The Relationship between Organizational Health and Robust School Vision in Elementary Schools

Mehmet Korkmaz
Gazi University

Teachers play an important role in developing a robust school vision. This study is aimed to find out the likely relationship between the teachers' perception of school health and a robust school vision. It has been found that there is a significant positive relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational health and the relative robustness of their school vision. Subsequent regression analysis indicates that collegial leadership and academic emphasis and resource support were the school health themes that characterized an overall association with robust school vision.

Leadership is the art of creating a working atmosphere which motivates and directs the people working in the organization as to the achievement of organizational aims and performance levels (Lashway, 1997; Manase, 1985; Sashkin, 1986). Creating such an atmosphere depends on the leader formulating a robust vision. Sharing such a school vision promotes a feeling of cooperation in administrators, teachers, students and others to attain the desired future state.

In organizational development, the leader, rather than being an important concept, is regarded as the one who guides and creates an appropriate environment for the employees. However, leadership alone is not sufficient in developing a strong organizational vision. A robust school vision which reflects the aims and needs of the society not only helps education develop further but also reconstructs the relations between the school and its environment (Hoy & Miskel, 1991; Tsui & Cheng, 1999; Hoy & Hannum, 1997; Hoy, Tarter & Kottkamp's, 1991). School health has been defined as the organization's ability to adapt to its environment, accomplish

goals and maintain unity among members (ibid).

On the other hand, teachers play an important role in developing a robust school vision. That's why in this study, teachers were chosen as the source of information and it is aimed to find out the likely relationship between the teachers' perception of school health and a robust school vision.

Vision and School Health
in the Turkish Educational System

After the foundation of the Turkish Republic on October 29th, 1923, a law of Unification of Education was passed (March 3, 1924, law number 430). A result of this law was that all educational institutions in Turkey were attached to the Ministry of Education with the aim of directing all educational activities from one national centre. Thus, the Turkish educational system was shaped as a centralized system and it has come up to now in the form as stated in the law. The only authority empowered to open schools, hire teachers and principals, develop curricula, and meet the financial needs of schools is the Ministry of Education.

Nowadays, although there are on-going discussions about decentralization of the educational system, the centralized system is still maintained. However, there have been a great many efforts to introduce innovations in the educational system, one of them being to give schools of all levels the task to specify their vision in the 1998-1999 educational year.

The term "vision," which was widely used towards the end of the 1980s by businesses and universities, later became the focus of elaborate educational research in Turkey (Çelik, 1995; Erçetin, 2000; Baskan, 2000; Argün, 2000; Erdoğan,1998; Balcı, 2000). Descriptive research on vision development, vision for change in education, and organizational leadership and effectiveness was carried out accordingly.

According to the results of the studies by Erçetin (2000), Baskan (2000), Argün (2000), who have investigated vision development and its significance regarding change in education, a vision reflecting the needs and aims of the surrounding community not only improves education but also helps rebuild

the relationship between school and its environment in a stronger fashion. They have stressed that such a vision needs to be based on cooperation among the school directors, teachers, students, parents, and staff. Likewise, Erdoğan (1998) and Balcı (2000), working on organizational leadership and effectiveness, have maintained that a vision being an outcome of a cooperative effort is closely related to the leadership style of the principal. Unless the principal operates as an effective leader, they have found, very little could be changed in the school. This is mainly caused by the fact that it is the principal who exhibits leadership behaviour in the development, maintenance, and conservation of the school vision. In order to ascertain those dimensions of the educational system requiring change and development, it is necessary to mark out what "organizational health" comes to mean. In the 1970s it was possible to see the term "school health" in books, articles and journals only at the theoretical level, even which was a rare event. Later, Başaran (1991) dealt with school health as a sub-dimension of organizational health and Can (1992) defined effectiveness as organizational health. Further, Aksoy (2002) has defined variables affecting organizational health at the theoretical level. Above all, the most comprehensive research regarding the organizational health of the educational institutions has been carried out by Akbaba (1997). He has classified organizational leadership, organizational integrity, interaction, organizational identity, and organizational products as the sub-dimensions of organizational health and argued that any attempt to measure organizational health by using only one of these will not to a large extent reflect the organizational health of a given organization. Consequently, he has stressed that these dimensions need to be evaluated in combination.

