

Full Length Research Paper

Effectiveness Administrative Reinforcement on Teachers' Efficiency: The Case of Aba'ala District, Afar Region, Ethiopia

Seid Mohammed & Serawit Handiso*

Education Strategy Center, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Article history

Received: 27-02-2018

Revised: 05-03-2018

Accepted: 15-03-2018

Corresponding Author:

Serawit Handiso

Education Strategy Center,
Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

Abstract

This paper was aimed to analyse the influences of administrative reinforcement on teachers' efficiency in Aba'ala District, Afar National Regional State. Both quantitative, such as semi-structured questionnaires; and qualitative data collection approaches were followed. It also employed a document analyses on secondary data sources. Positive reinforcement is effective than that of the four types of reinforcement. It was found that punishment and extinction are not effective mechanism of reinforcement tools. Concerning the reinforcement type which is most effective in helping teachers for the use of skills, both principals and teachers argued that social reinforcement is highly acceptable as a reinforcement instrument. Principals said token economy program and teachers said response cost is not a reinforcement procedure. But negative reinforcement is rarely selected as it is not a reinforcement procedure by both groups. The type of reward given for teachers can have its effect on teachers' efficiency. Reward as a whole is a motivational factor for enhancing teachers' efficiency. But all kind of reward is not equally motivates teachers. So principals and teachers respond their opinion on the reality that existed in their school. Most principals and teachers said that the use of certificate as a reward is practiced in their school. Based on the major finding it's recommended to enhance awareness on teachers, principals and other school community. Besides, reward system should be practical in the school to enhance teachers' efficiency. Different types of reinforcement are expected to implement based on the situation existed in schools. Reinforcement should be created as a system in all schools of the District. Collective efficacy should give attention than self efficacy in order to be effective collectively. Teachers and principals should recognize the effect of reinforcement on teachers' and schools' performance.

Key words: Aba'ala District, Influence, Reinforcement, Teachers' Efficiency, Performance

Introduction

Reinforcement theory explains in detail how an individual learns behavior. Managers who are making attempt to motivate the employees must ensure that they do not reward all employees simultaneously. They must tell the employees what they are not doing correct. They must tell the employees how they can achieve positive reinforcement (Chitiyo and Wheeler, 2009). The term reinforce means to strengthen, and is used in psychology to refer to anything stimulus which strengthens or increases the probability of a specific response. This is a simple description of a re-enforcer (Skinner, 1988), the treat, which increases the response, sitting. We all apply re-enforcers every day, most of the time without even realizing we are doing it. You may tell your child "good job" after he or she cleans their room; perhaps you tell your partner how good he or she look when they dress up; or maybe you got a raise at work after doing a great job on a project. All of these things increase the probability that the same response will be repeated (Weaver, 2004). Reinforcement is given to bring about desirable change and to teach students to take responsibility for behavior.

Your paycheck is reinforcement for doing your job and commendations and bonuses are reinforcements for going above and beyond expectations. There are four types of reinforcement: positive, negative, punishment, and extinction. According to educational experts who oppose the use of corporal punishment, use of positive reinforcement techniques reduces the frequency and extent of misbehavior (Human Rights Watch, 1999). Human Rights watch (1999) further states that teachers can reward students in a variety of simple ways. An instructor can praise a pupil in front of the student's classmates or other instructors, award special certificates to children who perform well or are particularly caring or list their names on notice boards. Positive reinforcement refers to the situation in which a teacher has a positive effect to increase the likelihood that the behavior will increase in future. How reinforcement techniques are used will, to a large extent determines the success of management education. Negative reinforcement strengthens a behavior and refers to a situation where a negative condition is stopped or avoided because of the behavior. Punishment, on the other hand, weakens a behavior because a negative condition is introduced or experienced as a consequence of the behavior and the individual

