

REWARD AND COERCIVE POWER OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AS DETERMINING FACTORS OF JOB PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS IN OWERRI EDUCATION ZONE.

BY

**NWACHUKWU, CHINYERE MARYROSE
DEPARTMENT OF CURRICULUM STUDIES & EDUCATIONAL
MANAGEMENT/PLANNING
UNIVERSITY OF UYO**

ABSTRACT

The study investigated principals' use of power and job performance of secondary school teachers' in Owerri Education Zone. The population of this study consisted of all secondary schools principals' and teachers' in Owerri Education Zone. The study adopted Expost-Facto research design while simple random sampling technique was used in selecting the respondents. The instrument for data collection which was tagged "Reward And Coercive Power Of Secondary School Principals And Job Performance Of Teachers Questionnaire" (Rcpsspjptq) was administered to the respondents and used for the study. The instrument was validated by two educational evaluators in the faculty of education before the reliability test was conducted which produced the reliability coefficient of (0.67, 0.77 and 0.85) proving the instrument to be reliable for the study. Data collected were analyzed and from the results of the data analysis, it was observed and concluded that principals' use of reward power has significant relationship with teachers' job performance in Owerri Education Zone. Also, principals' use of coercive power has significant relationship with teachers' job performance in Owerri Education Zone. It was therefore recommended that the power gap between the principal and teacher should be bridged with the appropriate application of high productivity, and not only in the school system, but also in any other sector of the economy, and it should be used for good motives.

INTRODUCTION

Principals are supposed have the power to enable them to build and maintain a sustainable quality education in their schools. Managerial behavior is as important as managerial competence. Mullins (2007) asserts that the principals' behavior and style of management will influence the effort and level of performance achieved by subordinate staff. The principals' managerial behavior and use of power can to a large extent influence job performance of the teachers'. It is the sole responsibility of the principal to manage and to achieve results through the effort of the teachers' and other subordinate staff. This involves effective utilization of power by the school principal. Teachers' job performance therefore is a function of principals' use of power.

The school principal has important roles to play. Among this roles include providing effective leadership in secondary schools, thereby enhancing better job performance among teachers. In supporting this issue(Crum & Sherman, 2008) stated that the principal need to provide highly valued, insights into their daily styles that foster an environment which is supportive of high teachers performance. These roles are categorized in developing personnel and facilitating

leadership responsible delegation and empowering team, recognizing ultimate accountability, communicating and rapport, facilitating instruction, and managing change. But, the main challenges for the principals are to create and promote the conducive atmosphere for teaching and learning. The principals leadership style influences the efficiency and also the effectiveness of the teachers performance in school (Alageheband, 1997).

Teachers performance could be described in various ways. (Robert and Tim, 1998) as the act of accomplishing or executing a given tasks. On the other hand (Obilade ,1999) defined teachers performance as the duties performed by a teacher at a particular period in the school system in achieving educational goals Whereas, (Akinyemi 1993; Okeniyi, 1995) defined it as the ability of teachers to combine relevant inputs for the enhancement of teaching and learning processes. However, (Meindl,1995) argued that teachers performance is determined by the workers level of participation in the day to day running of the organization.

Young (2008) makes the astute comment that the power of the principal is in the mind of others, arguing that principals gain the power to lead only when their constituents grant the permission to do so. Smirnov and Smotrina (2002) argue a number of powers are delegated to principals and vice-principals in the sphere of professional activity, with the aim of improving particular areas. Such sharing of powers creates the conditions in the school for freedom of thought and discussion, and for particular groups to establish their own stance and propose new ideas and practical measures (Smirnova 2002). This study therefore seeks to determine principals' use of power and job performance of secondary school teachers' in Owerri Education Zone.

