Teachers’ Record Keeping as Related to Teachers Job Performance in Cross River State Secondary Schools, Nigeria
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Abstract
This research investigated the influence of principal’s inspection of teachers’ record keeping strategy on teachers’ job performance in Cross River State, Nigeria. Subjects involved six hundred and sixty (660) teachers and three thousand, three hundred senior secondary school students which were randomly selected from two hundred and thirty two (232) secondary schools in Cross River State. Data was collected with Principals’ Instructional Supervisory Strategies Questionnaire (PISSQ) and Teachers’ Job Performance Scale Questionnaire (TJPSQ). The result of analysis utilizing one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) indicated that principal’s inspection of record keeping strategy significantly influenced teachers’ job performance. It is recommended that regular supervision which must include teachers’ record keeping strategy be regularly organized by government to enhance teachers’ job performance.

Introduction
Supervision is one the processes by which school administrators attempt to achieve acceptable standards of performance and results. It is the tool of quality control in the school system and a phase of school administration which focuses primarily upon the achievement of appropriate expectation of educational system (Peretomode, 1998); and it is also seen as those activities carried out by principal to improve instruction at all levels of the school system (Dittimiya, 1998). Supervision enhances productivity. Different strategies need to be utilized in exercising this role. Ogunsaju (1983) in an independent study identified four strategies in their separate studies; which will help teachers to achieve the set goals of instructional supervision and the improvement of the total teaching/learning process. These strategies include classroom visitation and inspection, conferencing, demonstration and provision for staff professional growth and development.

Observations have shown that most principals do not spend much time in supervising their teachers; rather they denote much time on administrative matters. Accordingly, most principals became humbugged with administrative work that they would not have the time to observe the academic work of the school. When the academic work of the school become secondary, how could teachers’ job performance be improved? According to Nakpodia (2011), the role of the principals is to facilitate the implementation of the various learning programmes aimed at improving the learning situation. Teachers whether new or old on the job need necessary support in implementing the instructional programmes. Principals as school heads therefore, need to provide this support to teachers, they have to be involved in the implementation of instructional programmes by overseeing what teachers are doing with the students. A good principal should devote himself to supervise the teaching – learning processes in his school.

However, Ntia (1988) emphasized strongly that the principal as an academic leader should not detach himself or herself from teaching completely in order to be abreast of the current discoveries in the teaching and learning processes. This exercise according to Ntia (1988) no doubt demanded more truth from the principals.

1.1. Statement of the Problem
The poor academic performance of students in secondary schools has been a source of great concern to all stakeholders in the education sector. It is heart-rending when one considers the huge amount of money parents spend in the education of their wards who don’t produce commensurate performance in their academics to match the huge investments made on them. Cross River State shares in this problem of the education sector despite its huge financial involvement in the sector. This research identifies some of the variables that may be responsible for this downward turn in the fortunes of education in Cross River (nay Nigeria).
In the same manner, the palpable decline in the performance of teachers which tends to indicate that the schools are not regularly and properly supervised and that the quality of instruction in the school has progressively declined despite the seemingly improved conditions of service for teacher in the state.

1.2. Purpose of the Study
The Specific objective of this study is to find out:

Whether Principal’s inspection of record keeping significantly influence teachers job performance

1.3. Research Questions
To what extent does principal’s inspection of teacher’s record keeping influence teacher’s job performance?

1.4. Statement of Hypothesis
There is no significant influence of Principals’ inspection of record keeping on teachers’ job performance

1.5. Significance of the Study
The study is significant in the sense that the findings may have implications for secondary school principals, teachers, students, the state and the country at large. The study is designed to provide useful information for principals in the supervision of teachers in secondary schools for improvement of instruction. It is hoped that the findings of this study would improve the instructional effectiveness of teachers so that they can contribute to the attainment of educational goals in Cross River State.

The findings of this work could be of help to the external supervisors from the Ministry of Education whose manner of inspection is dreaded by both the principals and the teachers. Again, the students stand to reap the immense benefits as teachers’ job performance will be affected positively through correct usage of instructional supervisory strategies by principals. Finally, it is also vital as it would add to the existing studies and literature relating to the principals instructional supervisory strategies and teachers’ job performance.

