

DO INSTITUTIONAL INTEGRITY AND RESOURCES ELICIT THE STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT?

¹Ijaz Ahmad Tatlah, ²Muhammad Amin and ³Zamin Abbas

¹University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan

Email: ijaz@tatlah.pk

²University of Education, Lahore, Pakistan

Email : amin@ue.edu.pk

³UMT, Lahore

ABSTRACT: *This study draws on the concept of organizational health in educational field. Purpose of this study is to explore the effect of organizational health facets institutional integrity and resource influence on the academic achievement of secondary school students. Students' achievement in this study is measured by the score they got in board of intermediate and secondary education examination in 10th grade. Institutional integrity and resource influence have been measured by School organizational health inventory at four point Likert scale. School organizational health inventory (SOHI) was duly pilot tested and found reliable in Pakistani context. This scale was served over a sample of one thousand nine hundred and twenty students of class tenth from sixty four public and private sector high schools in the Punjab. Sample included science and humanities group students from private and public schools of the population. To analyze the collected data simple linear regression was applied along with t test to find out any difference in opinion of the different groups of students. It was depicted that leading components of school organizational health institutional integrity and resource influence have a significant effect on the students' academic achievement at secondary level. Moreover, not any significant difference was found in the opinion of science and humanities as well as private and public school students about the status of organizational health of their schools. Some other facets of school organizational health have been suggested to be taken into consideration to enhance the students' achievement in the light of this research work.*

Key words: *Institutional integrity, Students' achievement, Teacher affiliation, Resource influence, Collegial leadership, Organizational health.*

INTRODUCTION

The uprightness of any organization is taken into thought by the folks while looking for confirmations for their kids. In addition, venue, area, foundation, environment and vibe are additionally well-thoroughly considered by the clientage of the instructive organizations. Idea of institutional trustworthiness and assets is the bedrock of hierarchical wellbeing in instruction. Likewise the idea of authoritative wellbeing in instruction is not new. Miles (1969)[19] connected the idea to government funded school atmosphere and related it to the school's capacity to work viably and also to develop and create. School wellbeing has likewise been identified with accomplishment, change endeavors, and mentalities toward control (Brookover et al, 1978; [5] Clark,1983)[7]. Business researchers have inquired about parts of authoritative wellbeing for a long time. Schein (1996) and Daft (2007)[9] connected the idea to hierarchical society. Others concentrated on parts, for example, authoritative duty, hierarchical citizenship, and authoritative anxiety (Cryer, 1996)[8].

All the more starting late, this written work has been redesigned by talk on controlling and testing the legitimate wellbeing of an affiliation (Lyden & Klingele, 2000)[18]. The examination of various leveled wellbeing in cutting edge training and especially educator preparing undertakings is compelled. In any case, internal definitive practices, for instance, those overseeing resource bit, evaluation inspiring strengths, reward systems, and execution affirmation, have been inferred to have famous effect on progressive wellbeing in the informed group (Boyer, 1990[4]; Glassick, Huber, & Meroff, 1997)[10].

Moreover, it has been found that the level of commitment that a representative showcases can impact the air of the workplace decidedly or antagonistically (Bandura, 1982)[3]. In addition, staff prizes were seen to be especially key to a

strong academic air. The thought of school wellbeing was delivered to get the method for understudy teacher, instructor, and educator director trades. The proposition of wellbeing in an association is not new; it brings up variables that both make possible and dissuade the change of useful interpersonal dealings within the alliance (Hoy & Forsyth, 1986)[11]. An inside and out regulated foundation is one in which similitude inundates associations amongst understudies, teachers, and director as the get-together wearisome its energies toward its charge. Strong schools have every one of the reserves of being high completing foundations (Hoy et al., 1990)[12]. In attempting to depict contrasts highly involved with convincing and deficient schools, investigators have recognized a couple of regulatory depictions that are joined with understudy accomplishment. School wellbeing is a structure for taking a gander at definitive environment of each open system to deal with the urgent issues as they are to persevere, create, and support. Schools to be sound are obliged to accumulate the requirements of form and their goal achievement, despite the imminent needs of social and regularizing consolidation. They ought to viably adjust to their surroundings as they move toward their goals. Meanwhile, schools to be sound, must keep up solidarity and coordination among their section parts and moreover make and transmit their unmistakable society and qualities.