Principals' Reward Power

Reward power is conveyed through rewarding individuals for compliance with one's wishes. This may be done through giving bonuses, recommendation, praises, promotion, and extra time off from work, etc. reward power is based on the perceived power to determine distributions of rewards; it refers to the degree to which the individual can give others a reward of some kind such benefits as: time off, desire gifts, promotions or increase in pay or responsibility. It is the power of the principal to reward the staff in return for displaying desired behaviors. This kind of power gets its strength from the attractiveness of rewards and the equal distribution of these rewards. The perception that rewards are not distributed justly can turn this power into coercive power. However, the effective use of reward power is effective in development of referent power. Effective and just use of this power by the principal could lead to positive results in an organization.

Power is effective but also ineffective if abused. People who abuse reward power can become pushy or became reprimanded for being too forthcoming or 'moving things too quickly (Zhao, Huo, Flynn, & Yeung, 2008). Reward power is the ability of a person to provide someone with the things which he desires and to remove those things which he does not desire. From an employee's perspective, reward power is the capacity of his/her supervisor to provide him with the benefits like pay raise, promotions, personal approval, praise and respect (Rahim, 1989; Raven, 1990). Numerous studies have shown different results about relationship between reward power of principal and job performance of teachers.

Coercive Power

Power is typically defined as the capacity to make others do what they would not otherwise do or the ability to overcome resistance (Tjosvold 2001). Power thus reflects a leader's potential to influence others such as teachers to collaborate, or to bring about change. Speer (2008) argues that

power is exercised through superior resources and the ability to reward or punish individuals, groups and communities. Goswick (2007) argues that power is the ability to influence other people and events. He maintains that the objective should be to influence and control others for the good of the group or organisation. Foucault (1993), on the other hand, argues that power is the “multiplicity” of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organisation. He views the school as participating in the growth of disciplinary power (Foucault, cited in Levitt, 2008). He argues that power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere. Levitt (2008) therefore argues that people have the power to influence education in general.

Hough (1978) argues that the school family is the principle source of power and influence rather than forces external to the school. Coercive power refers to the capacity to punish subordinates or to threaten to do so. Leader’s with coercive power can threaten an employee’s job security, make changes to the employee’s work schedule, and, in extreme cases, use physical force. The principal might in some instances force the staff to do tasks in a specific way. Failure might lead to punishment in the form of unpleasant things to do. This power thus uses fear as a motivator. Apart from these forms of power, the principal must be able to exercise personal power to motivate and gain the collaboration of other people. He must also be able to persuade people to change their attitudes or opinions (French and Raven 1995). Personal power refers to the leader’s ability to develop followers on the strength of his or her personality. This power is based on the relationship the principal is able to develop, both in and out of school. This includes leading staff, working with peers and getting the best out of everyone to serve a common purpose.

Rosen (1959) asserts that the power of a person is determined by his position in an organisation, the role he occupies, his responsibilities and the relationship between who perceives the power position of others and other group members who have greater power. McDermott (1985) takes a different view, arguing that the real source of your power is you because you are the source. Your power is derived from beliefs and values, skills and knowledge. It is based on your identity and influenced by the identity you project to the world.

McDermott (1985) identifies four primary sources of power in an organisation: firstly functional power, which derives from roles and responsibilities; secondly, positional power, which derives from the relative level of the position in the organisation; thirdly, idea, which derives from concepts and strategies; and lastly personal power, which derives from an individual’s beliefs, values, skills, knowledge and experience. Levington (1959) argues that the basis or the sources of a leader’s power lie in his or her capacity to make available and to withhold resources which are important for the need satisfaction of other members. For that reason, the leader’s power will be particularly enhanced when he uses it to further the group’s progress towards its goal. Dugan (2003) draws attention to the different lens that feminists use to look at power. They have identified three forms of power, which they describe as “power over”, “power to”, and “power with”. “Power over” refers to power through domination; it is coercive and operates largely through threat and fear. “Power to” directs our attention back to the definition of power in general. “Power with” refers to a certain form of getting things done, that is, collaborative endeavours.

