

The Effect of Coercive Power and Reward toward Teacher's Job Satisfaction

Ali Idrus^a, ^aDepartment of Science Education. Faculty of Teacher Training and Science Education, Universitas Jambi Indonesia, Email: ali.idrus@unja.ac.id

The purpose study is to find out the relationship and compare the effects of the use of coercive power and reward by managers in public and private schools in the city of Jambi. A quantitative research method, which involved the conduction of surveys and direct observation. The data collection techniques used in this study was questionnaires and documented studies. The data were analysed using the t-test, Pearson's correlation, and regression analysis. Finding the result study showed that reward positively related to the job satisfaction of teachers in private schools. The results explain the ability of managers for various government policies as a referral force. However, managers in private schools are more likely to use a thorough force in some situations and provide rewards in accordance with teacher incomes. Therefore, private and public schools have some differences, not only differ in the practice of developing human resources and leadership style, but also differ in the practice of managerial power. The difference is related to the basic strength and satisfaction of teacher work. The research findings generated in this study showed that coercive power had a neutral effect on the resolution of problems in private schools.

Key words: *Job Satisfaction, Coercive Power, Reward.*

Introduction

Efficient and effective human resources play a crucial role in the development and productivity of an organisation. Managers need power to achieve organisational goals. Power is an influential tool that can be used to achieve the desired results. For instance, power is required to ensure the seamless coordination of processes in the education sector. Therefore, it can be inferred that power facilitates the achievement of educational goals. Nelson and

Quick (2012) define power as a person's ability to influence others. Power is an effective resource tool for managers to make subordinates obedient and responsible (Zameni et al., 2012). Managers / supervisors use a variety of methods to influence their subordinates to change their behaviour, in order to ensure the achievement of organisational goals.

One of these methods includes reward and coercive power. Many managers aim to achieve organisational goals by changing the attitudes, beliefs and actions of their subordinates (Rahim, 1989). Thus, these two forces play an important role in influencing employee job satisfaction (Afza, 2005; Lee and Tui, 2008; Nadaee et al., 2012). The impact of reward and coercive power on employee job satisfaction varies in different organisations. Some researchers documented that there is a significant positive relationship between reward and job satisfaction (Hinkin and Schriesheim, 1994; Elangovan and Xie, 2000; Afza, 2005), while other researchers documented that there is a significant relationship between the two (Nadaee, et al., 2012). Many studies have shown that there are varying impacts of coercive power on employees (Richmond et al., 1986; Lee and Tui, 2008; Zameni et al., 2012). The power of a leader has a significant impact on the performance of the followers. They feel valued for their work when leaders wield the power they possess effectively. In addition, these followers are motivated to improve their performance at work. Thus, leaders in educational institutions who use their power wisely motivate followers to coordinate processes in the sector effectively. Hanafi et al. (2012) stated that there are certain differences in the leadership styles practised in the public and private sectors. Thus, it is the manager's responsibility to change the coercive power and reward used to ensure job satisfaction in the public and private sectors.

The research study conducted by Faiz (2013) documented that the coercive power and rewards given by the leaders in educational institutions influence a teacher's job satisfaction. The author also documented that private institutions significantly give more attention to the use of coercive power and reward. Furthermore, the conduction of a regression analysis revealed that the use of reward has a negative influence on teachers' job satisfaction in public schools, while the use of reward power has a positive influence on teachers' job satisfaction in private schools. Another relevant research study conducted by Idrus (2013) documented that the leadership style of principals has a significant influence on the job satisfaction of teachers and the learning outcomes of students. Furthermore, the study conducted by Idrus (2014) documented that leadership styles affect the performance of lecturers in state universities in Indonesia. These findings necessitate the investigation of the effect of coercive power and reward on teachers' job satisfaction in both public and private schools in Indonesia, especially in Jambi city. This investigation is quintessential to the formulation of positive policies that will ensure the satisfaction of teachers in public and private schools. In addition, the conduction of this study will improve the performance of teachers and build competitive teacher quality in the global arena.

