comprised of forty-four (four-point Likert-type) items in seven dimensions: institutional integrity, initiating structure, consideration, principal influence, resource support, cohesiveness and academic emphasis.

Location of School: It referred to urban school and rural school based on the area the school exists according to the data of education office of Hlegu Township.

Types of Schools: It meant Basic Education Post Primary Schools, Basic Education Middle Schools, and Basic Education High Schools.

Methodology

Quantitative Methodology

Population and Sample

This study was conducted in Hlegu Township. There were (1576) teachers who are nested in Basic Education Schools of this township. Science the unit of analysis is the school level, fifteen Basic Education Schools were randomly selected to answer the research questions. To acquire the required sample size, the proportionate stratified sampling method was used. A total of (307) teacher from three strata – senior teachers, junior teachers, primary teachers were selected as sample.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire was adapted by the researcher based on organizational health dimensions of Hoy and Feldman (1987), and Hoy, Tarter and Kottkamp (1991). This questionnaire was comprised of demographic data and items stating the organizational health of schools. Demographic data included gender, position, qualification of participants, and types of school and location of schools. Organizational health of schools items could be grouped into seven dimensions: Institutional integrity, Initiating Structure, Consideration, Principal Influence, Resource Support, Cohesiveness and Academic Emphasis. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each items that characterized their schools along a four-point Likert scale ranging from ("1=Strongly Disagree", "2=Disagree", "3= Agree" and "4= Strongly Agree). Open-ended questions (5 questions) about organizational health of schools were also part of the survey instrument. To be a valid and reliable instrument questionnaire, **instrument validity** and **instrument reliability** were conducted. **For instrument validity**, a panel of experts reviewed the instrument for content clarity, discriminative values among items, and grammar usages. This panel was a think-tank of nine experienced educators who were two associate professors, three lecturers, and four assistant lecturers qualified in educational administration and supervision. After taking instrument validity, pilot study was conducted with fifty teachers of No (3). Basic Education High School, Mingalardon Township, Yangon Region on 17th, September, 2019. **For instrument reliability**, the Cronbach's alpha value for overall items that taped into the organizational health of Basic Education Schools was (0.91).

Procedure

First and foremost, the related literature was first reviewed. With sincere guidance of supervisor, the researcher developed the research instrument to collect the required data. The content of the items and grammar usages were revised in accordance with the result of expert review. And then, the pilot study was undertaken to refine the developed questionnaire. After that, to distribute the questionnaires, the approvals of the professor of Department of Educational Theory and township education officer (Hlegu township) were requested. Then, the questionnaires were distributed to the respondents in each Basic Education School between 22nd October, 2019 and 25th October, 2019. After one week, the researcher recollected the questionnaires. The respondent rate was 95.05%.

Data Analysis

Descriptive Statistics, Independent Samples *t* test, One-way ANOVA and Post Hoc Tukey HSD were used to analyze the data.

Qualitative Methodology

To complete and provide strength of confidence in the quantitative findings, qualitative data were collected. Qualitative data were collected through open-ended questions, interview questions and observation checklist of organizational health of schools.

Sample

Out of fifteen schools, four schools were selected according to their organizational health index. Three teachers from four schools and totally twelve teachers were interviewed. All four schools were observed with observation checklist.

Instrumentation

Interview questions and observation checklist were developed by the researcher under the guidance of supervisor. The number of interview questions were totally 11 items which taped more details in touch information about organization health of schools dimensions. Observation checklist consists 22 descriptive facts which highlighted the observable data.

Procedure

The researcher and two collaborators held interview and observation in selected schools from 3rd December to 5th December, 2019. Interview was held by using semi structured interview.

Data Analysis

After collecting the data, they were thoroughly studied to categorize the similar ideas and to identify the main theme. Data analysis was based on categorizing and interpreting the interviews, open-ended questions and observation checklists. The data were examined in-depth to provide the detailed description of the responses of teachers in align with seven dimensions of their schools.

