Motives That Informs the Punishment of Noncompliance in Higher Education Students

Andre L. Bechuke

Faculty of Education and Training, North-West University,
Mafikeng Campus, Private Bag X2046, 2735 Mmabatho, South Africa

Abstract: Believing that the selection of an effective punitive strategy to improving the behaviour of a student is guided by the motives of the punisher this study aims at reporting on the findings of a research study which was conducted to investigate the motives of lecturers in higher education when selecting punitive strategies for noncompliant student behaviour. The existence of continuous noncompliant behaviour and poor performance of noncompliant students are problems in university lecture rooms all over the world. From a case study design in an interpretivist paradigm within a qualitative research approach, participating lecturer's views on their motives and influence of punishment of 5 non compliant student's behaviours on their academic success were collected through in-depth individual interviews and document analysis. From a population of lecturers 20 randomly selected lecturers with at least 5 year teaching experience at a university in the North-West province of South Africa were sampled. Data collected were analysed through open coding. The findings revealed that the motives behind particular punitive strategies used in the lecture rooms were geared for the students and intended to hurt the emotions of the noncompliant students with the hope that they would refrain from such behaviours. Only limited attention was directed towards the noncompliant behaviour and on the academic achievements of the students. Noncompliant students continued to show poor academic performance despite all the punitive strategies used by their lecturers. It is recommended that lecturers need to reconsider their motives for selecting punitive strategies along the lines of the behaviour modification approach.

Key words: Behaviour modification, motives, punitive strategies, student's academic achievements, strategy

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the world today, there is a continuous rise in noncompliant behaviour of students in universities and lecture rooms. Most research (Khuluse, 2009; Khewu, 2012) in this field has been focused on managing noncompliance in secondary and high schools and little attention has been given to universities. Non compliant behaviours evident in most universities range from mild to severe and have a direct impact on the academic success of universities and on lecturer's performance (Sun and Shek, 2012). Lecturers and management are not only supposed to yield to the core demands of universities which are teaching and learning, research and community engagement but they must also apply acceptable strategies to address noncompliant behaviour of students. In doing so, most lecturers resort to the use of different punitive strategies driven by different motives.

Background and problem statement: The ineffectiveness of some of the punitive strategies used in South African universities promotes lecturer burnout (Khewu, 2012) and raises questions about how lecturers can use punitive strategies effectively without jeopardizing student's academic success. Mtsweni (2008) suggests that to understand misbehaviours and teacher's reaction to it one must examine teacher's beliefs about the causes of errant and deviant behaviour. When teachers react to learner's misbehaviour according to Khuluse (2009) they need to bear in mind that the use of effective punitive strategies results in good academic achievement because self-discipline is involved which promotes the focus on the achievement of a learner's goal; ill-discipline has negative results such as high failure rates and vandalism at schools.

Student misbehaviour, especially in classrooms, presents one of the biggest barriers to academic achievement facing schools today (Colvin, 2009). Non compliant behaviours such as refusal to follow directions, in subordination, not doing what is requested, breaking rules, arguing, making excuses, delaying and doing the opposite of what is asked and defiance can cause serious disruption to the teaching-learning process in the

classroom. There is a need for stakeholders to put plans in place to address the situation if teaching and learning must be carried out effectively. To indicate the magnitude of noncompliance and defiance on teacher's productivity and teaching and learning Walker (1995) in the early 1980s conducted an extensive research project regarding teacher's expectations of students in their classrooms. The findings indicated that more than 90% of teachers participating in the survey rated non-compliance and defiance toward teachers as some of the least acceptable challenging behaviours in their classrooms. Similarly, 23 year later Lane *et al.* (2006) found that following teacher directions still remained a priority standard expectation of teachers for their students across grade levels and that failure to meet these expectations results in serious negative outcomes within and beyond school settings especially regarding academic underachievement and social relationship issues. Academic underachievement also has far reaching consequences for students. Ingweson (2000) holds that failure in academic tasks results in significant increases in problem behaviour for some students. This means that students who exhibit noncompliant behaviours are likely to do so throughout their school career, at home and into later life (Walker, 1995).