learns Cicerone & Pfadt, 2002). Punishment is used to provide an undesirable consequence for undesirable behavior (Weaver, 2004). For example, an employee who is late for a meeting is reprimanded. Notice that with avoidance there is no actual punishment; it's the threat of the punishment that controls behavior. Other methods of punishment include harassing, taking away privileges, probation, fining, and demoting. Using punishment may reduce the undesirable behavior, but it may cause other undesirable behavior, such as poor morale, lower productivity, and acts of theft or sabotage. Punishment is the most controversial method and the least effective at motivating employees. When you remove something in order to decrease a behavior, this is called extinction. You are taking something away so that a response is decreased. Rather than encourage desirable behavior, extinction (and punishment) attempts to reduce or eliminate undesirable behavior by withholding reinforcement when the behavior occurs. For example, an employee who is late for the meeting is not rewarded with praise. Or a pay raise is withheld until the employee performs to set standards. Supervisors who do not reward good performance can cause its extinction (Tepper and Taylor, 2003). The reinforcement in Ab'ala District of Afar national regional state have different aspects. Teachers and principals have no quite the same view to reinforcement and/or punishment and they assumed that the positive influence of reinforcement on teachers' efficiency is rarely low. Due to this the school leaders faced challenge when they want to exercise reinforcement and/or punishment. Some school principals worried on how they will use it in order to improve teachers' efficiency by administering reinforcement and/or punishment effectively. Due to the socio-economic and cultural causes, currently school principals are in the circle of so many challenges. However, studies or research information the major challenges and practices that school leaders faced while they are performing their duties in relation to reinforcement administration is not adequate. Above all, the magnitude of the problem and the extent of its influence on teachers' performance are not well-studied in emerging regions where teachers' absenteeism and irregularities are the major lacunae. Paradoxically, professionally, competent; skilful leaders cannot surely use and administer human manpower effectively due to lack of sufficient empirical evidences on the effectiveness of re-enforcement. Thus, this research was initiated to assess leaders' reinforcement administration and its outcome on teachers' efficiency.

Methodology

Research Design and Source of Data

The research follows descriptive method of study. The researcher used both primary and secondary a sources of data. The primary data was gathered through interview, questionnaire and focus group discussion; while documents and written materials are secondary sources. The researcher also used secondary sources as to have some background information about the issues. Related documents were reviewed. Documents like magazines, books, journals, research papers, published and unpublished materials were examined not only to help to establish the review of related literature, but also to come up with statistical data of teachers in the Wereda.

Procedures of the Study

First questionnaire was set and distributed to be filled by principals and teachers. Secondly interview was made with principals and supervisors. Focus group discussion was conducted with principals, teachers, supervisors and Parent Teacher Association (PTA) in order to have sufficient and consolidated information about how school leaders perform their duties in relation to reinforcement and/or punishment administration. After that the gathered and collected data was analyzed, presented and interpreted quantitatively as well as qualitatively. Finally the study summarized and concluded; the suggested recommendations were also forward.

Sampling Techniques

The investigator takes the entire primary and secondary schools of the wereda. Ten (25%) primary schools were selected as a sample area from the total of 43 primary schools; and the only secondary school of the District was also part of the study area selected purposively. The researcher randomly selected 10 General Primary Schools. All principals and teachers of the sampled schools were part of the study. All principals and teachers were included as a respondent to respond questionnaire and interview. So from the given 11 primary and secondary schools a total of 130 teachers (all teachers in the sampled schools) were selected as a respondent, out of those 39 (30%) were female teachers that were selected in convenience method of non-probability sampling techniques. Interview was conducted with principals and supervisors. Principals and supervisors were selected purposively, but some PTA members were selected as they are easily available in the school during the FGD session. There are a total of 10 school supervisors in the District and the research includes them as a respondent in the study which were selected purposively.

Data Collection Instruments

Information was obtained through various ways. First data was gathered by using questionnaire. Open and closed ended questionnaire was set by the investigator and responded by principals and teachers. There was interview which was made with principals and supervisors. Focus group discussion was also served as tools for data collection gathered from principals, teachers, supervisors and parent teacher association.

Method of Data Analysis

The data gathered was analyzed through the mean scores tested by high level statistical analyses, using SPSS. It enables to test data on the 'statistical significance of a relationship', by examining the ratio of between-group variance/within-group variance. Percentile was

used to differentiate the responses responded by different groups and it enables the researcher to know how the level of administering reinforcement and/or punishment was made by school leaders.

Results

Principals Practice and Perception of Reinforcement

As shown on table 1, most school leaders argued that they were not punishing teachers. Seventy three percent of principals themselves said that, in most cases, their focused was not tending to reinforce teachers. Ninety percent of teachers responded that they were not punished by principals in any cases. This shows that there is no any practice of reinforcement mechanism in Aba'alaDistrict of Afar regional state.