Findings

Quantitative Findings

Findings for research question (1) are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Organizational Health Index of Basic Education Schools

No.	Basic Education Schools	Organizational Health Index	Remark
1.	Post Primary School A	496	Average
2.	Post Primary School B	495	Average
3.	Post Primary School C	536	Above Average
4.	Post Primary School D	504	Average
5.	Post Primary School E	520	Average
6.	Middle School A	510	Average
7.	Middle School B	578	High
8.	Middle School C	518	Average
9.	Middle School D	499	Average
10.	Middle School E	542	Above Average
11.	High School A	487	Average
12.	High School B	507	Average
13.	High School C	423	Low
14.	High School D	500	Average
15.	High School E	501	Average

Scoring Direction: Less than 400= Very Low, 400-440= Low, 441-480= Below Average, 481-520= Average, 521-560= Above Average, 561-600= High, Greater than 600= Very High

As indicated in Table 1, one school had low organizational health index; eleven schools had average organizational health index; two schools had above average organizational health index; and one school had high organizational health index.

Findings for research question (2) are revealed in Table 2 and Table 3.

Table 2 Independent Samples *t* Test Result Showing Organizational Health of Schools Grouped by Location of Schools **(N=307)**

Organizational Health	Location of Schools	*df*	*t*	*p*
Institutional Integrity	Urban	305	-2.429	**.016***
	Rural			

Note: *p<0.05

Therefore, there was a statistically significant difference in institutional integrity between urban and rural schools.

Table 3 Post Hoc Turkey HSD Multiple Comparisons Result Comparing Organizational Health of Schools in terms of Types of Schools

Organizational Health	(I) Types of Schools	(J) Types of Schools	Mean Difference(I-J)	*p*
Initiating Structure	Middle Schools	Post Primary Schools	57.80	n.s
		High Schools	77.40*	**.019***
Consideration	High Schools	Post Primary Schools	-78.45*	**.000*****
		Middle Schools	-73.74*	**.000*****

Note: *p<0.05, ***p<0.001, n.s = no significance

Therefore, it can be noted that three types of schools differed only in initiating structure and consideration.

Qualitative Findings

Findings from Open-ended Questions

Question 1: *Do parents make demands on teachers and or the school that the school perceives as being unreasonable? If so, gives examples.*

Low organizational health index school: 28% of teachers answered that there were no unreasonable parental demands and 72% of teachers answered that some parents made unreasonable demands. Unreasonable demands are unfollowing school discipline, showing disrespectful manners.

Average organizational health index school: 66% of teachers answered that there were no unreasonable parental demands and 20% of teachers answered that there were demands from some parents. Unreasonable demands are seating arrangement, feeding their children at lunch time and to change school hour.

Above average organizational health index school: 76% of teachers answered that there were no unreasonable parental demands and 24% of teachers answered that some parents made unreasonable demands. Unreasonable demands are seating arrangement, to meet children at lunch time.

High organizational health index school: 100% of teachers answered that there are no unreasonable parental demands.

Question 2*: What are the major problems for you in this school?*

Low organizational health index school: 77% of teachers answered that they had the problems about principal management, resource support and students' learning and other problems.

Average organizational health index schools: 12% of teachers answered that they had no problems. 21% of teachers answered the problems about principal management and 61% of teachers answered the problems about insufficient resource support and unsatisfactory students' learning.

Above average organizational health index schools: 51% of teachers answered students' learning problems and 49% of teachers answered that there were no problems.

High organizational health index school: 100% of teachers answered the problems of students' less of interest in learning.

Question 3*: Does your principal protect or buffer your school from unreasonable demands made by community organizations and superiors? Explain.*

Low organizational health index school: 66% of teachers answered that the principal did not protect them from the unreasonable demands of community organizations.

Average organizational health index schools: 61% of teachers answered that the principal protected them from community organization demands.

Above average organizational health index schools: 100% of teachers answered that the principal gave protection them from the demands of community organization.

High organizational health index school: 100% of teachers answered that the principal protected them from unreasonable demands of community organizations.

Question 4*: Do you feel enjoyment in this school or not? Why?*

Low organizational health index school: 30% of teachers answered that they felt enjoyment in this school. 49% of teachers answered that they did not feel enjoyment in this school because of low parental involvement, unfollowing school discipline by the students, inconvenient transportation, over workload and no time for professional development, inconsistency of teaching subjects and specialization subjects and favorably treatment of principal.