Several laws have been enforced on the nature and use punishment and these make it difficult for teachers and lecturers to talk about punishment or to apply it. It is nevertheless important to do so since punitive action has effects on learner's behaviours and subsequent academic achievements (Khuluse, 2009). Avoiding talking of or using punishment does not justify how right or wrong it is. It should be discussed how best punishment can be applied to make it corrective and worthwhile. Stein (2005) emphasizes that one problem in discussing punishment arises from the strong feelings and values associated with punishment as retributive and intentionally harmful. Another problem arises from confusing two distinct concepts of punishment: the traditional concept and the more recent concept in behavioural psychology (Stein, 2005). There are some similarities between these two concepts but the differences have significant implications for the understanding, motives and applicable punitive strategies of punishment for raising teaching and changing the academic life of learners. Some teachers and even parents at home continue to scold, spank or use other punitive strategies on their learners and children because it puts an immediate stop to the problem behaviour, even though it does not make the learner's problem behaviour less likely to occur in the future. However, if such behaviour is repeated in the future the scolding, spanking and other

punitive measures do not function as punishers and may actually function as forms of reinforcement of the errant behaviour.

In most cases of defiance and noncompliant behaviours at university, punishment takes center stage. It is also quite complex in its ramifications (Maag, 1999). To emphasise the need and suggest strategies to curb the complications, Ezorsky holds that in order to apply punishment to noncompliant behaviours of students at university, there is need for justification but if the need to justify is obvious, the manner of doing so becomes a problem. This complicates the entire situation and creates confusion about the motive, punitive strategy and impact on student's academic success when applying punishment to noncompliant behaviour of students. What then are the motives that inform the selection of particular punitive strategies of university lecturers on noncompliance by students and how do they impact on the academic success of students?

Aim of the study: The aim of this study is to report on the findings of a research study conducted to investigate the motives of lecturers in Higher Education when selecting a particular punitive strategy for noncompliant learner behaviours in lecture rooms. This was done in order to assess the impact of the identified strategies on student's performance and success after the punishment.

Scientific orientation: The plan and framework for action that was used to create a link between the research questions and the empirical world suggested an interpretivist approach within a post-positivistic research orientation. Blanche and Durrheim (1999) suggest that interpretivism involves taking people's subjective experiences seriously as the essence of what is real for them (ontology) making sense of people's experiences by interacting with them and listening carefully to what they tell us (epistemology). Derivative from this paradigm the word 'understanding' usefully captures the two aspects of interpretation-understanding in the sense of identifying or empathizing with and understanding as trying to make sense of specific acts (Smith and Osborn, 2007). This approach allows for both aspects of the inquiry to lead to a richer analysis and do justice to the totality of the participants. Interpretivism was used to make sense of participant's experiences by interacting with them and listening carefully to what they had to say. In essence, the researcher captured the realities of participants inside in order to deduce meaning. As such participant's social actions, beliefs, thoughts and perceptions were described, interpreted and analysed to bring about improvement in educational practices of using punishment.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Conceptual and theoretical framework: Noncompliance and its analogues (disobedience, defiance in subordination and oppositional behaviour) are evident and persistent in schools and are a cause for concern to many educators (Colvin, 2009). According to Overton and Sullivan non compliance can be described as students not behaving in a manner appropriate to the classroom environment or not respecting other students and teachers. In this situation, noncompliance describes situations when students are not concentrating on their learning but hindering other students in their attempt to engage in classroom activities. Non-compliance in the classroom can take different forms. Overton and Sullivan indicate that non-compliant behaviour may include: not following classroom or school rules, disruptive behaviour, being off-task or moving around the classroom without permission. Other examples of non-compliant behaviour include talking out of turn, not being punctual, verbal or physical abuse of the teacher or peers, physical destructiveness, not respecting others or leaving the school without permission. Walker *et al.* (2004) categorize four types of noncompliance which include:

- Passive noncompliance: student simply does not perform requested behaviour but is not overtly noncompliant (simply ignores directive; not angry or hostile)
- Simple refusal: student acknowledges the direction but indicates via words or gestures that he/she does not intend to comply; not angry unless command persists or there are adult attempts to force the issues
- Direct defiance: student displays hostility, anger and overt resistance and attempts to intimidate
- Negotiation: student attempts to bargain, compromise; proposes alternative solutions