Shah (2010)[20] found that schools have 3 modes of mechanism to meet the requirements; off the cuff, authoritative, and institutional. The customized level of a school is concerned with the feelings learning technique. The standard vocation of the school is to make gifted and learned understudies. Instructors and chiefs have guideline obligation regarding clarifying the contradict joined with viable learning and bearing. The cushy level controls the interior authority limit of the union. Principals are the prime legitimate

authority of schools. They impart out resources and arrangement to the work strength. Meanwhile, principals must complete weight with their more significant to get having a place for their schools and assets. Credibility, legitimacy and sponsorship are needed by the schools in the point of convergence of masses. Pretty much as pioneers and aides need support and seize in case they are to proceed upon their own occupations in a concordant way without unreasonable strain from persons and social events from outside the school.

These points of view give the speculative underpinnings to major and use school wellbeing (Hoy & Feldman, 1999)[14]. Particularly, "a well-built school is that in which the oblivious, refined, and institutional levels are in coordination and the school is meeting both its instrumental and dynamic needs as it adequately oversee resistant outside qualities and well-talked its energies toward its dedication"(Hoy,2013)[16]. Five properties of various leveled quality; institutional reliability, indispensable force, considering, source keep up, and educational tension have been perceived to delineate the soundness of a school.

Institutional Integrity

As demonstrated by Hoy and Hannum (1997)[13] "the degree to which the school can deal with its surroundings in a way that carries on the enlightening reliability of its undertakings" (p. 294). Institutional honor is a school's office to tackle the situation in a way that keeps up the educational validity of its ventures. Teachers are secure from difficult to oversee zone and parental apprehension. Essential highlight is the key's ability to look for after the exercises of higher prevailing voices in pecking request. Being capable to impel more unmistakable, get additional considering, and be unconstrained by the various leveled pecking solicitation are essential capacities to be convincing as a fundamental. Believed is pioneer's lead that is liberal, responsive, steady, separate and collegial; it addresses a generous anxiety of a preeminent for the side interests of teachers. Store keep up insinuates schools where attractive classroom supplies and instructional and informational equipment are open and extra re-sources are purposefully supplied if asserted. Academic inflection is the extent to which a school is enduring by an adventure for informational remarkableness. Towering however accessible insightful destinations are set for understudies; in progression surroundings is sorted out and honest to goodness; teachers have confidence in their understudies' ability to finish; and understudies lock in and thankfulness that need to do well for all intents and purposes.

In this way, institutional respectability is a pointer of wellbeing at the institutional level and serves the included limit of helping the school social system adjust to its environment. Genuine weight, thought, and store support give measures of the soundness of the master system. Near the beginning use of the considered authoritative wellbeing was done by Miles (1969)[19] when analyzing schools. He isolated regulatory wellbeing that an in number alliance is an affiliation which not simply continues with its life inside, it could call its own particular edges. Furthermore, they industriously arrange with its environment, get data from and offer respect nature and use its ability to overcome issues and continue with its business in this methodology (Akbaba,

2001)[1]. In like way it supports the reliability of an association.

In seeing correspondence amidst affiliations and living things, a couple of masters recommend that affiliations may possibly create to be debilitated alike occupation things do. The experts in like manner show center to the assertion that there may be "incapably" social requests. In case all the sub-systems of a connection start immovably, the association is trusted sound as a result showing the capacity of the relationship to complete its reasons (Bass, 1990[2], p. 277; Akbaba, 2001[1] ; Korkmaz, 2005[17] ; Cemalog, 2006[6], p. 64).