When researchers study the issue of developing school vision and organizational health, they deal with these factors are as independent and unrelated entities. However, these concepts are, in fact, interrelated. Nonetheless, the Ministry of Education has asked the schools to develop vision without considering their

actual situations, that is to say, without paying attention to human resources, classroom equipment, the quantitative and qualitative situation of students, the relations among staff, and their level of job satisfaction. The success of a school in developing an effective vision depends on whether the school has a healthy structure or not. There is very little research on this in the literature about the Turkish Education System. Thus, it is aimed here to identify the possible relationship between teachers' perceptions of organizational health and their perceptions of a strong school vision. In addition, it is teachers who play a very important role in developing a strong school vision, which is why this research is based on their views.

Theoretical Framework

School Vision

Leadership is an important element in developing a school vision (Licata & Harper, 2001). What affects the learning climate and the morale of teachers is the leadership of the principal. In line with this is the fact that a prerequisite for a school principal is that he or she should be an effective leader. The two important elements of effective leadership are building up positive interpersonal relations and developing a school vision. Çelik (1995) and Balcı (2000) have conducted research concerning the characteristics school principals should have and they state effective leaders are visionary, with the ability to form strong relations based on a vision among people, which means planning, developing and sharing a dream for the future of the school.

According to Whitaker and Monte (1994) the vision of a school is the manifestation of its values, goals and aims. These writers define such a vision as addressing the feelings and ideas of the whole staff. Alternatively, according to Mathews, a vision that reflects the needs and purposes of the surrounding community not only improves education, but it also rebuilds the relationship between the school and its public (Mathews, 1996). For the time being, it seems impossible to form such a vision in the Turkish educational system because the Ministry of Education limits schools' relations with their immediate and

remote environment. For instance, no school principal is given the legal authority to hire, appoint, and promote teachers, or to develop his school's own curriculum and so forth. Further, the principal, even if he perceives it necessary for the functioning of the school, cannot permit any changes in the curriculum according to parents' views or students' immediate needs. Similarly, there are not many things that the environment can do to affect schools. The legal barriers due to the centralistic nature of the system restrict the development of vision inside the schools.

On the other hand, a school which faces an obstacle due to the structure of the system will not operate successfully, unless it has a shared feeling or a common vision. It is a fact that the existence of a shared vision increases the effectiveness of a school. According to Licata and Harper (2001), a robust school vision might best be expressed by harmony within the school and with its environment, alongside real participation from the environment in the school administration.

A robust vision is full of energy. In order to make such vision come into being, teachers jump-start the future by bringing to light their skills and resources. The vision's power lies in its ability to grab the attention of both those inside (teacher, student and principal) and those outside (parents) the organization and to focus that attention on a common dream (Nanus, 1992).

In the light of these explanations, adjectives such as interesting, action-packed, powerful, fresh and challenging rather than boring, uneventful, weak, stale or dull would be found in teachers' descriptions of a robust school vision. These adjectives reflect teachers' empathy for colleagues and students actively being involved in overcoming difficulties encountered in the accomplishment of their relatively robust view of the future (Licata & Harper, 2001).

Organizational Health

The term "organizational health" was first proposed by Miles in 1969 in order to study the school climate (Tsui &

Cheng, 1999). According to Miles, a healthy organization is considered as a structure which continuously uses its ability to continue its life and overcome difficulties in the long run (Miles, 1969). The term "organizational health", which was first used to express the continuous aspect of organizational health, was defined by Parsons, Bales and Sils (1953), Hoy and Tarter (1997) and Hoy and Miskel (1991) as the ability to adapt an organization to its environment, create harmony among its members and achieve its goals. As can be understood from his definition, the organizational health of a school is a useful sign of interpersonal relations among people in schools (teachers, students, managers and others). Schools need the support of their environment to protect their organizational structure. Moreover, healthy schools adapt themselves to the environment successfully and promote common values in their staff.

"Organizational health" became an important subject both in practice and in research after 1980s. Before the emergence of this term, it was believed that problems in the educational system were caused by the elements within the system or the outside elements such as migration, population growth and insufficient finance and solutions to these external problems were sought. The term "organizational health" has made educators focus on the chain of relations coming out both inside and outside the school. There are now many articles on organizational health. Özdemir (2002), for instance, has made suggestions about school health for school managers in an article presenting different aspects of school health.