1.6. Theoretical Framework
Theory X and Theory Y

Douglas McGregor (1960) Theory X and Theory Y developed his ideas of leadership theory and motivation where he compares the two ideal-type of management philosophies along with assumptions which emerge from these views of human nature.

Theory “X”

McGregor based his Theory X on assumption prepositions generally associated with the conventional or efficiency views of management, that is, classical organization school of thought as suggested by adherents of Taylorism. The assumptions of the theory are:

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if possible.
2. Because of this human characteristic of dislike for work, most employees must be coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward achieving organizational objectives.
3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wished to avoid responsibilities, has relatively little ambition and wants security.

Theory “Y”

Theory Y assumption represents a much more positive assessment of human behavior. It was based on optimistic philosophy about human nature. McGregor’s dissatisfaction with Theory X management and its assumptions’ failure to consider certain human needs that relate to self-fulfillment, self-actualization, ego satisfaction and the social needs of man led him to formulate Theory Y whose assumptions are:

1. The expenditure of physical and mental efforts in work is as natural as play or rest.
2. External control and the threat of punishment are not only means of bringing about effort toward organizational objectives to which are committed.
3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement
4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept, but to seek responsibility.
5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely distributed in the population.
6. Under the conditions of modern industrial life, the intellectual potentialities of the average human being are only partially realized or utilized.

As administrators strive to achieve the educational goals of the instructions, they tend to exhibit behavior consistent with assumptions of the theories above. Peretomode (2001) posited that school administrators who adopt the leadership style in line with Theory X are characterized by dictatorial procedures, eagerness for punitive measures against the subordinates and lack of participative management. He asserted that the essence of the theory was a philosophy of direction closer supervision, external control and authoritarian and directive style of leadership. The implication of the assertion is that, a school administrator who believed Theory X would always feel that average worker has inherent dislike for work and will eschew it if he can, and so must be coerced or forced to work.

However, school administrators who adopt the leadership style embedded in Theory Y are characterized by openness of communication with their subordinates, understanding and show concern for helping them develop and realize their potentials towards the achievement of common objectives.

Peretomode (2001) pointed out that school administrators who operate with Theory Y will encourage the following: delegating authority for many decisions to lower level workers; making an effort to make workers’ jobless routine and boring; improving the free flow of information and communication within the organization; and recognizing that people are motivated by a complex set of psychological needs, not just money. The implication of this is that school administrator in this category believed that if work is satisfying, it is as natural as play and will cause workers to exercise self-control and self-direction if well rewarded.

2.0. Literature Review

School records include:

1. Attendance register
2. Teachers’ record of work
3. Corporal punishment book
4. Teachers’ lesson notes
5. Marked books
6. Students’ cumulative folders
7. Minutes of teachers’ conferences

These, according to Edem (1987) were vital records which could not be replaced without destroying their original value. Other types of records included the statutory records which concerned the diaries for the syllabus, scheme and record of works and the school general time-table.

The importance of these records could not be overemphasized as they were tools for the attainment of school objectives and were essential for diagnostic and remedial purposes. These records enabled teachers and parents to have a clear and complete picture of the students’ progress with regard to attendance and achievement from test scores. They were used for occupational interest and plans, health, physical, social and emotional development and the level of participation in school activities as seen on the report sheets.

The folder affords ample information for transmission to another school if a child went on transfer. According to Edem (1987), they served as a reference point to convince parents and students in case of misbehavior and were used by counselors for remedial purposes. Records offer a basis for objective evaluation appraisal by inspectors.