Brookover et al. (1978)[5] contemplated that the utilization of the thought of school wellbeing set up of managerial environment is colossal for school suitability. In their progress of the legitimate Health Inventory (OHI-S), Hoy and Feldman (1987)[14] depicted in the cerise and harmful affiliations. In a strong foundation, school delegates are protected against the weights starting from outside. Indicating stores are unobtrusively used as a piece of the regulation. In uniqueness, in hurting relationship, there is misgiving on the school personnel, capable capacities of the key are imperfect, and in school declaration is asking for with conflicts and low school occasions.

Hoy and Miskel's (1991)[15] OHI-S duplicates the going with sub-estimations: authoritative genuineness, begin connection, boss effect, store bear, thinking ahead, and enlightening criticalness. According to Tsui and Cheng (1999)[21] managerial truth is the utmost of the school to be in concordance with its surroundings, having reliability within the arrangement tasks, and handle with negative strikes against the school.

Objective of the study

Objective if the study is to find out the relationship of institutional integrity and resource influence (Both are the core components of school organizational health) with students' academic achievement at secondary level. Moreover, the objective of the study is also to find out the effect of both these independent variable (institutional integrity and resource influence) on students' academic achievement.

METHODOLOGY

Population of the study is all secondary schools in the Punjab province. Analysis and results sample has been drawn from this population. Sixty four public secondary schools were selected randomly. The number of respondents is one thousand nine hundred and twenty students of science and arts group. Similarly, the secondary schools included in sample were from private and public sector. School Organizational Health Inventory (SOHI) was adopted and served over the 1920 students to know their perceptions about organizational health of the relevant schools. Simple linear regression was applied to find out the significance of effect of SOH on students' academic achievement. Moreover, t test was applied for finding out any difference between public and private sector schools organizational health. Accordingly, the same was applied to find out any difference in science

and arts group students perceptions about their schools’ organizational health.

Achievement?”

In order to find out the effect of Institutional Integrity on Students’ Academic Achievement, Simple Linear Regression test was applied, and the results obtained are presented in Tables bellow.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The first research question formed was “Is there any effect of Institutional Integrity on Students’ Academic

Table 1: Effect of Institutional Integrity on Students’ Academic Achievement

R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Df	F	Sig.
0.245	0.059	1	122.295	0.000

Table 2: Regression Coefficients of Institutional Integrity and Students’ Academic Achievement

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	P
SA	562.51	14.84		37.88	.00
II	61.86	5.59	.24	11.05	.00

- a. Dependent Variable: Students’ Academic Achievement (SA)
- b. Institutional Integrity (II)

Table 1 shows the results of F-test which supports the predictive utilities of Institutional Integrity and Students’ Academic Achievement with the value of R-square = 0.245, adjusted R-square = 0.059, F = 122.295 which is significant at p=0.000 with df = 1.

Table 2 presents the unstandardized coefficient of Institutional Integrity a subscale of School Organizational Health (II) β^{\wedge} =61.86, t= 11.05, and p = 0.000, that was found statistically significant. The null hypothesis claiming, no significant effect of Institutional Integrity on Students’ Academic Achievement, is therefore, rejected. The prediction equation of Institutional Integrity using unstandardized coefficient of Students’ Academic Achievement is given below:

$$SA = 562.51+61.86(II)$$

SA score calculated before the effect of II is = 624.37. Whereas, the SA score after the effect of Institutional Integrity on Students’ Academic Achievement has been calculated as under:

$$SA = 562.51+61.86 \times 2.57 = 721.49$$

The difference in SA score before and after the effect is 97.12, which shows that there is significant effect of Institutional Integrity on Students’ Academic Achievement. This is supported by the significance of p value mentioned in Table 2.

The second research question formed was “Is there any effect of Resource Influence on Students’ Academic Achievement?”

In order to find out effect of Resource Influence on Students’ Academic Achievement, Simple Linear Regression test was applied, and the results obtained are presented in Tables 3 and 4 given below.