Moreover, the term "organizational health" has paved the way to innovative methods in the educational system. Educators and policy makers have started discussing the need to move from central into a decentralized structure. In particular, it has affected the Turkish Educational System in three ways:

1.   Efforts in innovating and developing the educational system have been accelerated.
2.   The attention of educational research has been directed to the school's relation with its environment.

3.   There has been a discussion about the decentralization of the educational system.

        As Hoy and Miskel (1991) and Hoy and Tarter (1997) have stated, in a healthy school technical, managerial and institutional levels are in harmony, and the harmony between these three levels supports teaching and student learning. Defining these levels in detail, Parsons (1967) have stated that technical level is about teaching and learning mission in the school, managerial level is about the internal coordination of the school (e.g., the principal coordinating, finding ways to motivate teachers, and allocating the required resources), and institutional level is about the school-environment relationship. However, the centralized educational system in Turkey does not let the principal to be autonomous in making decisions concerning the school's internal functioning and its relations to its environment at the institutional level. We need radical changes to achieve the above-mentioned harmony. If we could make these changes, students, teachers, and principals in these schools will be able to work with the schools' environment in a constructive and collaborative way. Education will then be supported by both parents and the environment and there will be goodwill and trust among school staff (Hoy & Tarter, 1997).

Hypothesis

        Teachers working in healthy schools see their school's success in building positive communication with its environment as a strong characteristic of their school (Licata & Harper, 1999). Schools need the support of their environment: it is a mutual relationship. Keeping the inner dynamics of a society alive depends on creating a healthy environment and establishing healthy schools in this environment. As Parsons (1967) has pointed out, schools must also be sufficient at technical level, too. Healthy schools adapt themselves to their environment successfully, reach their organizational goals and promote their common values in their teachers (Hoy & Hannum, 1997). In a school where technical, managerial and institutional levels are in

harmony, students, teachers and principals respond to the school vision. Teachers working in such a school will be committed to the school vision as long as they see that their colleagues are in an effort to work towards a better future (Licata & Harper, 2001).

In the light of these explanations, it will be logical to relate a strong vision leading to a healthy school organization with organizational health. As a result, this study hypothesizes that there is a positive relation between the teachers' perceptions of a robust school vision and organizational health. To this end, first a correlation analysis was conducted and then a regression analysis was used for descriptive purposes.

Method

The research sample covered 50 elementary schools in Çankaya, Yenimahalle, Keçiören, Mamak, and Altındağ, which are the districts in Ankara. The schools in these districts and students of their 6th, 7th and 8th grades have different socioeconomic levels. Due to the fact that the principals of the 8 schools in the district did not allow the administration of the questionnaire in their schools, the remaining 42 schools (85 % of the 50 schools with 842 participants, which represents a sufficient sample size) participated in the research. The data was gathered through a questionnaire applied to 842 teachers working in these schools.

To test the hypothesis, the research was based on the arithmetic mean computed from the replies the teachers gave to the questions in the questionnaire. To measure the perceptions of teachers working in these schools about the vision in their schools, *Robustness Semantic Differential (RSD)*, developed by Licata and Willower (1978), was used. The language of the instrument was modified to adapt it to the educational system for linguistic and cultural reasons. Also, a pilot study for the reliability and validity of the instrument was done. In the pilot study, 15 schools and 261 teachers took part. The collected data was analyzed for internal consistency. The internal consistency of the instrument "Cronbach Alpha" was ●91. For the factor analysis, there was a one-factor structure and the factor analysis

explained 68 % of the total variance. The result was higher than the coefficient found for the reliability and internal consistency (Pearson Coefficient was .77 and Spearman Coefficient was .78) for the instrument developed by Licata and Willower (1978).

Table 1: Robustness Semantic Differential for School Vision

My school vision is

Interesting	____._____._____._____._____.	boring[a]
Stale	_____.____._____._____._____.	fresh[b]
Powerful	_____.____._____._____._____.	weak[a]
Meaningless	_____.____._____._____._____.	meaningful[b]
thrilling	_____.____._____._____._____.	quieting[a]
unimportant	____._____._____._____._____.	important[b]
active	____._____._____._____._____.	passive[a]
usual	____._____._____._____._____.	unusual[b]
challenging	_____.____._____._____._____.	dull[a]
uneventful	____._____._____._____._____.	action - packed[b]

a- Scored 7 through 1 from left to right. b- Reversed scoring.