Statement of the Problem

Principals, as instructional leader, focus on helping teachers to improve their classroom performance and make academic instruction as their schools top priority. Principals as educational leader play a pivotal role in the success of the school. But it is observed that in some secondary schools, principals are hardly seen in their offices executing their duties, they neither delegate duties nor fully communicate to their teachers. Much of their time was spent on political duties unrelated to the education of students at their school, and requiring much absence from the school site. This seems to reduce the level of performance affecting the teaching and learning process and/or cause undesirable outcome such as failure of student in examination, repetition rate drop out as well as other instructional activities at schools. Hence, the collision of principals' leadership style and teachers' performance has been a subject of disagreement by researchers; this study therefore seeks to determine principals' use of power and job performance of secondary school teachers' in Owerri Education Zone.

Purpose of the Study

This study was carried out to determine the influence of reward and coercive power of secondary school principals on job performance of teachers' in Owerri Education Zone, while specific objective are follows:

1. To find out the relationship between principals' use of reward power and job performance of teachers.
2. To find out the relationship between principals' use of coercive power and job performance of teachers.

Research question

The following research questions will be answered:

1. What is the relationship between principals' use of reward power and job performance of teachers?
2. What is the relationship between principals' use of coercive power and job performance of teachers?

Research Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested:

1. Principals' use of reward power has no significant relationship with job performance of teachers.
2. Principals' use of coercive power has no significant relationship with job performance of teachers'.

METHOD

Research Design

The research design used for this study was ex-post-facto research design .This design was considered appropriate for the research as it attempted to check the already existing relationship of the independent variable (the principals use of power) on the dependent variable(job performance of secondary school teachers)

Area of the Study

The researcher area for this study is Imo State. Imo State is one of the 36 states of the federation of Nigeria.

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of all secondary schools principals' and teachers' in Owerri Education Zone. They are estimated to be 234 principals and 2436 teachers respectively, (Imo State Education Board Planning and Statistics Department, 2012).

Sample and sampling Technique

The sample for this study consisted of 372 teachers' and 62 principals which is 26% from 62 schools' in the study area. Simple random sampling technique was adopted in selecting the principal from each school in Owerri Education Zone. The balloting system was used in selecting the sample.

Research Instrument

The instrument used by the research for this study was a research questionnaire. The questionnaire tagged' "REWARD AND COERCIVE POWER OF SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND JOB PERFORMANCE OF TEACHERS QUESTIONNAIRE" (RCPSSPJPTQ) was used to collect data on the independent and dependent variables presented in both sections A and B of the questionnaire While section A measured the demographic data of the respondents, section B measured the independent variables

Validation of the Research Instrument

The instrument was subjected to face validation by two educational evaluators in the faculty of education. The items in the questionnaire were properly worded to meet the respondent's level of understanding and each variable was properly measured.

Reliability of the Instrument

In order to establish the reliability of the instrument, cronbach Alpha reliability method was used, in order to test for the internal consistency of the instrument. From the analysis, the following reliability coefficients (0.67, 0.77 and 0.85) which was high enough to justify the use of the instrument.

Administration of the Instrument

The research used a letter of introduction and permission to gain access into the schools. On getting to the schools, the research presented the letter to the heads of the respective school, who assigned an assistant to the researcher. The assistant, having been given enough induction by the researcher, went ahead to identify the respondents, administer and retrieve the questionnaire. The exercise lasted for three weeks.

Data Analyses and Results

Research Question one

What is the relationship between principals’ use of reward power and job performance of teachers?

Table 1: Result of multiple R and R Square coefficients for the relationship between principals’ use of reward power and job performance of teachers’.

Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Principals’ Coercive Power	.955	.911	.910	3.03875

Dependent Variables Teachers’ Job Performance

Table 1 reveal the strength of relationship between the models (principals’ reward power) and the dependent variable (job performance of teachers’). R, the correlation coefficient (.955), is the linear correlation between the observed and model-predicted value of the dependent variable (job performance). Its big value indicates a strong positive relationship. R², the coefficient of determination, (.911) is the squared value of the correlation coefficient. It shows that 91% variation in job performance of teachers’ is explained by the model (principals’ reward power). The result means that there is a very corresponding linear relationship between principals’ reward power and job performance of teachers’.

Research Question two

What is the relationship between principals’ use of coercive power and job performance of teachers?