Average organizational health index schools: 19% of teachers answered that they had no enjoyment because of over workload and 76% of teachers answered that they felt enjoyment. The factors made them enjoyed are good administration, equal treatment of principals, collegial spirit among colleagues, good collaboration with community organizations, passion to teaching proficiency and adoring of students, and being their native schools.

Above average and high organizational health schools: 100% of teachers enjoyed because of convenient transportation, family type relation among colleagues, good cooperation among parents, school and community organizations, good management of principal and being their native school.

Question 5*: How would you suggest for the organizational health of your school?*

Low organizational health index school: 77% of teachers gave the suggestions: to reduce class size and over workload, to persuade parents to be interested in their children education, to have more cooperation among parents, teachers and principals, to nurture students for well round development and to lead by the principal with good management.

Average organizational health index schools: 76% of teachers gave suggestions: to reduce class size, to cooperate, to emphasize academic improvement by the principals.

Above average and high organizational health index schools: 91% of teachers suggested that to provide sufficient resource such as play grounds and teaching and non- teaching staffs to be organizational healthy schools.

Findings from Interview Questions

Interview findings can be summarized in line with seven dimensions as follows.

Institutional Integrity: Low organizational health index school encountered the unreasonable community and parental demands, low parental support and bad relation with community organizations. Average and above average organizational health index schools encountered the minor parental demands and had good relation with parents and community organizations. High organizational health index school did not have the community and parental demands and these organizations gave support to the school.

Initiating Structure: For the low organizational health index school, the principal was weak at defining roles and allocating works. The principals of average and above average organizational health index schools allocated work well to accomplish effectively and efficiently. The principal of high organizational health index school was good at defining roles and allocating works and demonstrated openly what is expected from the teachers.

Consideration: The principals of all schools treated the teachers in justice. They were friendly, supportive, open and collegial. The principals understood the personal difficulties of teachers and stand for the personal welfare of teachers.

Principal Influence: For the low organizational health index school, the principal did not protect the teachers from the unreasonable parental and community demands. The principals of average and above organizational health index schools protected the teachers from unreasonable parental and community demands and solved the problems. The principal of high organizational health index school gets the support of parents and community organizations and has good relationship with them. Noticeably, all teachers from all types of schools did not answer the relations of principals and superior persons.

Resource Support: Low organizational health school supported the instructional materials and cleaning materials at the beginning of academic year. When these materials run out, the teachers had to buy makers, ink, and cleaning materials by themselves. The average and above average organizational health index schools provided the instructional materials and cleaning materials at the beginning of academic year and ink, makers were provided one time per month. The high organizational health index school provided the instructional and cleaning materials one time per three months. But all schools had the problems of unbalanced teacher-student ratio and over class size.

Cohesiveness: Most of teachers in all schools are happy and united to perform tasks. They completed the tasks with great enthusiasm. They help each other and do favor each other. They like their jobs and are proud of their school, but do not feel a sense of accomplishment in their jobs. Inconvenient transportation, over workload, no time for professional development, low parental involvement, insufficient resource support, additional tasks other than instructional ones and unsatisfactory students' learning ability were the problems facing by the teachers and that affect the teachers' cohesiveness. From the positive side, being their native schools and loving their students were the factors that enhance the cohesiveness of teachers.

Academic Emphasis: Except the low organizational health index school, other schools held the various competitions such as random talk, sport competitions for students to nurture their students to be well round developed citizens. The classrooms were decorated with instructional aid charts. The teachers tried by using various instructional methods to get the interest of students. But all

schools encountered the problems of students' less of interest in learning and unsatisfactory learning ability of students.

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

Conclusion and Discussion

Based on the findings of both quantitative and qualitative studies, discussion was presented in align with seven dimensions of organizational health of schools.

According to standardized mean values of each school, two schools had low institutional integrity, another two schools were below average; seven schools had average institutional integrity; one school was above average and three schools had high institutional integrity. In this study, the schools have integrity in its educational programs, there are no narrow, vested interests of community groups. At only the low organizational health index school, the community organizations wanted to take benefit from school improvement fund. It indicated that institutional integrity depends on location of schools and does not depend on types of schools. Rural people and parents are more friendly and respectful to the teachers than urban ones. They believe teachers can best guide and instruct their students. It is consistent with the findings of Dunne (1983 as cited in McCracken, 1991). He found that rural people were proud of their schools and described a feeling of family, individual attention, and community commitment of resources and people.