Table 1 shows the pairs of adjectives which were used to measure individuals' perceptions of their school's vision by completing the sentence "my school vision is …". Teachers rated 10 RSD adjective pairs on a 7 – point scale. These adjectives define effective or ineffective school settings. Each adjective pair was scored from 7 to 1. Total scores for the 10 pairs ranged from 10 to 70. The higher the score, the more teachers saw their school vision as robust.

In addition, *Organizational Health Inventory (OHI)*, first developed by Hoy and Miskel (1991), was used in the study. A middle school form of the OHI scale was published by Hoy and Tarter (1997) and Hoy and Sabo (1998). The OHI developed by Licata and Harper (2001) was composed of 33 items distributing across 6 subscales accounting for approximately 77 % of the cumulative variance. Relatively high alpha reliability coefficients for these subscales ranged from .82 to .92

The instrument used by Licata and Harper (2001) for their research *Organizational Health and Robust School Vision* was also used in the study. The language of the instrument was adapted to the educational system for linguistic and cultural reasons. For reliability and validity, a pilot study was undertaken involving 261 teachers in 15 schools. After this, a factor analysis was carried out. As a result of the factor analysis, 35 items were identified distributing across 3 subscales accounting for 74 % of the cumulative variance. The alpha level was ●96. The final form of the measurement is shown in *Table 2*.

Table 2: Organizational Health Inventory Subscales and Sample Subscale Items

Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis	The school sets high standards for academic performance The principal welcomes teachers and listens to their problems
Resource Support	Teachers are provided with adequate materials for their classroom Supplementary materials are available for classroom use.
Institutional Integrity	The school is open to whims of the public. The principal may be prevented by their superintendents

Each item in the OHI has a 4-point Likert 7 response scale that assigns *1 to" frequently", 2 to" often", 3 to "sometimes"* and *4 to "rarely"*. Responses to all items were summed to produce either a subscale score or a total instrument score. Teachers' mean scores were calculated from the total scores for all teachers completing the OHI in a particular school. The higher the school mean score, the more frequently health was observed by the faculty.

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for all variables. To test our hypothesis, Pearson correlation coefficients were computed for the relationship between the mean scores for school vision and the mean scores gathered for OHI. Later, by

using the 3 subscales of the OHI as the independent variables and school vision as the dependent variable, a multi-regression analysis was done.

To determine the construct validity of the instrument, a factor analysis was done. As a result of the factor analysis 10 items whose factor loading were below .30 were taken out of the instrument. The remaining 35- item instrument showed a distribution over three different dimensions. The first dimension was "Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis" with 22 items, the second dimension was "Resource Support" with 8 items, and the third dimension was "Institutional Integrity" with 5 items. The factor loading of the items was between .30 and .55

Finally, the reliability of the OHI was determined by Cronbach alpha coefficient. For the whole OHI Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was found to be .95. As for subscales, the inner constituency coefficient was .95 for the "Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis" subscale, ●91 for the "Resource Support" subscale and ●69 for "Institutional Integrity"

Following from the calculations above, it can be stated that for the OHI and its subscales the validity was high. In addition to this, for the RSD "my school vision is…" the validity coefficient was .91.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 shows a summary of descriptive statistics for all measured in this study. In the table, the maximum possible scores means are given so that the statistical analysis can be understood by the reader. As can be seen, the lowest maximum possible scores mean was 11.54 (for Institutional Integrity), which means that teachers' views as regards the perception of the Institutional Integrity sub-scale's items were close to one another; the highest maximum possible scores mean was 74.50 (for Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis), which means that teachers' views regarding Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis were different from one another. Also, the

maximum possible scores mean for robust school vision was found to be 55.50

The teachers' perception of Institutional Integrity, which is a subscale of the OHI, had the lowest standard deviation. In other words, it is the variable with the highest homogeneity. The biggest change of teachers' perception, except for the standard deviation given to the whole OHI, belongs to Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis subscale. That is, it is this sub-scale where the variable has the lowest degree of homogeneity in teachers' perception. *Table 3* shows the 35- item OHI, its subscales and the number of items related to the subscales.