Table 2: Result of multiple R and R Square coefficients for the relationship between principals’ coercive power and job performance of teachers.

Variable	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
Principals’ Coercive Power	.970	.941	.940	2.46765

Dependent Variables Teachers’ Job Performance

Table 2 reveal the strength of relationship between the models (principals’ coercive power) and the dependent variable (job performance of teachers). R, the correlation coefficient (.970), is the linear correlation between the observed and model-predicted value of the dependent variable (job performance). Its big value indicate a strong positive relationship. R², the coefficient of determination, (.941) is the squared value of the correlation coefficient. It shows that 94% variation

in job performance of teachers is explained by the model (principals' coercive power). The result means that there is a very corresponding linear relationship between principals' coercive power and job performance of teachers.

Testing the hypothesis

Hypothesis one

Principals' use of reward power has no significant relationship with teachers' job performance

Table 3: Result of simple linear regression analysis for the relationship between principals' reward power and job performance of teachers'.

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Principals' legitimate Power	Regression	5687.314	1	5687.314	615.910*	.000
	Residual Total	554.040	60	9.234		
		6241.355	61			

Dependent Variable: Teachers' Job Performance

*Significant at 0.5 alpha level

Table 3 shows the analysis of variance with an f-value of 615.910 at 60 degrees of freedom and critical f-value of 4.00. Since the calculated f-value is greater than the critical f-value, it means that principal's reward significantly predicts the criterion variable which is job performance of teachers'. This therefore leads to the rejection of null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between principals' reward power and job performance of teachers'.

Hypothesis two

Principals' use of coercive power has no significant relationship with teachers' job performance

Table 4: Result of simple linear regression analysis for the relationship between principals' coercive power and job performance of teachers'.

Variable		Sum of Squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig
Principals' coercive Power	Regression	5875.996	1	5875.996	964.969*	.000
	Residual Total	365.358	60			
		6241.355	61	6.089		

Dependent Variable: Teachers' Job Performance

*Significant at 0.5 alpha level

Table 4 shows the analysis of variance with an F-value of 964.969 at .05 with 1 and 60 degrees of freedom and critical F-value of 4.00. Since the calculated F-value is greater than the critical F-value, it means that principals' coercive power significantly predicts the criterion variable which is job performance of teachers. This, therefore, leads to the rejection of the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between principals' coercive power and job performance of teachers. Meaning that changes in principals' coercive power scores also cause changes in job performance of teachers'.

Discussion of Findings

Analysis of data in hypothesis one showed a significant relationship between principals' use of reward power and job performance of secondary school teachers'. The cal f-value of (615.910) was greater than the critical f-value of (4.00) at .05 level with 1 and 60 degrees of freedom, leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis. This analysis gave a high relationship between the variables,

thus answering the research question. The implication is that the use of reward power enhances job performance by teacher in secondary school. This is supported by the findings of Luo (2004) who said that the use of reward power is obvious in organizations, it is ineffective if abused. Teachers' who are rewarded in one form or the other tends to do better. This also agrees with Akpa (1990) who said that the use of power by school principals' boosts the morale of teachers' and enhances job performance. The significance of the result caused the null hypotheses to be rejected while the alternative one was accepted.

Analysis of data in hypothesis two showed a significant relationship due to the fact that the obtained f-value (964.969) was greater than the critical f-value (4.00) at .05 level with 1 and 60 degrees of freedom. This result implies that there is significant relationship of principals' coercive power and teachers' job performance. The significance of the result is in agreement with the findings of Zameni (2012) who concluded that if a manager moderates his/her use of coercive power, employees will be committed and satisfied with their job and organization. The significance of the result caused the null hypotheses to be rejected while the alternative one was accepted.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the research, the researcher wishes to draw the following conclusion:-Principals' use of reward power has significant relationship with teachers' job performance in Owerri Education Zone. Principals' use of coercive power has significant relationship with teachers' job performance in Owerri Education Zone.