School records served as sources of useful information to successors and outside researchers. To show how vital they are, Edem (1987) emphasized “if a school keeps good records, it is certain to have a sound and efficient administration. If it does not, chaos is around the corner, as an inspector will be highly disappointed in the administration of a school where records are unreliable or badly kept or unobtainable (p. 85-86)

Interestingly, most of these records were kept by the teachers. However, class teachers’ duties among other things were:

1. To work class attendance register every morning and afternoon
2. To work out the rate of students’ attendance at the end of the week, term and year
3. To compile tests and examinations results, and
4. To sign report sheets of their class student

Often class teachers fall out with the principal due to communication problems. The same applied to subject teachers and heads of departments whose duties were to fill diaries and some other students’ records. Such
bickering and rancor could be eschewed if the communication through supervision was cordial, friendly and respectful, since duties would not attract any additional remuneration to the normal monthly salaries teachers receive. To this, Schon (2000) opined that principals while trying to supervise the records kept by teachers should always do it with some motivational comments to the best teachers so as to encourage others to follow. He affirmed that through this strategy their job performance would be enhanced.

The point has been made earlier that the principal is an instructional supervisor in his institution. The way people see him in the course of discharging his duties and functions has given rise to a variety of names and titles labeled on him. Thus, is seen as the Head teacher, leader, instructional supervisor, adviser, public relation officer, curriculum director, chief education officer, policy maker, etc. These titles reflect the place and role of the secondary principal in the educational processes (Nakpodia, 2011).

The Nigerian secondary school principal occupies a unique position in the overall secondary school educational system. He is an educational leader in his own right and his influence is considerable in the educational programme of the country. The principal is an agent, who executes or transmits rules and regulations handed down by the ministry of education. The curriculum, the system of instruction and discipline are handled by him. We see the principals’ main task as interpretation of policy, execution of instructional programme. The principal is a leader counselor, a guide, a psychologist, the chief communicator and the teacher of teachers (Nakpodia, 2011).

3.0. Research Methodology
3.1. Study Area
The research was conducted in Cross River State, with three educational zones, namely Calabar, Ikom and Ogoja. Cross River is situated in the tropics sharing common boundaries with Cameroon Republic in the East, Benue State in the North, Abia and Ebonyi in the West, and Akwa Ibom in the South. It lies between latitude 4°27' and 5°32', and along longitude 7°23'. The State has 390 pre-primary schools, 1000 primary schools, 232 post-primary schools and 20 technical schools (Cross River State Ministry of Education, 2008).

3.2. Population of Study
The population of the study is made up of all principals of public secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. Information available at the State Ministry of Education showed that there were a total of two hundred and thirty two (232) school principals in public schools in 2008/2009 academic session. The data also showed that there were five thousand, three hundred and eighty two (5382) teachers with nine thousand, five hundred and thirty three (9,533) students in the senior secondary school sector in the entire state. These formed the population of this study.

3.3. Sampling Technique
The technique adopted to draw the sample for this study was stratified random sampling. The basis for stratification was education zones of the state. The secondary schools in the state were grouped according to the three educational zones. Based on this, simple random sampling (‘hat and draw’) was used to select the principals. Since there is one principal leading each school, the names of the schools according to their educational zones were written on pieces of paper, folded and dropped into ‘an empty can’. Thereafter, the schools were drawn from the empty can without replacement. The same process was utilized to randomly select the teachers to assess the principals and senior secondary students to assess the job performance of their teachers.

3.4. Sample Size
The sample for the study comprised two hundred and twenty school (220) principals, six hundred and sixty (660) teachers and three thousand three hundred (3,300) senior secondary school students from two hundred and twenty (220) public secondary schools. Out of these, 78 principals consisting 35.5% of the sample were from Ikom educational zone, 76 principals consisting 35.5% of sample were from Calabar educational zone, while 66 principals consisting 30% of the sample were from Ogoja educational zone.

3.5. Instrumentation
Two (2) questionnaires were used in collecting data for the study. Principals’ instructional supervisory strategies questionnaire (P.I.S.S.Q.) and Teachers’ Job Performance Scale (T.J.P.S.). The P.I.S.S.Q. was designed to elicit information from the teachers based on the variables, while T.J.P.S. was designed to elicit information from the students based on the teachers’ job performance variables such as maintenance of discipline, classroom organization and management, instructional ability and students assessment and evaluation.
The questionnaire took the form of four-point likert scale with the following responses: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD).