In terms of standardized mean value of each principal, one principal was in low; three principals were in below average; six principals were average; three principals were above average and last one principal were high in initiating structure. Principals have task and achievement behavior and maintain the standard of performance. Principals with good initiating structure skills were good at defining roles and allocating tasks. But principals with low skills were weak in these tasks. Initiating structure of principals did not depend on the location of schools but it varied according to the types of schools. It could be the effect of organizational size. The organizational size of high schools was greater than middle schools and post primary schools. Principals cannot know the individuality of all teachers and there are misplacements of teachers when allocating tasks. It is consistent with finding of Matrix (2017). He found that company size was negatively related with task-oriented leadership dimension. It is interested that why there was no significance difference between initiating structure of post primary schools and high schools although these schools had a difference in organizational size. Number of teachers in primary schools are less than ten and all teachers had to participate in all activities of school.

In terms of standardized mean value, only one principal had low consideration standardized mean value. Three principals were in below average; five principals were in average; three principals were in above average; and three principals were in high. In this study, all principals are friendly, and approachable. Low organizational health index schools were weak in listening teachers' suggestions. It was found that consideration of principals was independent of location of schools but it varied according to types of schools. It could be the effect of organizational size. High school principals cannot listen to the voice of all teachers. They had to make decisions with only head of teachers for school affairs and subject leaders for student achievement. Principals cannot give understanding for personal difficulties of some teachers to be fair treatment. They could not reach knowing individuality of teachers. It is consistent with the literature of Matrix (2017). He found that increasing size has statistically significant negative effects on employee-oriented leadership styles.

According to standardized mean value of each principal, two principals had low principal influence standardized mean value; three principals were in below average; five principals were in average; and three principals were in above average. The last two principals had high principal

influence standardized mean value. In this study, the noticeable thing for this dimension is that there was no reverse communication by the principals to the superiors and superintendents. The principals had to carry out functions in a line with given orders of superiors and superintendents and they did not report the things that were inconsistent with the real situations. It was found that principal influence did not depend on location of schools and types of schools. It depended on own personality of principals. And also it can be because all schools are government supported schools, the trending procedure is centralized system, there are timely rules, regulations and procedures, instructions for all schools and all principals had to follow them strictly and definitely.

In terms of standardized mean value of each school, two schools had low standardized mean values for resource support; another two schools had below average; seven schools were in average; one school were above average; and three schools were in the high of resource support. It was found that resource support of schools is not governed by location of schools and types of schools. It could be because all schools are government supported schools and all schools received school improvement fund two times per one academic year based on number of students in their schools. According to observation checklist results, some classrooms were hall type and it made interference the instruction of one teacher to another. The maximum number of students per classroom was even (81) in some schools. The ratio of teachers to students was even 1: 54. Some schools had no non-teaching staffs and teachers had to perform additional tasks besides instructional ones. There were schools with no specialization teachers for some subjects and the others teachers tried to teach this subjects. It leads to over work load for teachers.

In terms of standardized mean values of cohesiveness of each school, teachers from three schools were in below average; teachers from eight schools were in average; teachers from two schools were in above average; and teachers from another schools were in high. In this study, there are no relationship problems among teachers, they are friendly, trust each other. But, teachers do not feel a sense of accomplishment from their jobs. It is the only factor which causes cohesiveness of teachers below average. It found that cohesiveness among teachers is not concerned by location of schools and types of schools. Teachers' cohesiveness depends on only their school and there are some factors that affect teachers' cohesiveness. These factors are low parental involvement, inconvenient transportation, unsatisfactory students' learning ability, insufficient resource support, mismanagement of principals and over workload, non-teaching tasks and no time for professional development. Especially, teachers did not gratify with students' learning ability and they want their students to try hard and have interest in learning. From the positive site, teachers love their students and some teachers worked at their native schools. These are the facts that enhance teachers' job satisfaction of cohesiveness.