This study aimed to determine the relationship and compare the effects of the use of coercive power and reward by managers in public and private schools in the city of Jambi. The novelty of this study lies in the comparison of the strength of the manager's position in wielding coercive and reward powers in the private and public sectors, as well as the comparison of the impact of these powers on teacher job satisfaction in public and private schools.

Literature Review

Factors That Influence Job Satisfaction in Education

Job satisfaction is defined as a positive attitude towards work. A person who has a high job satisfaction will be highly committed to perform positively in an organisation. On the other hand, a person with a low job satisfaction will exhibit unsatisfactory performance and negative attitude towards work. According to Luthans (1985), the level of each employee's job satisfaction in an organisation can be measured using payment (salary, wages, and incentives), the work itself, promotion, supervision, cooperation, and working conditions. According to Wesley & Yulk (1997), there are three types of job satisfaction theories; these include Discrepancy, Equity, and Two Factor job satisfaction theories. The Discrepancy Theory suggests that a person's job satisfaction can be measured calculating the difference between what should be and the perceived reality. Meanwhile, the Equity theory states that a person will feel satisfied or dissatisfied, depending on if they identify inequities in their input or output ratios. On the other hand, the third theory (called the Two Factor Theory) proposed by Herzberg argued about job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. Both factors are intrinsic and extrinsic factors (As'ad, 2003:4); According to the Value Theory, job satisfaction occurs when individuals as expected receive the results of the work. The more people receive expected results, the more satisfied and vice versa. This theory explains that the key to measuring the job satisfaction of employees lies in the difference between the aspects of work that is owned and what one wants. The greater the difference, the lower the satisfaction of employees.

The factors that cause teachers to feel satisfied with their work are actually inseparable from these theories. Thus, it can be concluded that teacher job satisfaction is characterised by the emergence of a sense of satisfaction and the prompt completion of tasks that are the responsibility of the teacher. In addition, there is an emergence of dedication, excitement, crafts, perseverance, initiative, and high creativity in work. Hence, teacher job satisfaction is one of the factors that must be considered for the achievement of organisational or school goals. Power can be defined as the ability of a person (leader) to change and control the behaviour, attitudes, beliefs and actions of others (Rahim, 1989). French and Raven (1959) classify power into five different categories: power of expertise, strength of reward, coercive power, legitimate power, and supporting power. Power is a very important asset for

leadership. According to Sulistiyani (2008), power is not the only factor that determines a leader's success. However, the existence of a leader will be recognised by the proper use of power.

There is a relationship between leadership and job satisfaction. Leadership power influences job satisfaction in school organisations. According to Zamani et al (2013), leadership power is a person's ability to build a positive attitude in the organisation. If a positive attitude is used to wield coercive power and reward power, it will positively influence employee performance and job satisfaction of teachers in the school. According to Nadee et al (2012), the effective use of leadership power influences performance. There is a close relationship between job satisfaction, the power of leadership, and the commitment of employees in an organisation (Hinkin and Schriesheim, 1998; Schriesheim et al., 1991; Mossholder et al., 1998).

Coercive Power and Job Satisfaction

Coercive power is often referred to as compulsion power; it is the power people have to influence others due to their strong position. This form of power involves the use of threats, sanctions or even punishment to persuade someone to do something. The implications of the application of power are usually in the form of pressure, fear, lack of confidence and stress from subordinates (Podsakoff and Schriesheim, 1985; Burke and Wilcox, 2001). Sulistiyani (2008) stated that the use of coercive power could lead to manipulative obedience. Resistance and avoidance (such as not being open and being inclined to pretend) can occur as a result of the use of coercive power. In order to reduce these outcomes, the application of punishment must be done with wise consideration. It is conducted by using the element of education.