3.6. Process of Testing Hypothesis

This study has two (2) hypotheses. The generated null hypotheses were tested in order to solve the study problem. The variables for each hypothesis and the appropriate test statistical tool are indicated thus:

Hypothesis One
There is no significant influence of the principals’ inspection of record keeping on the teachers’ job performance.

Independent variable: Inspection of lesson notes
Dependent variable: Teachers’ job performance
Statistical tool: Analysis of variance (ANOVA)

4.0. Result and Discussion

NOTE: For the purpose of this study (i.e. testing of the hypothesis, the dependent variable (Teachers’ job performance) was split into four sub-variables (Maintenance of discipline, Classroom management, Instructional ability and Students’ evaluation). The results of the four sub-variables were aggregated to form the single variable, Teachers’ job performance).

Hypothesis
There is no significant influence of the principals’ inspection of record keeping on the teachers’ job performance.

Results of analysis in Table 3 shows that the F-ratio for One-way ANOVA of influence of the principals’ inspection of record keeping on the teachers’ job performance is 20.982, which is greater than the critical f (3.04) at α = 0.05. This means that there is a significant influence of principal’s inspection of record keeping on teachers’ job performance in terms of classroom management, instructional ability and student evaluation. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected, and the alternative hypothesis accepted since there is significance in terms of Total Job performance.

4.1. Discussion of Findings

The result of this study indicated a significant influence of the principal’s inspection of record keeping on the teachers’ job performance in terms of maintenance of discipline, classroom organization, instructional ability and students’ assessment and evaluation. The result of the study was in line with the findings of Edem (1987) and Schon (2000). These researchers posited that the principal inspection of record keeping in school enhanced the teachers’ job performance. In line with these findings, Edem (1987) emphasized that if a school kept good records, it was almost certain to have a sound and efficient administration. If it does not, chaos must be around the corner, as an inspector would be highly disappointed in the administration of a school where records were unreliable or badly kept or unobtainable.

The result of this study is in line with the position of Peretomode (1998) who stated clearly that a school without proper record keeping procedures is administratively deficient. Record keeping is a part and parcel of instructional supervision, it is record keeping that shows how well the teachers and students perform in the school.

5.0. Conclusion and Recommendation

The summary of research findings indicated that:

There was a significant influence of the principal’s inspection of record keeping on teachers’ job performance. Based on this research findings, it could be concluded that: Since humans naturally have an inherent dislike for work according to Douglas McGregor Theory X, this research encourage the use of coerced, controlled, directed and threatened with punishment to support regular supervision in our school for enhanced productivity. It could be observed principal’s inspection of record keeping is a supervisory strategy that can enhance teachers’ productivity significantly. Therefore, this researcher advocates for intense utilization of these two strategies for enhanced job performance of teachers in our secondary schools.

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. School principals should help their teachers develop skills in using record keeping strategies, this in turn would lead to a higher students’ performance.

2. Regular and continuous supervision should be organized by the Ministry of Education, State Education Board and School Principals as this would enhance teachers’ job performance.
3. The inputs into our education sector are inadequate especially in terms of materials and instructional support. Therefore, enough instructional materials, textbooks for learners, teaching aids as well as teachers guide should be provided. This would go a long way in improving the quality of education.

4. Teaching performance of the teacher should be ascertained and improved upon through various in-service strategies such as conference attendance, inter- or intra-school visitation method, demonstration teaching or practical work, seminar or workshop attendance where the principles and advantages of record keeping are emphasized upon.
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Table 1: Descriptive Results for All Variables in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Principal’s inspection of record keeping</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>36.56</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total job performance</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>326.35</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Descriptive statistics of the influence of the principals’ inspection of record keeping on the teachers’ job performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories of record-keeping strategy</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total job performance</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>336.16</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>324.70</td>
<td>16.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>317.03</td>
<td>24.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>326.35</td>
<td>20.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: One-way ANOVA of influence of the principals’ inspection of record keeping on the teachers’ job performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals inspection of record-keeping</td>
<td>Between group</td>
<td>14580.19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7290.095</td>
<td>20.982*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ job performance</td>
<td>Within group</td>
<td>75396.156</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>347.448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89976.345</td>
<td>219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at α = 0.05, critical f = 3.04