Table 3: Summary of Descriptive Statistics for OHI and RSD

OHI (No. of items in scale)	M	SD	Max.
Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis (22)	59.98	5.83	74.50
Resource Support (8)	17.65	2.64	23.95
Institutional Integrity (5)	9.9	0.78	11.54
OHI Total (35)	87.54	7.69	108.29
RSD (my school vision is ….) (10)	45.02	5.57	55.50

Note: OHI= Organizational Health Inventory RSD= Robustness Semantic Differential

Hypothesis Test

Table 4 summarizes Pearson product-moment correlations among all variables used in this study. The relationship among the subscales of the OHI is from the middle-level to high level. These correlation coefficients are between 0.09 and 0.63 and are higher than the ones first developed for middle schools (Hoy & Sabo, 1998). They are close to the correlation of the values which Licata and Harper (2001) developed for middle schools. The strongest relation among subscales is between teachers' perception of the resource support by the school and teachers' views about collegial leadership and academic emphasis (r= 0.63). It is a mutual relation. That is, wherever there is an increase in the perception of teachers about resource support, there is also an increase in the views of teachers about collegial

leadership and academic emphasis. This finding can be evaluated in a situation which arose as a result of the centralized structure of the Turkish Educational System.

Table 4: Correlations between OHI and RSD scales

	CL. AE	RS	II	OHI	RSD
Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis (CL.AE)	1.00				
Resource Support (RS)	0.63	1.00			
Institutional Integrity (II)	-0.09	-0.31	1.00		
OHI Total (OHI)	0.96	0.79	-0.08	1.00	
RSD (my school vision is …..) (RSD)	0.36	0.83	-0.24	0.54	1.00

Note: OHI= Organizational Health Inventory   RSD= Robustness Semantic Differential

In the central system all hiring, transferring and turnover procedures are carried out by the central authority. The central system has authorized the school principal to manage the school and to do all the jobs related to it. One may understand the relation between the equipment that the principal supplies to develop educational activities and the principal's positive attitude towards teachers in this light. It can also be a result of not only the fact that teachers are affected by the individual efforts of the principal but also of the fact that their level of organizational loyalty has increased. As Anderson (1991) states, the managerial quality of the school principal plays an important role in developing the school and the success of the school. The finding of the present study is similar to the findings of Davis (1989) and Conley (1992) in that there is a parallel relation between resource support and collegial leadership and academic emphasis, which can be thought of as the result of effective leadership in schools. This is because two important elements of leadership are interpersonal positive relations and developing a school vision.

There was no linear relation between the perception of teachers for institutional integrity and their perception of

collegial leadership and academic emphasis. They were independent from each other (r= - 0.09). The fact that there was no relationship between the teachers' perceptions regarding institutional integrity subscale and collegial leadership and academic significance was no surprise because institutional integrity is part of a healthy school profile.

However, considering the structure of and applications in the Turkish National educational system and since the central system develops the curriculum and sends it to schools to be applied, it is clear why this subscale did not have an effect on school success. Parents and school environment never have any effects on or contributions to the application of the curriculum and the development of the school policy. The central system does not allow this. In this way, teachers are protected by the system against the out-of-school pressures, yet the fact that teachers are protected from the pressure outside the school does not necessarily mean that these interventions could be harmful, because institutional integrity does not discriminate between positive and negative forces. Interventions influencing educational and training activities in a positive way are also excluded. As a result, in the present study, there was no relationship between the institutional integrity subscale, collegial leadership and academic emphasis relating to teachers' views. The results of this study and those of Licata and Harper's (2001) are not the same because of the differences in the structure and practices of the educational systems.

　　　As a test of the hypothesis, the correlation coefficient between the total scores for the OHI and the school vision scale was 0.54 (P< 0.001). Except for the Institutional Integrity subscale, there was a significant positive relationship between the school vision scale and the organizational health subscale. Thus, it can be stated that in a school setting where centralism is in effect, giving teachers the right to participate in activities to develop a vision about their school in the process of change and development might have brought about positive human relations with their colleagues. The teachers might have answered the questionnaire under the influence of this. These positive

developments, further, might have created a situation in which educational problems and new ideas are shared. In such a situation, school principals are open to teachers' ideas and wishes, and they can develop a positive relationship with teachers and are keen to provide teachers with the necessary equipment. Under such circumstances teachers can easily obtain the class material and extra materials they need. Teachers who are working in schools which have the qualities that are considered to be signs of a healthy school profile show loyalty to their school vision, a loyalty which may increase as long as they see the principal and other teachers working to reach the desired goal for their school. This finding is similar to those of Logan's (1993), Willower and Jones' (1965), who state that in schools with a low organizational health teachers have a short-term and less healthy vision for their school.