The studies conducted by Burke and Wilcox (2001) revealed that coercive power has a negative influence on the performance and satisfaction of employees in an organisation. The study conducted by Zamani et al. (2012) also reported that coercive power might reduce work productivity and satisfaction in an organisation. On the other hand, Nadee et al. (2012) stated that there is a positive relationship between coercive power and the legitimacy of power. However, the authors stated that there is no significant relationship between coercive power and reward. The study conducted by Richmond et al. (1986) revealed that coercive power and legitimacy of power exhibited a negative relationship towards job satisfaction, while reward exhibited an insignificant relationship towards job satisfaction.

Based on the findings documented in these studies, it can be inferred that the coercive power used in an organisation does not result in job satisfaction of employees.

Reward and Job Satisfaction

Leaders that use reward emphasise the distribution and control of resources given to others as a form of appreciation for performance, achievement, and actions (Rahim, 1989; Raven, 1990; Luthans, 2006).

Robbins (2006) emphasised that reward is a form of positive benefit that it is not always realised in the form of material such as salary, promotion, and position. Reward eliminates negative values in subordinates because it applies substitution that is the negation of negative means having a positive meaning. Examples of reward include rendering praises and the provision of self-development opportunities. In terms of effectiveness, Sulistiyani (2008) explained that giving rewards would be effective if the leader fulfills or realises the reward. Also, the distribution of rewards should be in accordance with the performance and productivity of the subordinates' performance. In addition, giving rewards will be effective if the leader applies a progressive reward system.

Many research results showed that giving rewards has a positive influence on job satisfaction. For instance, Hinkin and Schriesheim (1994) concluded that giving rewards has a positive influence on job satisfaction. Also, the results of the study conducted by Afza (2005) revealed that employee satisfaction is positively influenced by rewards. In addition, the study conducted by Elangovan and Xie (2000) documented that job satisfaction is positively influenced by rewards.

Research Methodology

Population and Sample

This study population included all teachers and principals of public and private high schools, in the city of Jambi. Six (6) schools consisting of 3 (three) public schools and 3 private schools were selected as representative samples for this study. The sample size used for this study is 150. An equal proportion of data was collected from the public and private schools.

Data Collection Methods and Techniques

A quantitative method was used to assess the relationship and effect of coercive power and reward on a teacher's job satisfaction. This assessment was conducted by comparing the difference between the influence of coercive and reward on a teachers' job satisfaction in the public and private schools. This research aimed to prove the hypothesis and theory that has been built from French and Raven's analysis about the influence of coercive power and reward concept on a teachers' job satisfaction.

The statistical test used to analyse the data obtained from this study was Regression Analysis. The main components in this study were analysed to determine the occurrence of high multicollinearity between independent variables (Kadir, 2010).

The stratified random sampling method was used to collect samples in this study. The number of samples required for this study was determined by using the formula (Bungin, 2009):

Information:

n = sample size

N = population size

d = Precision value (determined, that is 99.5% or $\alpha = 0.05$)

Research Instruments

The research instrument used in this study was questionnaires. The impact of coercive power and reward was assessed using four items adopted from Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989) while the job satisfaction of teachers was assessed using 10 items taken from the Descriptive Job Index by Smith et al (1969). A close-ended questionnaire and a 5-point Likert scale was used for all items.

Data Analysis

The Data Analysis Method Used in this Study was Multiple Regression Analysis.

A. Analysis Model

Where: Y = Teachers' job satisfaction

X_1 = Coercive power

X_2 = Reward Power

B_0 = Intercept, it is the intersection between the regression line and the vertical axis Y or value of Y , if all independent variables of X_i are zero.

B_j = Slope, it states the amount of addition or subtraction in variable Y for each addition of one unit X_i , ($i = 1, 2, 3$) for $j = 1, 2, 3$

ε = residual, it is the difference between the value of the real response and the value of estimation obtained from the model.

b. Analysis Phase

- 1). Multiple Regression Analysis with the Ordinary Least Square method was used to determine the factors that influence a teacher's job satisfaction in public and private high schools in Jambi City (as initial estimator).
- 2). Test assumptions were used to obtain an unbiased, consistent, and efficient model.