Table 3 shows that the results of F-test which supports the predictive utilities of School Organizational Health subscale Resource Influence and Students’ Academic Achievement. Because value of R-square = 0.568, adjusted R-square = 0.322, and F = 911.383 that is significant at p=0.000 with df = 1.

Table 3: Effect of Resource Influence on Students’ Academic Achievement

R-Square	Adjusted R-Square	Df	F	Sig.
0.568	0.322	1	911.383	0.000

Table 4: Regression Coefficients of Resource Influence and Students’ Academic Achievement

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	T	p
SA	228.25	16.62		13.72	.00
RI	170.09	5.63	.56	30.18	.00

- a. Dependent Variable: Students’ Academic Achievement (SA)
- b. Resource Influence (RI)

Table 4 shows that unstandardized coefficient of Resource Influence (RI) $\beta^{\wedge} = 170.09$, $t = 30.18$, $p = 0.000$ was found statistically significant. So, the null hypothesis claiming no significant effect of Resource Influence on Students' Academic Achievement is, therefore, rejected. The prediction equation of Resource Influence using unstandardized coefficient of Students' Academic Achievement is given below:

$$SA = 228.25 + 170.09(RI)$$

SA score before the effect of RI is 398.34 and the same score after the effect has been calculated as under:

$$SA = 228.25 + 170.09 \times 2.90 = 721.51$$

The difference before and after the effect of Resource Influence on Students' Academic Achievement is 493.26. Thus, the prediction equation reflects that there was a significant effect of Resource Influence on Students' Academic Achievement. The same has been supported by significance of the p value that is mentioned in Table 4.

Third research question of the study was "Is there any difference in School Organizational Health on the basis of gender of the respondents?"

In order to find out difference between male and female students' perceptions about School Organizational Health of their relevant schools, t statistics was conducted, and the results obtained are presented in Table 5 given below

Table 5: Difference in School Organizational Health on the basis of Gender of the students

Gender	N	M	SD	Df	T	P
Male	995	2.89	.30	1918	-4.37	.00**
Female	925	2.95	.35			

**p<.01

Table 5 reflects t-value (-4.37) at significance $p < 0.01$ with $df = 1918$ and mean score for male students = 2.89, and for female students it is 2.95. Similarly, standard deviation for male students is 0.30, and for female students it is 0.35. The number of male students who took part in the study was 995 and female students were 925. Hence there was a significant difference in School Organizational Health according to the opinion of the male and female students. The null hypothesis claiming, no significant difference between male and female

students' opinion about School Organizational Health is, therefore, rejected.

Fourth research question was "Is there any difference in public and private schools' Organizational Health?"

In order to find out difference between public and private Schools' Organizational Health, t test was applied, and results yielded through this analysis are presented in Table 6 given below:

Table 6: Difference in School Organizational Health on the basis of Public and Private Schools

Type of Schools	N	M	SD	Df	T	P
Public	960	2.93	.33	1918	.96	.33
Private	960	2.91	.32			

Table 6 shows that $t = 0.96$ at $p > 0.01$ with $df = 1918$ while mean score for public schools was 2.93 and for private schools was 2.9. Similarly standard deviation for public schools was 0.33 and for private schools was 0.32. The number of public and private schools was same, which was 960. There was no significant difference in School Organizational Health of public and private secondary schools as t-value is not significant at $p = 0.33$. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. Hence, public and private

secondary schools observe the similar conditions of School Organizational Health.

Fifth research question was "Is there any difference in School Organizational Health according to the opinion of the Science and Arts students?"

In order to find out the difference between science and arts group students' opinion about their Schools' Organizational Health, t test was applied, and the results found after this analysis are presented in Table 7 given below:

Table 7: Difference in School Organizational Health according to the opinion of Science and Arts group students

Discipline of Students	N	M	SD	Df	T	P
Science	1005	2.95	.31	1918	-5.07	.00**
Arts	915	2.88	.34			

**p<.01

Table 7 shows that the number of science students was 1005 and arts students were 915 who participated in the survey of the study regarding School Organizational Health. Mean score for science students was 2.95 and for arts students it was 2.88. Accordingly, the standard deviation for science students was 0.31 and for arts students it was 0.34. Whereas, t-value was -5.07 which is significant at $p < 0.01$ with $df = 1918$. This shows that School Organizational Health was significantly different for Science and Arts group secondary school students.