       Moreover, the results of the research by Licata and Harper (2001) support the finding of this study that there is an important positive relation between teachers' perception of organizational health and their perception of a healthy school vision.

Table 5: Multiple Regression Analysis

Variable	RSD "My School vision is …"	Standard Beta	Standard Error	t	p
Constant		19.453	8.244	2.360	0.024
Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis (C.L and A.E)		-0.265	0.104	-2.550	0.015
		2.166	0.240	9.010	0.000
Resource Support (R.S)		0.329	0.625	0.526	0.602
Institutional Integrity (I.I)					
N			42		
Multiple R			0.86		
Squared Multiple R			0.74		
F Value			36.053		

Note: RSD= Robustness Semantic Differential "My school vision is . . . ."

Regression Analysis
As can be seen in table 5, the *F* test was used and the related *F* values were 36.053. According to this,

---

School Vision (Sv)= 19.453- 0.265 C. L and A. E + 2.166 R.S+ 0.329 I.I

It can be stated that the above model is statistically significant on the $\alpha = 0.05$ error level ($p<0.05$) (Draper & Smith, 1980). R^2 is calculated as 0.74. This can be interpreted as "the independent variables in the model explain the 74 % of the change in the dependent variable". That is, Collegial Leadership and Academic Emphasis, Resource Support, and Institutional Integrity explain the 74 % of the change in the school vision. The coefficient of determination (R^2) is not sufficient alone to find out whether the independent variables in the model are sufficient to explain school vision or not. When the value of R^2 approximates 1, the significance of the model increases. The values of *F* in *Table 5* shows the model is significant ($F = 36.053$). The second stage in regression analysis is to identify which independent variables are sufficient in explaining school vision and which are not. This is because the effect of some of the independent variables in the model may be very small. To find out such variables a significance test (*t*-test) for each variable is done. The results of the *t*-test are presented in *Table 5*. It is seen in *Table 5* that "Institutional Integrity" is insignificant in explaining school vision ($p = 0.602$). In actual fact, when this variable is taken out of the model, the reduction in the value of R^2 is considerably small ($R^2 = 0.738$).

Discussion
Statistics used to collect data and analyse the findings seem to support the hypothesis of the study that there is an important positive relationship between teachers' perception of organizational health and their perception of robust school vision. It can comfortably be stated then that where technical, managerial and institutional levels are in harmony in a middle school, there is a healthy professional atmosphere (Parsons, 1967). Probably, a school with such an atmosphere meets its

needs and directs its potential energy towards the realization of its mission.

Students, teachers and principals in healthy schools cooperate with the environment of the school. Teachers tend to take risks and try out new ideas. They will be more willing to convey their values and beliefs to the students. When teachers observe their colleagues exploring ways of overcoming challenging problems, they will be encouraged to apply their views about the desired future (Glenn, 1994; Hoy & Miskel 1991; Licata & Harper, 2001). Hoy and Miskel (1991) developed an organizational health inventory to measure and describe the organizational health of a school; it has 7 dimensions. The concept of organizational health by Hoy and Miskel, (1991), Licata and Harper (2001), and Tsui and Cheng (1999) is consistent with the definition that organizational health is the ability of an organization to adapt itself into its environment, accomplish goals and promote common goals in the members of the organization. Then, according to the findings of the present study, it is suggested that there is a positive relation between teachers working in a healthy organization and a robust school vision.

Probably, teachers working in schools where organizational health is low perceive school vision as low and the communication between principal and teachers, and teachers and other teachers in a school with low organizational health may be weak. For this reason, challenges outside might be damaging for the school (Hoy & Hannum, 1997). In such a case, teachers do not like school, students or each other. In a school where personal visions are put into practice, loyalty to a common vision will be weaker. As a result, the relation of the school-environment relationship will be weaker and educational standards will suffer.