Most staff members did not support their principal when there is the need of reinforcing teachers. The argument is supported by principals and teachers themselves. Eighty two percent of principals said that they were not helped by their staff when they want to reinforce teachers, and 67% of teachers said that they are supported by their colleagues not to punish by their principal. This means that the activity of teachers is against the principle of reinforcement.

Table 1:- Reinforcement Practice of Principals responded by School Directors

R. No	Items	Responses					
		Yes		No		Total	
		Frequ.	%	Frequ.	%	Frequ.	%
1	Did you punish Teachers?	3	27.3%	8	72.7%	11	100%
2	Do the staffs support you when you reinforce teachers who need reinforcement?	2	18.2%	9	81.8%	11	100%
3	Do you think that punishment is effective?	5	45.5%	6	54.5%	11	100%
4	Pairing primary reinforcement with a secondary reinforcement to motivate teachers with a new skill.	7	63.6%	4	36.4%	11	100%

When the relevance of punishment as reinforcement was sought, teachers (73%) assume that punishment is not effective for bringing teachers into the right truck. Not only teachers but 54% of principals did not believe that punishment will help them in order to achieve their goal. This kind of perception is the sign of lack of adequate information and knowledge about reinforcement and its significance for higher performance of teachers. Almost two third of the principals, that were part of the participant of the study, preferred to use secondary reinforce immediately after using primary reinforce in order motivate teachers for a better performance. Similarly almost half (49.2%) respondents of teachers were also agreed with what principals pursued on the reinforcement use one another.

Table 2: Reinforcement Practice of Principals responded by Teachers

No	Items	Responses					
		Yes		No		Total	
		Frequ.	%	Frequ.	%	Frequ.	%
1	Do you punished by the school administration?	13	10%	117	90%	130	100%
2	Do your staffs support you not to be reinforced/ punished by the school administration?	87	66.9%	43	33.1%	130	100%
3	Do you think that punishment is effective?	35	26.9%	95	73.1%	130	100%
4	When using a primary reinforcement, principals should always pair it with a secondary reinforcement to motivate teachers with a new skill.	64	49.2%	66	50.8%	130	100%

As clearly shown on table 4.6, school leaders practice on using reinforcement as a system and the reward situation is poor. Most principals responded that their performance on effective usage of reinforcement is good ($X = 3.27$). The teachers mean shows that there is a relatively moderate way of reinforcement practice by principals. The mean is in between 3.93 and 2.11 (average mean $X = 2.89$). The response on item 3 and 5 (teachers were rewarded and praised by the school leaders when they perform better on their duties; and there is a reward system that teachers were positively reinforced in the school) shows us there is statistically significance difference observed between the two group respondents. The 2-tailed value of item 3 and 5 is 0.008 and 0.014 respectively which is much smaller than the t-table value of 0.05.

As indicated in table 3, there is no significance difference observed between teachers' and principals' response on item 1, 2 and 4, with 2-tailed value of 0.604, 0.651 and 0.446 respectively which is greater than the t-critical value of 0.05. So the two groups have almost similar response on teachers were rewarded and praised by the school leaders when they perform better on their duties; and

there is a reward system that teachers were positively reinforced in the school. This shows there is no sufficient statistical evidence that show the mean difference between the groups of respondents at significance level of 0.05. This implies, both groups perceive the items similarly and there is no reward system in the schools.

The weighted mean for each item reflects that principals rated relatively high than teachers. So the average mean of principals ($\bar{X}=3.27$) in rated higher than the mean value of teachers ($\bar{X}=2.89$) which implies principals recognize their performance that their practice is better than what the teachers assumes about their performance.

Table 3. Reinforcement Practice of School Principals

No	Item/ Practice	Respondents				Weighed Mean	T-Obt	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Principals		Teachers				
		X	Std	X	Std			
1	Reward motivates teachers than punishment	3.82	1.18	3.93	1.01	3.91	-0.520	0.604
2	Reinforcement is always necessary to use when you see some kind of behavior from teachers	2.78	1.48	2.89	1.09	2.87	0.453	0.651
3	Teachers were rewarded and praised by the school leaders when they perform better on their duties	3.40	1.15	2.66	1.38	2.77	2.674	0.008
4	The reward given for teachers fits with the performance of teachers	2.92	1.59	2.11	1.08	2.17	-0.763	0.446
5	There is a reward system that teachers were positively reinforced in the school	3.44	1.19	2.84	1.16	2.93	2.479	0.014
Average Mean		3.27	1.32	2.89	1.14	2.93	0.8646	0.3446