Thus, the null hypothesis claiming no significant difference between Science and Arts group students' opinion about their Schools Organizational Health is, therefore, rejected.

CONCLUSION

From results it has been concluded that a significant correlation between Institutional Integrity and Students' Academic Achievement exists. Moreover, Resource has also a significant correlation with Students' Academic Achievement. It has been concluded from the results that

there was a significant difference in School Organizational Health as perceived by the male and female students. It was found that t-value was significant. Therefore, it has been concluded that male students ranked School Organizational Health different from female students. It is evident from the findings that there was no significant difference between School Organizational Health of public and private secondary schools according to the perceptions of students' because value of t was not significant. Therefore, it has been concluded that public and private secondary schools provide similar Organizational Health. The perceptions of science and arts students about School Organizational Health of secondary schools were found to be statistically different.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akbaba, S. (2001), Organizational Health, Nobel Yayinevi, Ankara.
- [2] Bass, B.M. (1990). A Handbook of Leadership (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.
- [3] Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American psychologist*, 37(2), 122.
- [4] Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Practices of the professoriate*. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- [5] Brookover, W. B., Schweitzer, J. H., Schneider, J. M., Beady, C. H., Flood, P. K., & Wisenbaker, J. M. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15(2), 301-318.
- [6] Cemalog , N. (2006), "Analysis of the primary school teachers' perception of organizational health in terms of different variables", *H. U . Eg̃ itim Fakũ ltesi Dergisi*, Vol. 30 No. 1, pp. 63-72.
- [7] Clark, E., & Fairman, M. E. (1983). Organizational health: A significant force in planned change. *NASSP Bulletin*, 41, 108-113.
- [8] Cryer, B. A. (1996, June). *Neutralizing workplace stress: The physiology of human performance and organizational effectiveness*. Presentation of Psychological Disabilities in the Workplace, The Centre for Professional Learning, Toronto, Canada.
- [9] Daft, R. (2007). *The leadership experience*. Cengage Learning.
- [10] Glassick, C. E., Huber, M. T., Maeroff, G. I., & Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- [11] Hoy, W.K., & Forsyth, P.B. (1986). *Supervision of instruction: Theory into practice*. New York: Random House.
- [12] Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J., & Bliss, J. (1990). Organizational climate, school health, and student achievement: A comparative analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26, 260-279.
- [13] Hoy, W. K., & Hannum, J. W. (1997). Middle school climate: An empirical assessment of organizational health and student achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 33(3), 290-311.
- [14] Hoy, W. K., & Feldman, J. A. (1999). Organizational health profiles for high schools. *School climate: Measuring, improving and sustaining healthy learning environments*, 84-102.
- [15] Hoy, W.K., Miskel, C.G. (1991) *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [16] Hoy, W. K. & Miskel, C. G. (2013). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice*, 9th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [17] Korkmaz, M. (2005), "İlkoğretim okullarındaki öğrenci başarısı ile öğretmenlerin arasındaki ilişki" ("The relationship between organizational health and student achievement in primary school"), *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Yönetimi*, Vol. 44 No. 11, pp. 529-48.
- [18] Lyden, J. A., & Klingele, W. E. (2000). Supervising organizational health. *Supervision*, 61(12), 3-7.
- [19] 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). 56 New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [20] Shah, S. (2010). Re-thinking Educational Leadership : Exploring the Impact of Cultural and Belief Systems. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 13(1)pp.27-44.
- [21] Tsui, K. T., & Cheng, Y. C. (1999). School organizational health and teacher commitment: A contingency study with multi-level analysis. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 5(3), 249-268.