When students do not have a strong common vision for their academic success, teachers will resort to discipline and, even worse, regard discipline as an aim rather then a means to

develop students' success (Licata & Wildes, 1980; Licata & Harper, 2001).

Consistent with previous research which defines school health as the organization's ability to successfully adapt to its environment, and accomplish goals (Hoy & Hannum, 1997; Licata & Harper, 1999; Tsui & Cheng, 1999), the explanatory regression used in the present study indicates a positive, significant relationship between school health and robust school vision. Collegial leadership and academic emphasis related to school health and resource support subscales are related to a robust school vision. These findings suggest that teachers working in healthy schools perceive a robust school vision. To put it in another way, collegial leadership and academic emphasis related to organizational health and resource support subscales have a significant effect on the school vision variable, and as a result of teachers' perception collegial leadership and academic emphasis subscales cause a school to press for high but achievable goals and principal's behaviour towards duty and success.

The resource support subscale indicates that a school has enough class equipment and that educational and extra equipment can be obtained easily (Hoy & Miskel, 1991). In such schools, the school vision depends on not only the technical level of the organization which explains principals' and teachers' collaborative behaviour to accomplish organizational goals but also the institutional level of the organization which explains the relation between the school and its environments. That is, the positive relationship between organizational health and a robust school vision is basically influenced by the harmony between the school's technical and institutional levels.
When the relation between the technical and institutional levels is in harmony, teachers will probably feel that they have been strengthened by the school vision. Their motivation to accomplish organizational goals will increase. The result is a positive school atmosphere. When the technical and institutional levels are not in harmony, the common vision of the school will not develop and all efforts will be doomed to failure. Then,

school staff moves according to their individual vision and takes fewer risks, leading to a less healthy future.

Another finding is that the institutional integrity subscale has no significant effect on the school vision variable. In other words, there is a weak relationship between the two variables. The institutional integrity, which means overcoming the efforts to obliterate school by the external forces, was not found to be related to school vision. This is probably because teachers think that pressures from parents and the environment are not obstacles for them, and such groups have no chance of needless interference. Indeed, the central educational system does not allow anyone or any group to interfere in the system.

Conclusion

The aim of this study was to discover the possible relationship between school health and a robust school vision. To collect data, the *Organizational Health Inventory* (OHI) developed by Licata and Harper (2001) and the *Robustness Semantic Differential* (RSD) were used.

The languages of the both instruments were modified due to linguistic and cultural reasons. The OHI, having 35 items and 3 subscales and the RSD were given to 842 teachers in 42 primary schools. Like most research, this study is limited to the sample size and instruments. Nonetheless, alpha coefficients were consistent with research with larger samples and more dense instruments (e.g., Licata & Harper, 2001; Logan, 1993 or Tarter, Sabo & Hoy 1995).

The findings demonstrate that teachers identify a significant relationship between organizational health and a robust school vision. As a result of multiple regression analysis, it was found that collegial leadership and academic emphasis related to school health and the resource support subscale were related to the robust school vision.

To understand this relationship, further research is required. For example, school health could be related to the managerial style of the school (e.g., School Based Management) or whether there is a mutual relationship between managerial

style and school health could be tested. Also, in which way the managerial style affects the organizational health of the school could be investigated. Besides, the effect of a robust school health on students' success can be studied. In the future, instead of evaluating school health alone, by adding Hoy's (1991) school atmosphere concept, the relationship between an open school atmosphere and a robust school vision can be tested. By studying types of relationships between school health and organizational conflict, the results can be used to develop school health. To develop a school vision, teachers' perceptions of principals' effectiveness can be measured and the results could be used to discover the possible positive relationship between school health and school vision. Moreover, the vision a school has can be tested every 4 or 5 years and the effective factors in change of vision can be sought.

References
Akbaba, S.(1997). *Organizational health in Middle School.* Doctorate Thesis Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences.
Aksoy, N. (2002). Organizational Virus: A Threat Toward Organizational Health. *Yaşadıkça Education.* January-March, Ankara.
Anderson, M. E. (1991). Principals: How to train, recruıt, select, induct, and evaluate leaders for America's schools. *ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management College of Education.* University of Oregon.
Argun, T. (1997). *Vision: Executive Excellence.* Rota Publications Number: 7.
Balcı, A. (2000). Total Quality Congress in the Year 2000. 8th Total Quality Congress November 3-4.
Baskan, G. (2000). *Action and vision in higher education in the 20th Century.* Number:22.
Başaran, İ.E. (1991). Organizational behaviour. *Ankara University Faculty of Education Publications.* Ankara, Number: 108

Can, H. (1992). Organization and Management. (2nd ed). Ankara: Adım Publication.