Non compliance has a serious impact on learners and the entire school environment. According to Colvin (2009) students who display noncompliant behaviours are at risk for a number of serious negative outcomes, ranging from damaging life outcomes in general to detrimental effects on academic achievements. When lecturers provide instructions they typically anticipate tasks from students which require them to follow directions. Students who refuse to follow such instructions and directions have difficulty completing the task and this in turn affects their academic success. Noncompliant behaviour in the classroom reduces the teaching and learning time available to all students. According to Hoy

and Weinstein (2006) disruptions of the progress of normal classroom activities can have an impact on student motivation and levels of engagement by exposing the students to numerous interruptions while the teacher manages the noncompliant student's behaviour. This indicates that noncompliance threatens the effectiveness of a learning environment. This in turn implies that there is a clear correlation between academic underachievement and noncompliance. Lecturers therefore need to use different discipline strategies to manage noncompliant behaviour. One of the commonly used strategies is punishment. The use of punishment in managing noncompliance also has many complications.

Lecturers normally get confused between punishment and discipline and at times use the terms interchangeably (Karen, 2009). Punishment and discipline are quite different things however. Punishment is one technique of discipline. It may be physical or psychological. The main goal of applying punishment is to stop unwanted behaviour (non compliance). Most teachers consider and use punishment and punitive strategies as the only measure for dealing with noncompliance. In doing so they use the most reliable negative consequence with the hope of controlling students and communicating to others that the behaviour is not tolerated. This makes the benefits of using punishment to be offset by many negative consequences although Karen (2009) insists that that the occasional use of punishment in a mild form is acceptable if it is used in combination with positive methods of discipline. For this to happen it is important to keep in mind the goals a lecturer has for the students. If the goals are to help students control their impulses and become self-directed adults then this has to be reflected in the punitive strategies used. Cascading punitive strategies for noncompliance with the goal of helping students requires strategies to modify existing behaviour. Modifying behaviour (Behaviour Modification) according to Skinner (2002) moulds all children to conform by using standard punishments and rewards. In this situation, prediction takes a central role. By prediction, lecturers should be able to envision the expected behavioural outcomes of selected punitive strategies. Behaviour Modification techniques suggest that specific rewards and punishments yield predictable results in the behaviour of children (Smith, 2002). Behaviourism suggests a system that modifies children to comply with prescribed norms. Compliance with these prescribed norms restricts student autonomy. As would be expected in the Newtonian paradigm the theory is to predict results by detailing correct initial conditions and equations that prescribe action upon those initial conditions. In the case of

Skinnerian behaviourism, the initial conditions are individuals and the equations are those behaviouristic techniques set out to modify the individuals.

The behaviouristic techniques set out to modify student's behaviour are punitive measures which are not corporal. Generally, in criminal law, punishment is considered to be any pain, penalty, suffering or confinement inflicted upon a person by the authority of the law and the judgment and sentence of a court, for some crime or offence committed by him (Dressler, 2005). Traditionally, punishment is seen as curtailment that someone in authority imposes on someone else as a penalty for a misdeed. It is deliberately performed on people to make them feel punished enough to pay for their misdeed. To make sure that punishment is always effective in changing behaviour, psychologists consider any stimulus that reduces the strength of behaviour in some measurable way as a punishment for that behaviour (Stein, 2005). As such, punishment is something that happens to behaviour rather than something that is done to a person as is the case with the criminal law view point.

According to Burden (2010) punishment is an act of imposing a penalty with the intention of suppressing undesirable behaviour. There are 2 procedures for achieving this purpose: withholding positive reinforcers or desirable stimuli through techniques such as logical consequences and behaviour modification approaches such as time-out and loss of privileges; adding aversive stimuli through actions where students receive a penalty for their misbehaviour (Jacobs *et al.*, 2013).