The Effect of Reinforcement on Teachers' Efficiency

Teachers' efficiency is highly influenced by reinforcement. As we see on table 4.7 efficacy is one factor that affects teachers invest in teaching. Both principals and teachers highly respond that teachers' efficiency is highly affected by the reinforcement system they use having a mean value of 4.52 and 4.09 respectively. There is no significance difference on the response of teachers and principals that efficiency is influenced by reinforcement. Thus, both groups agreed that the effort of teachers invest in teaching is highly affected by efficacy.

Table 4:- The effect of Reinforcement on Teachers Efficiency

R. No.	Item/ Practice	Respondents				Weighed Mean	T-Obt	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Principals		Teachers				
		X	Std	X	Std			
1	Efficacy affect the effort of teachers invest in teaching	4.52	0.75	4.09	1.12	4.12	1.905	0.058
2	Teachers' sense of efficacy has been related to students' outcomes such as achievement and motivation	3.85	1.23	4.04	3.56	4.02	-0.271	0.787
Average Mean		4.19	0.99	4.07	2.34	4.07	0.8145	0.4225

On the other hand teachers perceived more than principals on 'teachers' sense of efficacy have been related to students' outcomes such as achievement and motivation' with a mean value of 4.04 and 3.85 respectively. Both principals and teachers responded that efficacy has been closely related to students' outcomes. The students' outcomes at the end of a certain grade have highly direct relationship with that of teachers' efficacy. The response of principals on both items has no significance difference with the response of teachers. Both groups responded on the same way that shows the relation of efficiency with reinforcement practice of Aba'ala District schools. The interview and focus group discussion sessions also consolidated that the teachers' efficiency has direct influence on teachers' performance. The effectiveness of teachers' performance is affected by teachers' efficacy. The students' outcomes such as motivation and achievement have direct relation to that of teachers' efficacy. This means that when teachers' efficacy increases the outcome of students also increases and vice versa. All participants of the study, including key informants, argued that teachers' efficiency is highly influenced by reinforcement practice of school principals.

Teachers' Perception of Reinforcement

The perception of teachers is the same with that of school principals on the use of punishment and the impact of punishment on teachers' motivational factor (table 4). Both groups perceive that reinforcement practice in a certain school is significant to enhance teachers' quality as well as principals' way of motivating their followers. There is a slightly higher average mean value of principals

(\bar{X} =3.35) which is moderate that the average mean of teachers (\bar{X} =3.21) that does not necessarily imply teachers perception are different than that of principals.

Table 5:- Teachers Perception on Reinforcement

R. No.	Item/ Practice	Respondents				Weighed Mean	T-Obt	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Principals		Teachers				
		X	Std	X	Std			
1	Reinforcement is used to increase and decrease target skills	3.85	1.41	3.48	1.50	3.54	1.207	0.229
2	Punishment motivates teachers	2.93	1.41	2.50	1.26	2.56	1.577	0.117
3	Reinforcement increase (affect) the performance of teachers	3.96	1.09	4.01	1.18	4.00	-0.179	0.858
4	Based on you believe, negative reinforcement/punishment enhance your efficiency	2.67	1.21	2.84	1.46	2.81	-0.587	0.558
Average Mean		3.35	1.28	3.21	1.35	3.23	0.5045	0.4405

Principals and teachers agreed on that reinforcement increases the performance of teachers with a mean value of 3.96 and 4.01 respectively (table 4). But to the contrary both teachers and principals said that punishment, as a reinforcement tool, have any impact to enhance teachers efficiency. As their response teachers may not be motivated and do not increase their performance due the punishment/negative reinforcement taken by the school principals. Not only teachers but also principals perceive that teachers' efficiency may not be enhanced due to punishment taken by principals as a reinforcement tool. This implies that principals by themselves are not interested to punish teachers because they do not believe that punishment increase the performance of teachers and contribute to quality education.

As the response from teachers and principals, their perception item 2 and 4 is rated as poor having a weighted mean value of 2.56 and 2.81 respectively. From here we can see that punishment do have any motivational factor for teachers to enhance their efficiency. The response of school directors and teachers on reinforcement increase (affect) the performance of teachers is high with a weighted mean value of 4.00. So they argued that reinforcement (with its all type as a whole) increases teachers performance, but when we see punishment only their response is the reverse of the previous one. They simply disagree on punishment is not a factor that enhance the performance of teachers. We can conclude here teachers as well as principals knowledge on punishment is different from the fact that scholars defined it.