Conley, D. T. (1992). The vision thing and school restructuring. *OSSC Report 32,* 2 (Winter) 1-8 Eugene: Oregon School Study Council. ED 343-46.

Çelik, V. (1995). Vision and mission of educational administrator. *Educational Administration Journal*, 1 (1).

Davis, J. (1989). Effective Schools, Organizational Culture, and Local Policy Initiatives.   In *Educational Policy For Effective Schools*, New York: Teachers College Press.

Draper, N.R., & Smith, H. (1980). *Applied regression analysis* (2nd ed.). New York. Wiley.

Erçetin, Ş. (2000). Vision round leader. *Nobel Publication Com*: Ankara.

Erdoğan, İ. (1998). How should be the change in education? *New Turkey Journal (19),* New Turkish Media Service Publication, Ankara.

Glenn, L.C. (1994). School sistinctiveness. *Journal of Education (*176) 2.

Hoy, W.K.& Hannum, J. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33, 290-311.

Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J. & Kottkamp, R.B. (1991). *Open schools/ Healthy schools*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hoy, W.K., & Miskel, C.G. (1991). *Educational administration*: Theory, research and practice (4th ed). New York: McGraw- Hill.

Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. J. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (1997). *The road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change: Middle   a   n   d secondary school edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lashway, L. (1997). *Leading with vision*. College of Education, University of Oregon, Eugene. (ERİC Clearinghouse on Educational Management No. ED 412 592)

Licata, J. W.; & Willower, D. J. (1978). Toward an operational definition for environmental robustness. *Journal of Educational Research*, 71, 218-222.

Licata, J. W, & Harper, G.W. (1999). Healthy schools, robust schools and academic emphasis as an organizational theme. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 37 (5), 463-475.

Licata, J. W, & Harper, G.W. (2001). Organizational health and robust school vision. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 37*, (1) 25-26.

Licata, J. W., & Wildes, J. R.(1980). Environmental robustness and classroom structure. *High School Journal 63*, 146-154.

Logan, C.S. (1993). Structural coupling, robustness, and effectiveness of schools. *Journal of Educational Administration, 31*, 4, 19-32.

Manase, A.L. (1985). Vision and leadership: paying attention to intention. Peabody *Journal of Education, 63* (1) 150-170.

Mathews, D. (1996). *Is there a public for public schools*? Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation Press.

Miles, M.B. (1969). Planned change and organizational health: Figure and ground. In F.D. Carver & T.J. Sergiovanni(Eds), *Organizations and human behavior* (pp. 375-391). New York McGraw-Hill.

Nanus, B. (1992). *Visionary leadership*: *Creating a compelling sense of direction for your organization* San Francisco: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Özdemir, A. (2002). The various aspects of a healthy school climate and student success, 10, (1), *Kastamonu Education Journal.*

Parsons, T. (1967). Some ingredients of a general theory of formal organization. In A. W. Halpin (Ed),

Administrative theory in Education (pp. 40-72). New York: Macmillan.

Parsons, T., Bales, R.F., & Sils, E.A. (1953). *Working papers in the theory of action*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Sashkin, M. (1986). *Making participative management work.* King of Prussia, PA: Organization Desing and Development, Inc.

Tarter, C.J., Sabo, D.J., & Hoy, W.K. (1995) Middle school climate, faculty trust, and effectiveness: A path analysis *Journal of Research and Development, 29*,41-49.

Tsui, T.K. & Cheng, C.Y. (1999). School organizational health and teacher commitment: A contingency study with multi-level analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation,* 5, (3), 249-268.

Whitaker, K. S. & Monte, C. M. (1994). *The restructuring handbook: A guide to school revitalization*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Willower, D.J., & Jones, R.G. (1965). When pupil controlbecomes an organizational theme. In E. Wandt (Ed), *A cross-section of educational research*. New York: David McKay.