Consequently, the behavioural principle of punishment views a person engaged in a behaviour in which there is an immediate consequence that makes it less likely for the person to repeat that behaviour in similar situations in future. Miltenberger (2008) after demonstrating many examples of punishment, splits the definition of punishment into three parts:

- A particular behaviour occurs
- A consequence immediately follows the behaviour
- As a result, the behaviour is less likely to occur again in the future (the behaviour is weakened)

A punisher (also called an aversive stimulus) is a consequence that makes a particular behaviour less likely to occur in the future. A punisher is defined by its effect on the behaviour it follows. A stimulus event is a punisher when it decreases the frequency of the behaviour it follows. Punishment cannot be defined by whether the consequence appears unfavourable or aversive. A particular consequence is regarded as punishing only if the behaviour decreases in future. When we define punishment (or reinforcement) according

to whether the behaviour decreases (or increases) in future as a result of the consequences we are adopting a functional definition. One other point to consider is whether a behaviour decreases or stops only temporarily when the consequence is administered or whether it decreases in the future.

The purpose of punishment ranges from education or rehabilitation to retribution or social benefit. As such, it is geared towards reforming the offender; to deter him and others from committing like offences and to protect the society (Stein, 2005). In each, punishment is uncomfortable for the one experiencing it. This discomfort is important because it reveals that we assume one understands that the discomfort is to be connected with the mistake or crime committed. The result is that the perpetrator realises the mistake or crime is not a good thing and avoids it in the future or the perpetrator simply feels pain proportionate to the pain inflicted.

Scholars are aware of the influence which punishment plays in shaping the behaviour of human beings. Human behaviour from a behaviourist perspective is motivated to produce behaviours rewarded by the environment and to avoid behaviour that is punished (Nazri *et al.*, 2011). Theorizing from his well-known experimental work on reinforcement and operant conditioning, Skinner (2002) concluded that behaviours that we call "right" or "wrong" are not due to any real goodness or badness in a situation nor due to any innate knowledge of right or wrong but are simply due to contingencies involving many kinds of positive and negative reinforcement, rewards and punishment. In order to understand the concept punishment, Skinner (2002) mentions that: a group maintains some kind of order by punishing its members when they misbehave but when this function is taken over by a government punishment is assigned to specialists to whom more powerful forms such as fines, imprisonment or death are available. "Good" and "Bad" become "legal" and "illegal" and the contingencies are codified in laws specifying behaviour and contingent punishments.

A religious agency is a special form of government under which "good" and "bad" become "pious" and "sinful". Contingencies involving positive and negative reinforcement often of the most extreme sort are codified for example as commandments and maintained by specialists usually with the support of ceremonies, rituals and stories. Punishment as education involves developing associations between ideas about right and wrong and the discomfort of pain (Stein, 2005). Pain results from doing wrong. Since no one wants pain, one will learn not to commit the wrong. For example, suppose a child grabs a toy from another child's hand, an adult may take the toy away from the 'offender' admonish the

child that taking toys away from others who had them first is 'not nice' and then send the child to a 'time out' area. The 'time out' is meant to show the child that the behaviour in question is in appropriate; the child equates the discomfort of the time out with the inappropriateness of the action.

Variations in punishments: The two procedural variations in punishment are positive punishment and negative punishment. The difference between positive and negative punishment is determined by the consequence of the behaviour. Positive punishment according to Miltenberger (2008) is the occurrence of a behaviour that is followed by the presentation of an aversive stimulus (punishment) and as a result, the behaviour is less likely to occur in the future. Negative punishment then is the occurrence of a behaviour followed by the removal of a reinforcing stimulus (the driving force behind that behaviour) and as a result, the behaviour is less likely to occur in the future.

From analysis, it is evident that these definitions parallel each other but the critical difference is that reinforcement (use of rewards) strengthens a behaviour or makes it likely to occur in the future while punishment weakens a behaviour (an unwanted behaviour) or makes it less likely to recur. The question is: is this always the case in every facet of life in the greater society outside the education and school milieu and does it yield the expected outcome of weakening the unwanted behaviour?

