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ABSTRACT: The development towards variable accountability to persons other than the parents is significant. The child’s individuality is molded by pressure and changes in his society. The child’s development is also influenced by those around him or his parents, other adults, his peers, and other siblings. Many pressures of the society in which the child lives are also reflected upon him as they affect behavior of those who are rearing and teaching him. This study aimed to determine the effects of rewards and punishment on the academic performance of students of the College of Teacher Education. The descriptive correlational research method was used in the study to determine the effects of rewards and punishments on the academic performance of the pupils. The respondents of the study were 130 students of the College of Teacher Education and two regular faculty members who were chosen purposively for the conduct of this study. A questionnaire patterned from the study of Marilou J. Catolos, was utilized as the main data gathering tool for the study. It was used to elicit information on the effects of rewards and punishments on the students. The grades of the student-respondents in the most recent semester (First Semester SY 2017-2018) were also utilized for this study. It can be concluded that rewards and punishment leads to a change in the behavior of the students specially affecting their academic performance and this study proved that it has resulted to the better performance of the students in their courses. Therefore, it is recommended that teachers should always make the appropriate remarks and appreciation for every act or deed that students do or perform in the class.
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INTRODUCTION

The development towards variable accountability to persons other than the parents is significant. The child’s individuality is molded by pressure and changes in his society. The child’s development is also influenced by those around him or his parents, other adults, his peers, and other siblings. Many pressures of the society in which the child lives are also reflected upon him as they affect behavior of those who are rearing and teaching him. Guiding the development of a child is a cooperative process. The parent and teacher need to see the whole child as he reacts in his life at school and at home in order to provide a complete program for him. The quality of the teacher – parent relationship during this period will have an influence upon the child or throughout his formative years.
Performing is one of the highest functions of the human brain. This is because among all creatures on earth only man can perform and follow or understand instructions. Indeed, performing is an essential tool of learning. That is why educators discovered the “rewards and punishments” as an element to find motives that will stimulate interest and effort on the pupil. Teachers recognize the effects of rewards and punishments as a motivation which is essential condition upon which learning is dependent. Teachers normally employed different strategies to deal with problem behavior directly with the use of punishments. Sometimes such method seems to help a child but it is in the long run, it is no longer effective. Punishment is a negative approach and it is inhumane to employ this kind of disciplinary measure. Many have resorted to reward praise and acts of recognition of the students and these are probably healthy signs to provide pupils the feeling of security and belongings and furthermore, the urge to learn more.

In the study conducted by Carlson C, et. Al, they examined the effects of reward and response cost on the performance and motivation of 40 children with ADHD and 40 controls. Participants completed an arithmetic task under one of three (reward, response cost, and no contingency) conditions. Dependent variables included pretest at tributional measures, direct performance measures, self-rated performance and motivation, and a post contingency “free-choice” behavioral motivation measure. Relative to controls, children with ADHD reported a less adaptive attributional style and differed in their attributions for predicted good and poor performance. For children with ADHD, response cost improved accuracy on the arithmetic task relative to reward and resulted in higher motivation in the second half of the behavioral motivation measure; however, reward had a relatively more salutory effect on self-rated motivation. No negative effects of either reward or response cost on perceived performance or willingness to do the task Douglas and Parry made an experiment to investigate the effects of continuous, partial, and non-contingent schedules of reward, as well as the withdrawal of rewards, on the performance of hyperactive and normal control children on a delayed reaction time task. Although non-contingent reward resulted in faster reaction times for control subjects, performance of hyperactive deteriorated under non-contingent reward and improved when it was withdrawn. Also, reaction times of controls during extinction remained superior to baseline, whereas performance of hyperactive returned to baseline level. It was suggested that these and other findings reviewed point to an unusual sensitivity to rewards in hyperactive children.

In the research conducted by Cullen J et. Al, 233 students from 14 high school classes were utilized to undertake as respondents of their study and these respondents were either offered points (ranging from 2 to 12) on their final grade of the term for completing an assignment or threatened with loss of points (ranging from 1 to 7) for not completing an assignment. A control class was asked to complete the assignment without gaining or forfeiting any points. Data suggested that grades used as an incentive elicited greater
assignment completion than when no incentive was used, that assignment completion was
greater when grades were used as a negative as opposed to a positive incentive, and that as
the level of incentive utilized rose, assignment completion tended to increase.