These assumptions include the following:

a) Multicollinearity

At this stage, the value of R² (coefficient of determination) and the value of VIF (Variance inflation factor) are seen and individual testing of the model parameters is conducted. If there is a multicollinearity case, it is solved by the Stepwise regression.

b) Heterogeneity

At this stage, the Glejser test is used to find it out. If it found a heterogeneity case, the transformation of the variable will be conducted.

c) Autocorrelation

At this stage, the test used is Durbin Watson. It is also seen from the ACF plot.

If 95% of the ACF values do not exceed the $\pm (1.96 / \sqrt{n})$ limit, then the assumption of no autocorrelation is met.

d) Normal Distribution

To test the normality, Kolmogorov-Smirnov can be used. It is conducted by comparing P value statistics Kolmogorov-Smirnov with $\alpha = 0.05$.

After obtaining a regression model that has met several predetermined classical assumptions, the final model was analysed and conclusions were made.

Results and Discussions

Data Description

The dependent variable Y represents Teacher Job Satisfaction while the independent variables X 1 represents Coercive Power and X 2 represents the reward in this case study. A total number of 150 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents that were spread across six schools in Jambi. However, only 132 respondents completed and returned the questionnaires. This is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Frequency Distribution for the Administration of Questionnaires

o	School	Number of Questionnaire	
		Distributed	Returned
	Public	80	66
	Private	70	66

The Cronbach Alpha test was used to test the validity and reliability of the instrument. The result of this test is shown in Table 2. This test is the most widely used formulation for testing internal consistency and instrument stability. It is considered adequate if it exceeds 0.60 (Churchill, 1979).

Table 2: Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

Variable	Amountt of Respondents	No. Items	Cronbah Alpha
reward	66	5	0.651
Coercive Power	66	5	0.792
Job Satisfaction	66	5	0.743

Statistical Analysis

Independent sample t-tests were used to measure the differences between the two sectors. Furthermore, correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between all variables. Linear regression analysis was also used to determine the impact of reward and coercive power on teachers' job satisfaction.

Independent Sample t-test

In order to test hypotheses 3 and 6, a t-test was used to examine the average difference between public schools and private schools.

Table 3: Statistical Groups

Variable	School	N	Mean	Std Deviation
Coercive Power	Public	66	60.8939	5.51119
	Private	66	61.1818	4.85453
Reward Power	Public	66	52.997	7.92653
	Private	66	53.6818	7.94241

Table 3 shows that the mean values for the reward and coercive power in private schools was higher than the mean values for the reward and coercive power in public schools. There are significant differences between the two sectors. Thus, principals can apply reward in private schools compared to the public sector. In the results of coercive power, it shows the differences between the two types of schools.

The Pearson Correlation

The Pearson Correlation shows the correlation between the dependent variable (job satisfaction) and independent variable (reward and coercive power). The correlation analysis conducted in this study showed that the teachers' perceptions of the reward were negatively related to teachers' job satisfaction in public schools ($r = -0.076$, $p < 0.01$).

However, there was a positive relationship between the two variables ($r = 0.01$, $p < 0.01$) in private schools. Teachers' perceptions of coercive power had a greater positive correlation with teachers' job satisfaction in the public sector ($r = -0.756$, $p < 0.01$) while there was no relationship between the teachers' perceptions of coercive power and teachers' job satisfaction in private schools ($r = 0.195$, $p > 0.01$). This is shown in Table 4:

Table 4: Pearson Correlation

Public School			Private School	
Independent		Significance(0.01)		Significance (0.01)
Reward Power	0.076	Negative	.01	Positive
Coercive Power	.756	Positive	.195	Positive

Regression Analysis

Regression Beta analysis coefficients in linear regression shows the dependence of the independent variable(s) with the dependent variable. Table 5 shows the summary results generated from the analysis of data using linear regression techniques. R2 value shows that reward in private schools will affect teacher job satisfaction ($R^2 = 23.7\%$). On the other hand, reward is less influential in changing teacher job satisfaction in public schools ($R^2 = 5.7\%$). An increase of one unit in the reward for teachers will increase the job satisfaction in private

schools by 47 units in private schools while an increase in one unit of reward in public schools will reduce teachers' job satisfaction by nine units. Based on these values, H1 is rejected and H2 is accepted.