Recommendations

Based on the findings the following recommendations were made:
Being that the principals' power has been identified as a very important determining factor to teachers' job performance, it is pertinent that the power gap between the principal and teacher should be bridged with the appropriate application of high productivity, and not only in the school system, but also in any other sector of the economy, and it should be used for good motives. Hence, it should be practiced by all levels of management in order to quickly fast track and reset up with the objectivities of the organization.

REFERENCES

- Akinyemi, P. (1993) *Building commitment to change and organizational learning* (Phase 4 final report). Victoria, BC: British Columbia Ministry of Education.
- Alageheband, D. (1997) Leadership as an organization-wide phenomena: Its impact on school performance. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31, 564-588.
- Crum, B. & Sherman, D. (2008) *Images of principal instructional leadership: From supervision to collaborative inquiry*. *Journal of Curriculum Supervision*, 12, 356-6.
- Dugan, F. (2003) Leadership for of organizational learning. In K. Leithwood (Ed.), *Understanding schools as intelligent systems* (pp. 267-292). Stamford, CT: JAI.
- Foucault, L. (1993). *Has Sam and Samantha's time come at last?* *Educational Leadership*, 46(8), 4-9.
- Foucault, L. (2008) School leadership and teacher quality of work life in restructuring schools. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts* (pp. 99-122). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- French, D. & Raven, A. (1995) *The role of principal as leader: Analysis of variation in leadership of urban high schools*. *Journal of Educational research*. 81(2), 69-79.
- Goswick, M. (2007) Conditions fostering organizational learning in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(2), 243-276.
- Hough, D. (1978) *Higher School: A report on Secondary Education in America*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Imo State Education Board Planning and Statistics Department, (2012) Primary school principal's performance in critical administrative task areas. *Journal of Negro Education No. 54*, 566-74.
- Levington, M. (1959) A description of restructuring in nationally nominated schools: legacy of the iron cage? *Educational Policy*, 8, 28-50.
- Levitt, N. (2008) Radical Revisions: Power, Discipline and Organizations, *organizations studies*, 10(1): 97-115.
- McDermott, A. (1985) *Principals can be effective managers and instructional leaders*. *NASSP Bulletin*, 74(525), 20-29.
- Meindl, D. (1995) Transformational leadership and teachers' commitment to change. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Reshaping the principal ship* (pp. 77-98). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Mullins, A. (2007) *School Climate and Teaching Effectiveness of Secondary school Teachers in Akwa Ibom State*. Unpublished M. Ed Thesis, University of Uyo.
- Obilade, B. (1999) Leadership and cooperation in marketing channels: a comparative empirical analysis of the United States, Finland, and Poland. *International Marketing Review*.
- Okeniyi, R. (1995) The school as a formal organization. In J. March (Ed.), *handbook of organizations*. New York: Rand McNally, 972 - 1022.
- Rahim, Z. (1989) *The pedagogy of poverty versus good teaching*. Retrieved from <http://www.enc.org/topics/equity/articles/document.shtm?input=ACQ-111376-1376>
- Raven, B. (1990) Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. *School effectiveness and school improvement*, 1(4), 249-280.

- Robert, D. & Tim, J. (1998) Policy and professionalism. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 55-77). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Rosen, D. (1959) Progress towards professionalism in teaching. In G. Cawelti (Ed.), *Challenges and achievements of American education: The 1993 ASCD yearbook* (pp. 19-52). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Smirnov, M. & Smotrina, N. (2002) *Cultivating leadership in schools: Connecting people, purpose, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Smirnova, C. (2002) *The experience of Secondary Headship selection: continuity and change*. Educational Studies, 17(3), 285 - 294.
- Speer, M. (2008) *Principal leadership and resource situation as contingency factors of school success in Ondo State*. Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Tjosvold, B. (2001) The dimensions of syntality in small groups. *Human Relations, Vol. 6, 331-356*.
- Young, B. (2008) Transformational school leadership. In K. Leithwood et al. (Eds.), *International handbook of educational administration* (pp. 785-840). Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Zhao, A., Huo, D., Flynn, B. & Yeung, Z. (2008) Cognitive perspectives on leadership. *Journal of School Leadership, 5, 115-135*.