According to standardized mean value of each school, one school had low standardized mean values of academic emphasis; eight schools had average standardized mean values; five schools had above average standardized mean values; and one school had high standardized mean values of academic emphasis. In this study, most teachers believe that students cannot learn well and do not try hard. These factors make academic emphasis of schools lower. It was found that the academic emphasis of schools was not influenced by location of schools and types of schools. Teachers put students' interest in learning as the first priority. Then, they start instructional process. In this study, it could also reveal the factors that impede academic emphasis of schools. Especially, students' interest in learning is the major problem that teachers faced and impeded the academic emphasis of schools. Although school effectiveness is a complex multifaceted construct, every effective school gives emphasis on academic emphasis.

In sum, these dimensions are the heart parts of organizational health of schools. The organizational health of a school can provide insights into aspects of their schools that could have gone unnoticed for school leaders, both teachers and principal. When these seven dimensions are

harmony in a school, this school is a home of happy teachers, students, parents and principals. The community will be proud of their school.

Suggestions

The following suggestions should be taken into account by all educators.

- The school should persuade parents to attend the meetings held by the school. Principals should explain about the running school functions and should have good communication and collaboration with parents and community organizations. Teachers need to act and react the parents and community well.

- Principals need to listen to their voice before making work allocation and defining roles; should express openly what is expected of teachers; should strict school discipline definitely; should persuade all teachers to be actively participated in school activities; and should take into consideration about the effect of organizational size.

- It is needed by the principals to listen to teachers' voice before decision making, to implement their suggestions, and to treat them equally. Principals should read teachers mood, use formal and informal communication channels adequately and effectively.

- Principals should play as a key role in mediating the relationships among stakeholders and in developing a good school climate. They should protect teachers from unreasonable parental and community demands, and solve problems. They should report inconsistent orders back to superiors.

- Resources such as insufficient infrastructure, teaching staffs and non-teaching staffs should be provided to be effective in performing the school functions. The superiors should listen to the feedback of teachers concerning real situations of schools and give reconsideration whether or not the existing infrastructure and resources are fitted with the requirements of new curriculum implementation.

- Principals should establish clear objectives, set both school and individual goals for each teachers and implement team building activities. Principals have to persuade parents to support their children education, and provide sufficient resource.

- Principals should make academic emphasis as central theme of school. Teachers need to become an integral part of academic focus by allowing and getting participation in all decisions of instruction. The board of study meetings should be implemented well where teachers from each grade level can communicate their academic goals and objectives and share significant data regarding student performance.

Needs for Further Study

Organizational health of schools did not vary both in terms of their location and types because of all schools were government schools. Therefore, the comparative study of organizational health of government schools and private schools should be investigated. Moreover, organizational health of high education institutions should be examined. It is also needed to examine relationship studies such as organizational health of schools and students' achievement, organizational health of schools and teachers' commitment, and organizational health of schools and teacher efficacy.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we would like to express our sincere gratitude to Dr. Pyone Pyone Aung and Dr. Kay Thwe Hlaing (Pro- Rectors, Yangon University of Education) for their permissions to carry out this study. We would like to express our heartily gratitude to Dr. Khin Mar Ni (Professor and Head of Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education) the chairperson of this thesis, for her expert guidance, valuable advice and encouragement to complete this thesis. We would like to offer our thanks to Dr. Phyu Phyu Yin (Professor, Department of Educational Theory, Yangon University of Education) for her invaluable advices, comments and suggestions about this study. We would like to offer our thanks to each person who has contributed directly or indirectly in completing our thesis successfully.

References

Hoy, W. K., & Feldman, J. A. (1987). Organizational Health: The concept and its measure. *Journal of REsearch and Development in Education*, 30-38.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open school, Healthy schoool: Making schools work.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Matrix, T. G. (2007). The Impact of Company Size on Leadership. *Management and Organization Studies, 4*, 82-89.

McCracken, J. D. (1991). Differences Between Rual and Urban Schools, Student Characteristics and Student Aspirations in Ohio. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 29-40.

Miles, M. B. (1969). Planned Change and Organizational Health:Figure and Ground. In F. D. Carver, & T. J. Sergiovanni, *Organizations and Human Behavior* (pp. 375-391). New York: McGraw-Hill.