There is no significance difference observed between the two groups response on the four items found on table 4.8. Here we can understand that the perception of teachers is similar to principals' perception on the effect of punishment/negative reinforcement on motivating teachers. The FGD and interview data gathered shows that punishment, as a reinforcement tool, was not accepted totally by the key informants who participated in interview and focus group discussion. The participants of interview and FGD argued that punishment does not motivate teachers and it does not enhance teachers' efficiency.

Table 5:- Teachers Perception on Reinforcement and its effect on Teachers Efficiency

S. No.	Item/ Practice	Respondents				Weighed Mean	T-Obt	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Principals		Teachers				
		X	Std	X	Std			
1	Efficacy relations are affected by level of organizational interdependency	4.07	0.96	3.23	1.05	3.36	3.872	0.000
2	Collective2 efficacy is important in the socialization of new teachers	4.07	1.14	3.86	1.30	3.89	0.774	0.440
Average Mean		4.07	1.05	3.55	1.175	3.63	2.323	0.220

Table 5 has information on teachers' perception on reinforcement and its effect on teachers' efficiency. Principals' response on the efficacy relations are affected by level of organizational interdependence is rated as high with a mean value of 4.07 while teachers responded the item as a moderate range with mean value of 3.23. Principals believed more on efficacy has a direct relation with the organizational interdependency level than teachers. Collective efficacy is important in the socialization of new teachers as responded by both groups with a weighted mean value of 3.89. But when we see in separate one, principals perceive more (\bar{X} = 4.07) than teachers (\bar{X} =3.86) on collective efficacy is important in the socialization of new teachers.

Table 6:- Teachers and Principals perception on Reinforcement

R. No	Item	Responses					
		Principals		Teachers		Total	
		Frequ.	%	Frequ.	%	Frequ.	%
1	Which type of reinforcement is do you think more effective than others?	8	72.7%	93	71.5%	101	71.6%
	• Positive	2	18.2%	21	16.2%	23	16.3%
	• Negative	1	9.1%	10	7.7%	11	7.8%
	• Punishment	0	0%	6	4.6%	6	4.3%
	• Extinction	11	100%	130	100%	141	100%
	• Total						
2	Which type of reinforcement is most effective in helping teachers for the use of skills?						
	• Social reinforce	6	54.5%	78	60%	84	59.6%
	• Tangible reinforce	4	36.4%	36	27.7%	40	28.4%
	• Natural reinforce	1	9.1%	16	12.3%	17	12.0%
	• Total	11	100%	130	100%	141	100%
3	Which of the following is not a reinforcement procedure?	2	18.2%	19	14.6%	21	14.9%
	• Positive reinforcement	1	9.1%	11	8.5%	12	8.5%
	• Negative reinforcement	3	27.3%	67	51.5%	70	49.6%
	• Response cost	5	45.5%	33	25.4%	38	27.0%
	• Token economy program	11	100%	130	100%	141	100%
	• Total						
4	Which kind of reward was given to teachers?						
	• Prize	2	18.2%	23	17.7%	25	17.7%
	• Money	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
	• Certificate	8	72.7%	85	65.4%	93	66.0%
	• Thank you ceremony	0	0%	8	6.1%	8	5.7%
	• Training	1	9.1%	14	10.8%	15	10.6%
	• Total	11	100%	130	100%	141	100%

There is significance difference between the response of teachers with that of principals with a 2-tailed value of 0.00 that shows us teachers response is totally different from principals one. From here we can see whether principals perceive it exaggeratedly or teachers do not sense the effect of organizational interdependency on efficacy relations (table 6). When teachers concentrated on self efficacy than that of collective one, some teachers who need continuous support and assistance may not be effective because most of the self efficacy rounded teachers are not worried about to be successive in collaboration with other. So when teacher are considered to be self sufficient, it is difficult to think and work in group but as one. Due to the above the reason self efficacy affects collective efficacy in some sampled schools. But is it not as challenging factor for principals.