Behaviour modification theory: To answer the question above and generate a milieu where noncompliant behaviour and related punitive strategies are integrated to establish lecturer motives that model student's behaviour and promote their success, behaviour modification theory is of essence. Miltenberger (2008) indicates that behaviour modification is the field in psychology concerned with analysing and modifying human behaviour. Analysing human behaviour entails identifying the functional relationship between environmental events and particular behaviour to understand the reasons for behaviour or determine why a person behaved the way they did. Modifying human behaviour means developing and implementing procedures to help change an unwanted behaviour. It involves altering environmental events in order to influence behaviour. Behaviour modification procedures are developed by professionals and used to change socially significant behaviours with the goal of improving some aspect of a person's life. Punishment therefore is geared at improving some aspect of a person's life and not elements of retribution or retaliation that wrongdoers deserve.

Empirical investigation
Aim and design of the investigation: This study was undertaken from a qualitative research paradigm. This paradigm gave room for the researcher to study the key issues of the problem without being constrained by pre-determined categories of analysis. Since, the research was based on an interpretive research paradigm rooted in a qualitative approach a case study research design was deemed appropriate. The researcher visited the selected small group of participants (individuals at universities) as required by a case study approach and collected data. This means that the variables under investigation were studied where they naturally occurred not in a research controlled environment under controlled conditions.

Population: The population of the study was lecturers and students of one university in South Africa which had one or more similar characteristics that were of interest to the study. A common characteristic of these participants was that they were involved in the teaching and learning and managing of discipline through the use of punitive strategies in their lecture rooms. Participants were approached to confirm their belonging to the population based on this characteristic.

Sample: Since every lecturer everywhere, doing everything cannot be studied Moles and Huberman as Punch (2001) data were collected through document analysis and in-depth individual interviews with 20 randomly selected lecturers each with at least 5 year teaching experience at a university. Data were collected on five forms of non compliant student behaviours (absenteeism, late coming to class, late submission of assignment, failure to submit assignment and talking back at lecturer) which have a direct impact on student achievement. These behaviours were identified and determined during interviews with the lecturers.

Data collection tools: The in-depth individual interview used in this research is sometimes called the "informal conversation" or unstructured interview (Punch, 2009) as the interview questions were not all pre-formulated or the themes identified before the interview took place but were developed spontaneously in the course of the interactions with the participants. Individual in-depth interviews were conducted with the lecturers to gain their views on the motives that drove the selection of particular punitive strategies selected to address the 5 forms of noncompliant student behaviour.Written data sources included unpublished documents (Maree, 2010) such as lecturer's records of noncompliant students, attendance

registers and records of student's performance. The documents were analysed to evaluate the impact of the selected punitive strategies on the student's performance.

Data analysis: Data analysis was done through open coding. The process followed the steps from specific to general and involved multiple levels of analysis as suggested by Creswell (2009) in a linear, hierarchical approach building from the bottom to the top.

Ethical considerations: Permission to undertake the empirical study was sought and granted from the university under whose auspices the study was done, more precisely from the ethical clearance committee in the Faculty of Education. In order to ensure internal validity in this study, the researcher used the participant validation or member checking strategy. The consent form agreement ensured that the participants fully comprehended the nature and outcomes of the research and they were assured of anonymity and confidentiality. Permission was obtained from all participants involved. They were informed that they could withdraw their participation at any time without any penalty to them.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In lecture rooms since suspension is not an option, punishment took the form of a decision to do something to students that they did not want. In other cases, punishment was accompanied by a demand for future compliance in the form of threat of harsher punishment if the student failed to comply. In this case, punishment was meted out on the conviction that the student was an "undesirable person" (Table 1).

Punitive strategies to combat noncompliant student behaviours in lecture rooms

Late coming to class: When asked which punitive strategies lecturers used when learners came late to class, participant's responses indicated that lecturers took no action to curtail late coming kept late comers out of class or repeated the lesson to assist late comers to catch-up at times. Lecturer A: "I don't do anything when they come late, I allow them to go and sit down and follow-up the lectures. But normally I warn them to do so without interrupting the lesson." Lecturer F: "I normally give them a 20 min grace period after the start of the lesson after which if they don't show up they stay out of my class." Lecturer O: "If I only have less than half of the class at the start of the lesson, I am forced to repeat the lesson when the others come. You know, not entirely but the main points so that they can catch up."