Houghton, Merrett & Wheldall used a questionnaire in their study about praise, rewards,
punishment and reprimands was given to a sample of 1,779 junior school pupils aged from 8
to 11. Generally, the children thought that praise and reward were appropriate for good
behaviour and good work and that, on the whole, the amount of praise and blame they
received in school was about right. The great majority of pupils said that they valued the
opinions of their teachers above those of their peers in relation to both their work and their
behaviour. Both for praising their good work and behaviour and as a punishment, a letter
sent from school to parents was believed to be very potent. This underlines the importance
of close collaboration between home and school. These results very largely mirror those
from a similar survey of pupils of secondary school age (Houghton, Merrett & Wheldall,
1988).

There are a multitude of possible reactions that teachers can have toward students who fall
below academic standards. Some of these reactions have utilitarian goals, whereas others
are punitive. In this study, the authors investigated these reactions, as well as the situations
that determine when these different strategies are likely to be used. Both undergraduates
playing the role of teachers (Study 1) and actual high school teachers (Study 2) used at
tributional information in much the same way to guide their choice of responses to
academic failure. Controllable causes of failure give rise to punitive and retributive
strategies, whereas lack of controllability elicits utilitarian responses. The stability of the
cause moderates teachers' responses to failing students. These attributionally guided
interventions are mediated in part by inferences of responsibility, emotional reactions of
anger and sympathy, and beliefs in the efficacy of the intervention. The implications of this
model are discussed in terms of student motivation and classroom performance. (PsycINFO
Database Record (c) 2016 APA, all rights reserved)

Gonzalez (1987), pointed out that when the behavior of the child reaches a point at which it
interfered with his academic work, some attempt to change pupil behavior appears
warranted. He further emphasize that rules, praise and ignoring played their role in
remedying disruptive classroom behavior.

Juanito (1983), also states that the school and public are justifiably concerned with pupils
who are weak. She further stressed that when a learner is both slow and an under achiever,
we may be sure that he needs special help.

Estrada (1986) categorized treatment of behavior problem towards their academic
performance into four namely: taking punitive measures, talking to the child to determine
the causes of misbehavior This study seemed to indicate that the teacher involve were more
on instruction-conscious, more learning-centered than guidance conscious and guidance oriented.

Salcedo (1989), said that “punishment” is one of the most important factors in controlling behavior as an educational means, punishment is essentially corrective by leading the youth to a proper estimation of his fault and for a position change in his behavior. There are two kinds of punishment: one is moral and other is physical. It is moral when it affects one’s desire to be honored and loved. It is physical when it is either the refusal of that which the child desire or the injection pain is punishment.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
Generally, this study aimed to determine the effects of rewards and punishment on the academic performance of students of the College of Teacher Education. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the academic performance of the student-respondents?
2. What is the perception of the respondents on the effects of rewards and punishment?
3. What is the perception of teachers on the effects of reward and punishments?
4. Is there a significant difference between the perceptions of the two groups of respondents?
5. Is there a significant relationship between the academic performance of student-respondents and the perceived effects of rewards and punishment?

METHODOLOGY
The descriptive correlational research method was used in the study to determine the effects of rewards and punishments on the academic performance of the pupils.

RESPONDENTS OF THE STUDY
The respondents of the study were 130 students of the College of Teacher Education and two regular faculty members who were chosen purposively for the conduct of this study.

DATA GATHERING TOOLS
A questionnaire was utilized as the main data gathering tool for the study. It was used to elicit information on the effects of rewards and punishments on the students. The grades of the student-respondents in the most recent semester (First Semester SY 2017-2018) was also utilized for this study.
STATISTICAL TOOL

The data gathered were treated with the use of the following:
Frequency count and percentages were used to measure the academic performance of the respondents.
The weighted mean was used to determine the perceive effects to rewards and punishment. Person r was used to determine the significant relationship between the effects of rewards and punishments on the academic performance of pupils.
T-test was used to determine the significant difference in the perception of the teachers and pupils on the effects of reward and punishments.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1
Academic Performance of Student-Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Performance</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 and above</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-79</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ==== 130</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Mean Grade: 81.38

Table 1 reflects the academic performance of the student-respondents. As gleaned from the table, majority of the respondents (70 or 53.85) earned grades ranging from 80-84 percent with an average mean grade of 81.38. This implies that the respondents are performing satisfactorily in their academic subjects.