Table 5: reward Regression Results

Reward Power		R2	Beta		Sig(0,01 lev)
Public School	.274	0.057	-0.096	0.762	0.0449
Public School	.487	0.237	-0.269	2.380	0.020

Table 6 shows that the coercive power of private schools will affect the changes in teacher job satisfaction (R2 value is 48.7%). An increase of one unit in the manager's coercive power will result in a decrease in teacher job satisfaction in private schools by 47.2 units. Therefore, H4 is accepted and H5 is rejected, as coercive force has no relationship with the job satisfaction of teachers in private schools.

Table 6: Results of Coercive Power Regression

Coercive Power		R ²	R	Beta		Sig(0,01 lev)
Public School			0.	0		0.005
	.239	057		.243	.926	
Private School			0.	0		0.000
	.487	237		.472	.178	

Comparison of these two sectors indicates that the impact of the manager's reward and coercive power toward teacher job satisfaction is different in public and private schools.

Discussion

The main focus of this research was to investigate the differences in teachers' perception about the strength of the leadership of the principal as a manager. The results showed that both public and private school sectors were significantly different in the supervisory power of managers. Principals in private high schools use higher supervisory powers over teachers compared to principals in public high schools. In addition, private high school principals have stronger control over their subordinates while public school teachers have the opportunity to enjoy empowerment in their daily routine as teachers. The second focus out of this study was to determine the relationship between reward and the job satisfaction of teachers in public and private schools and to make a comparison of the results obtained from both sectors. This

study revealed that reward was positively related to the job satisfaction of teachers in private schools. The more a teacher receives gifts and supervision from his/her boss, the more satisfied he/she will be with the job. These results are consistent with the findings of Hinkin and Schriesheim (1994), Elangovan and Xie (2000), and Afza (2005). These authors discovered that there is a positive relationship between subordinate job satisfaction and reward power.

This study revealed that there is a significant negative relationship between reward and teacher job satisfaction in public and private schools. According to the results of this research, reward may affect the behaviour and performance of teachers in the short term. However, in the absence of job security, contractual basis for employment, and a sense of teacher ownership in a school organisation, it is called a short-term satisfaction. They (teachers) generally switch from one school institution to another for better opportunities. On the other hand, public high schools provide job guarantees to teachers, especially a civil-service employee. This creates a negative relationship between rewards and job satisfaction.

This study shows that there is a significant negative relationship between the coercive power of principals and the job satisfaction of teachers in public schools. Coercion resulted in an increase in dissatisfaction in public schools. Previous studies found a similar relationship between these two variables (Burke and Wilcox, 1971; Podsakoff and Schriesheim, 1985; Richmond et al., 1986; Rahim, 1988; Elangovan and Xie, 2000). According to previous research, coercive power can lead to temporary compliance. However, in the long term, this causes side effects such as frustration, fear, revenge, and alienation. This can also lead to poor performance and dissatisfaction. There was no significant relationship between coercive power and job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with the findings of Afza (2005), Lee and Tui (2008) and Nadaee et al. (2012). An explanation for this relationship is that principals as direct supervisors in private schools often have little authority to exercise coercive power. According to Lee and Tui (2008), managers running coercive power have greater management control. Therefore, managers in private school institutions do not have the level of management control required to adopt and exercise coercive power. Another legitimate explanation for this non-significance relationship between coercive power and job satisfaction is that private teachers are more concerned about their job satisfaction. Thus, teachers may have plans to leave if employers cannot meet the needs required for their job satisfaction.

Conclusion

School managers use a combination of coercive power and reward to influence teachers to achieve specific goals. However, the managers in public schools are less likely to use a little reward and coercive power to influence employees. The manager's ability is very influential



in certain situations; the ability of managers for various government policies is a referral force. However, managers in private schools are more likely to use a thorough force in some situations and provide rewards in accordance with teacher incomes. Therefore, private and public schools have some differences, not only do they differ in the practice of developing human resources and leadership style, but they also differ in the practice of managerial power.