The interview and FGD information also consolidate the two items as responded in questionnaire. Efficiency as a group rather than as individual is significance for new teachers to bring them in the socialization of them within the school community. So, collective efficiency is more important than individual efficiency for the socialization of new teachers in order to involve them highly in the teaching learning process. Eight (72.7%) principals and 93 (71.5%) teachers responded that positive reinforcement is effective than that of the four types of reinforcement. They said that punishment and extinction are not effective mechanism of reinforcement tools responded by 10 (7.8%) and 6 (4.3%) participants from the total respondent respectively. So we can see here positive reinforcement (72.7%), negative reinforcement (16.3%), punishment (7.8%) and extinction (4.3%) are rated as their effectiveness in using on teachers by school directors.

Concerning the reinforcement type which is most effective in helping teachers for the use of skills, both principals and teachers argued that social reinforcement is highly acceptable as a reinforcement instrument. Sixty percent of teachers and 54.5% of principals said that social reinforcement is the most effective reinforcement mechanism that helps teachers for the use of their skills in the respected way. The natural reinforcement is rated as the last option which is preferred by 1 (9.1%) principals and 16 (12.3%) teachers and is termed as 'it is not the effective one in helping teachers for the use of their full skill in realizing quality education in the school.

Basically for assessing their background information on the procedure of reinforcement, the researcher tried to put one question to the respondents. From the given alternatives principals select token economy program (45.5%) and teachers select response cost (51.5%)

as not a procedure of reinforcement. So principals said token economy program and k8teachers said response cost is not a reinforcement procedure. But negative reinforcement is rarely selected as it is not a reinforcement procedure by both groups. One (9.1%) principal and 11 (8.5%) teachers select negative reinforcement not a reinforcement procedure.

The type of reward given for teachers can have its effect on teachers' efficiency. Reward as a whole is a motivational factor for enhancing teachers' efficiency. But all kind of reward is not equally motivates teachers. So principals and teachers respond their opinion on the reality that existed in their school. Eight (72.7%) principals said that they use certificate as a reward in their school. Similarly 85 (65.4%) teachers recognize awarding certificate is commonly practiced in their schools. Next to awarding certificates giving prize is the 2nd reward system that schools of Aba'ala District practice as a reward system to motivate teachers. But awarding money as a reward is totally ignored in the schools as responded by both principals and teachers. No one responded that awarding money as a reward system is not practiced in any of the sampled schools of the District. Not only awarding money but also thank you ceremony is not also practiced in the District. Principals themselves argued that the kind of reward given for teachers is rated from awarding certificate to awarding money. It ranged as awarding certificate (66%), prize (17.7%), training (10.6%), thank you ceremony (5.7%) and awarding money (0%) to those of teachers who performs better than the others.

Discussion

Most school principals argued that they were not punishing teachers. Almost three fourth of the principals admitted that, in most cases, their focus was not tending to reinforce teachers. Ninety percent of teachers responded that they were not punished by principals in any cases. This shows that there is no any practice of reinforcement mechanism in Aba'ala District of Afar regional state. Most staff members did not support their principal when there is the need of reinforcing teachers. The argument is supported by principals and teachers themselves. Principals said that they were not helped by their staff when they want to reinforce teachers, and most teachers were supported by their colleagues not to punish by their principal. This is in agreement with the findings of Weaver (2004) which stated that the activity of teachers is against the principle of reinforcement.

The relevance of punishment as reinforcement, most teachers and principals assume that punishment is not effective for bringing teachers into the right truck. Thus, principals did not believe that punishment will help them in order to achieve their goal. This kind of perception is the sign of lack of adequate information and knowledge about reinforcement and its significance for higher performance of teachers. Equivocal conclusions were drawn by Tepper and Taylor (2003). Principals practice on using reinforcement as a system and the reward situation is poor. On principals' side, most of them said that their performance on effective usage of reinforcement is good. But teachers' response shows us that there is a relatively moderate way of reinforcement practice by principals. There is statistically significance difference observed between the response of teachers and principals on the reward system given for teachers when they perform than others; and the existence of reward system that enables teachers to reinforce positively. There is no sound reward system in the schools of Ab'ala District education office. In some cases principals give some kind of reward for teachers, otherwise we can't find a reward system that must be practice throughout the whole year. The finding is supported by Weavers (2004).