Table 2
Perception of the two Groups of respondents on the effect of the Reward on the academic Performance of Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED EFFECTS</th>
<th>STUDENT-RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TEACHER-RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t give up on difficult problems</td>
<td>3.54 Often</td>
<td>3.53 Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish work in school on time</td>
<td>4.20 Always</td>
<td>4.18 Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Leadership</td>
<td>3.02 Sometimes</td>
<td>3.04 Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect to Teachers</td>
<td>4.26 Always</td>
<td>4.24 Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do reading at home</td>
<td>3.57 Often</td>
<td>3.54 Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen to teachers in class</td>
<td>4.28 Always</td>
<td>4.27 Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study lessons everyday</td>
<td>4.40 Always</td>
<td>4.37 Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do assignments Regularly</td>
<td>3.99 Often</td>
<td>3.92 Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Independently</td>
<td>3.40 Often</td>
<td>3.39 Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work without being told</td>
<td>3.38 Sometimes</td>
<td>3.39 Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.80 OFTEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.78 OFTEN</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As gleaned from the table, student-respondents perceived that the existence of reward greatly affect their academic as this is revealed in the result with an adjectival value of “always” in the item finish work in school on time, listen to teachers in class and study lessons everyday with weighted means 4.20, 4.26, 4.40 respectively. The data further revealed that the strategy of reward used by their professors encouraged them to do not easily give up in difficult homework, do some readings even at home, do assignments the teacher tells them to do, and do not let anybody work on their assignments with a rating of “often”. Similarly, teacher-respondents have the same perception except that their mean perception is a little lower that the student-respondents.

Table 3
Perception of Student-Respondents and Teachers on the Effects of Punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEIVED EFFECTS</th>
<th>STUDENT-RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>TEACHER-RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do homework</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review lessons regularly</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive in class</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid cheating</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid doing unnecessary things</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid getting late</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not lie to teachers</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid making mistakes</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid making noise inside the classroom</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERALL WEIGHTED MEAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 reflects the effects of punishments as perceived by the student-respondent and the teachers.

As revealed in the table, the use of punishments is perceived by the student-respondents as “always” do their homework and listen to their teacher with corresponding weighted means 4.23 and 4.45 respectively. Likewise, they “often” do their responsibilities inside the classroom because of the fear of the punishment that it may be imposed on them and got a rating of 4.14. The overall weighted mean of 3.44 reveals that the student-respondents “often” result to positive effects just as the effects of rewards. This data would imply that for the student-respondents not to be punished for the second time, they try to make up for whatever mistake they have committed ahead. On the other hand, teacher-respondents perceived that mistake are never repeated due to fear of the students to be punished again. The data further imply that students “always” do their homework, review their lessons, listen to teachers, avoid cheating, perform responsibilities inside the classroom, avoid doing unnecessary things avoid, avoid getting late, afraid of making mistake, and do not make noise inside the classroom for fear of punishment from their teachers.
Table 4
**Relationship between Academic Performance and Perceived Effects of Rewards and Punishment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishments</td>
<td>0.11 ns</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:* Significant   Ns=Not Significant   Level of significance=.05

Table 4 shows the relationship between the perceived effects of punishment and reward on the academic performance of the students. Results show that the perceived effects of rewards are significantly related to the academic performance of the respondents. This implies that as the students are rewarded in terms of the praises and good grades, they are motivated to perform better or they tend to improve their performances in class. The effect of punishments on the other hand does not significantly influence their academic performance.

Table 5
**Difference in the Perception of the two groups of respondents on the Effects of Reward and Punishments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishments</td>
<td>3.55*</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:* Significant   Level of significance=.05

Table 5 reflects the difference between the perception of the two groups of respondents on the effects of rewards and punishment. Results reveal that there exist a significant difference in the perception of the two groups of respondents on the effects of punishment with t value of 3.55 while no significant difference exist in their perception on the effects of rewards with t-value of 0.34.

**CONCLUSION**

Based from the result of the study, it can be concluded that rewards and punishment leads to a change in the behavior of the students specially affecting their academic performance and this study proved that it has resulted to the better performance of the students in their courses.
RECOMMENDATION

From the results of the study, it is recommended that teachers should always make the appropriate remarks and appreciation for every act or deed that students do or perform in the class.
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