REFERENCES

- Afza, M. (2005). Supervisor-Subordinate Relationships and Satisfaction in Indian Small Business Enterprises. *VIKALPA*, 30 (3), pp. 11-19.
- As'ad, M (2002) *Industrial psychology*. Fourth edition. Yogyakarta. Liberty. (In Indonesia).
- Burke, R. J. And Wilcox, D. S. (1971). Bases of Supervisory Power and Subordinate Job Satisfaction. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 3 (2), pp. 183-193.
- Elangovan, A. R. And Xie, J. L. (2000). Effects of Perceived Power of Supervisor on Subordinate Work Attitudes. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 21 (6), pp. 319 – 328.
- Faiz, N. (2013). Impact of Manager's Reward Power and Coersive Power on Employee's Job Satisfaction: A Comparative Study of Publis and Private Sector. *International Journal Management Business*, 3 (4), pp. 383-392.
- Hinkin, T. R. And Schriesheim, C. A. (1998). Development and Application of New Scales to Measure the French and Raven 1959 Bases of Social Power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74 (4), pp. 561-567.
- Hinkin, T. R. And Schriesheim, C. A. (1994). An Examination of Subordinate-perceived Relationships between Reward and Punishment Behavior and Leader Bases of Power. *Human Relations*, 47 (7), pp. 779-800.
- Idrus, A. (2013). The Implementation of School-Based Management Policy In Indonesia: A Survey on Public Junior High School Principals' Perception, *Journal of Education and Practice* 4 (7), pp. 49-62.
- Idrus, A. (2014). The Effects of Concientiousness, Agreeableness, Organizational Climate, and Job Satisfaction on Lecturer's Commitment at One Public University in Jambi, *The ISCLO International Proceeding*, pp. 185-189.
- Kadir, (2010), *Statistika untuk Penelitian Ilmu-ilmu Sosial*, Jakarta: Penerbit Rosemata Sampurna.
- Luthans, F. (1985). *Organizational Behavior*, 4th ed. New York: McGraw- Hill.
- Mossholder, K. W., Kemery, E. R. And Wesolowski, M. A., (1998). Relationship between Bases of Power and Work Reactions: The Meditational Role of Procedural Justice. *Journal of Management*, 24 (4), pp. 533-552.
- Nedae, T., Alavi, K. And Ramezani, Z., N. (2012). Employees' Effectivenss. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 18 (10), pp. 1400-1411.



- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey J. C. And Davis L. M. (1986). The relationship of supervisor Use of Power and Affinity-seeking Strategies with Subordinates satisfaction. *Communication Quaterly*, 34 (2), pp. 178-193.
- Rahim, M. A. (1988). The Development of a Leader Power Inventory. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 23 (4), pp. 491-502.
- Raven, B. H. (1990). Political Applications of the Psychology of Interpersonal Influence and social Power. *Polical Psychology*, 11 (3), pp. 493-520.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M. And Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement, Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Schriesheim, C. A., Hinkin, T. R. And Podsakoff, P. M. (1991). Can Ipsative and single-item Measures produce Errorneous Results in Field Studies of French and raven's (1959) Five bases of Power? An Empirical Investigation *Journal of applied psychology*, 76 (1), pp. 106 – 114.
- Sulistiyani, A. T (2008) *Human Resource Management; concepts, theory and development in the context of public organizations*. Jakarta, Raja Grafindo Persada. (In Indonesia).
- Wexley dan Yukl (1997). *Organizational Behavior and Personnel Psychology*. Jakarta, PT. Rineka Cipta. (In Indonesia)
- Zameni, F., Enayati, T., Palar, H. and Jamkhaneh, R. Z. (2010). The anylisi of the Relationship between the Manager;s Power Resources and Organizational Commitment: A case Study of Employees of Education Organization of Mazandaran Province. *Journal of Basic and Applied Science Resrach*, 2 (11), pp. 11595-11602.