Teachers' efficiency is highly influenced by reinforcement. Efficacy is one factor that affects teachers invest in teaching. Both principals and teachers highly respond that teachers' efficiency is highly affected by the reinforcement system they use. The effort of teachers invest in teaching is highly affected by efficacy. On the other hand teachers perceived other than principals on 'teachers' sense of efficacy have been related to students' outcomes such as achievement and motivation'. Efficacy has been closely related to students' outcomes. The students' outcomes at the end of a certain grade have highly direct relationship with that of teachers' efficacy. Teachers' efficiency has direct influence on teachers' performance. The effectiveness of teachers' performance is affected by teachers' efficacy. The students' outcomes such as motivation and achievement have direct relation to that of teachers' efficacy. This means that when teachers' efficacy increases the outcome of students also increases and vice versa. For Tepper and Taylor (2003), increase in teachers' efficacy improves the outcome of students' performances.

The perception of teachers and principals is the same on the use of punishment and the impact of punishment on teachers' motivational factor. Both groups perceive that reinforcement practice in a certain school is significant to enhance teachers' quality as well as principals' way of motivating their followers. Principals and teachers agreed on that reinforcement increases the performance of teachers. But to the contrary both teachers and principals said that punishment, as a reinforcement tool, have no any impact to enhance teachers efficiency. As their response teachers may not be motivated and do not increase their performance due the punishment/negative reinforcement taken by the school principals. Punishment does have any motivational factor for teachers to enhance their efficiency. Reinforcement (with its all type as a whole) increases teachers performance, but when we see punishment only as one factor, the reverse is true. The findings of Chitiyo and Wheeler (2009) and Tepper and Taylor (2003) strengthen this finding.

Conclusion

Principals believed more than teachers on efficacy have a direct relation with the organizational interdependency level. Collective efficacy is important in the socialization of new teachers as responded by both groups. But when we see in separate one, principals

perceive more than teachers on collective efficacy is important in the socialization of new teachers. When teachers concentrated on self efficacy than that of collective one, some teachers who need continuous support and assistance may not be effective because most of the self efficacy rounded teachers are not worried about to be successive in collaboration with other. So when teacher are considered to be self sufficient it is difficult to think and work in group but as one. Due to the above the reason self efficacy affects collective efficacy in some sampled schools. But is it not as challenging factor for principals.

Positive reinforcement is effective than that of the four types of reinforcement. Respondents said that punishment and extinction are not effective mechanism of reinforcement tools.

Concerning the reinforcement type which is most effective in helping teachers for the use of skills, both principals and teachers argued that social reinforcement is highly acceptable as a reinforcement instrument. Principals said token economy program and teachers said response cost is not a reinforcement procedure. But negative reinforcement is rarely selected as it is not a reinforcement procedure by both groups. The type of reward given for teachers can have its effect on teachers' efficiency. Reward as a whole is a motivational factor for enhancing teachers' efficiency. But all kind of reward is not equally motivates teachers. So principals and teachers respond their opinion on the reality that existed in their school. Most principals and teachers said that the use of certificate as a reward is practiced in their school.

Recommendations

Based on the major finding, it is recommended to begin with raising the awareness of teachers, principals and other school community towards enforcement mechanisms. Reward system should be practical in the school to enhance teachers' efficiency. Different types of reinforcement are expected to implement based on the situation existed in schools. Reinforcement should be created as a system in all schools of the District. Collective efficiency should a given a due consideration than self efficiency in order to be effective collectively. Teachers and principals should recognize the effect of reinforcement on teachers' efficiency.

References

- Chitiyo, M., & Wheeler, J. J. (2009). Analyzing the treatment efficacy of a technical assistance model for providing behavioral consultation to schools. *Preventing School Failure*, 53, Retrieved March 13, 2010, from ERIC database.
- Cicero, F. R., & Pfadt, A. (2002). Investigation of a reinforcement-based toilet training procedure for children with autism. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. pp23.
- Human Rights Watch (1999). *Spare the Rod: Corporal Punishment in Kenyan Schools*. September Vol. 11.No.6(A).
- Skinner, B. F. (1989). *The Origins of Cognitive Thought*. New York: Macmillan Publishers
- Tepper B.J. and Taylor, E.C. (2003). "Relationships among Supervisors' and Subordinates' Procedural Justice Perceptions and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors," *Academy of Management Journal* 46, No. 1
- Weaver G.R. (2004). "Ethics and Employees: Making the Connection," *Academy of Management Executive*. Vol18 (2)