Absenteeism: Participant's responses regarding the particular punitive strategies used when students absented themselves from lectures revealed that lecturers took no action, awarded marks for attendance and deducted marks from absentees. Lecturer C: "It's such a large class to even notice all those who absent. So, I just ignore those who absent and focus on those who are present." Lecturer N; "I simply reward those who

Table 1: Summary of the main results of the study

Non-compliant behaviour	Lecturers punitive strategy	Motive for the selected punitive strategy	Impact on student's success
Late coming to class	No action	Don't want to distract others	Miss out on lesson
	Stay out of class	Teach them to be early next time	Under performance of students
	Repeat lesson	Help them on what they missed	Ignoring promotes repetition and likelihood for similar disruptive behaviour to continue
Absenteeism	Deduct marks	Teach them a lesson on the need	Miss out on lesson
	Reward attendance	to attend all lectures	Under performance of students
	No action	Make them feel the pain of losing marks	Ignoring promotes repetition and likelihood for behaviour to continue
Late submission of assessment activities	Deduct marks	Teach them a lesson to submit on time	Rejection of activity and deduction
	Reject assignment	next time	of marks handicap student's performance
	Very strict marking	Make them feel the pain of losing marks or scoring zero for the activity	General under performance of students ignoring promotes repetition and likelihood for behaviour to continue
		Marking with the intention of looking for reasons to fail the student	
Failure to submit assignment or write a test	Zero (accept no excuses)	Teach them to always submit assignment	Rejection of activity and deduction of marks
	Second chance (based on valid excuse)	and write their test	handicap student's performance
	No action	Awareness of unexpected setbacks	General under performance of students
		that can keep students away	Ignoring promotes repetition and likelihood for behaviour to continue
Talking back to lecturer	Send out of lecture room	Remind them of their position/who the boss	General under performance of students
	Identify student and make	in this class is	Ignoring promotes repetition and likelihood
	follow-up	Reduce them to their level	for behaviour to continue
	Talk back to student	Revenge on someone who wants to hurt you	

attend. I have an attendance register." Lecturer F; "I deduct marks at the end of the semester for all those who absent themselves from my lectures".

Late submission of assessment activities: Participant's responses revealed that lecturers deducted marks, rejected activities that were submitted late and applied strict marking to scripts of students who submitted the assessment activities late. Lecturer Q; "I deduct a certain percentage from the student's marks for submitting late. The marks go up depending on how late the submission is." Lecturer N; "I normally reject late assignments. Once the submission date has passed that is it no more submission. Students must learn to be punctual." Lecturer E: "Well, I accept the late submission but I am very strict when marking the scripts of late submissions. Not because I want them to fail but because since they took all the time their work should be better."

Failure to submit assessment activities: Data revealed that when students failed to submit assessment activities like assignments or write a test, lecturers scored them zero (accept no excuse) gave second chances based on valid evidence to failure to submit or took no action. Lecturer B; "Once you fail to submit my assessment activities or write my test, I score you zero. I don't take chances with these students. They always have stories. Lecturer H; "If they provide a valid excuse like a medical slip as to why the fail to submit assessment activities, I give them a second chance." Lecturer T; If they fail to submit my activities at all, I ignore them at all. That's their problem. My focus is on those who want study and not those who don't care."

Talking back to lecturers: Participant's response to the selected punitive strategies for students who talked back to lecturers revealed that lecturers sent the students out of the class, identified the student and made a follow-up on other ways to use other punitive strategies and also talked back to students aggressively using harsh reprimands. Lecturer J; "If a learner has the guts to talk back at me, I send him out of my class and if he refuses to go, I stop the lesson and leave." Lecturer C; "If a learner talks back to me in an aggressive manner, I identify the learner and deal with him/her later. There are other strategies to use to teach them some respect." Lecturer B; "If a learner talks back at me, I put you in your position. They need to be reminded of who is in control of the class".

Motives for selecting punitive strategy: Data revealed that the motive for lecturer's selection of particular punitive strategies was to hurt the emotions of the students since it was believed that noncompliance behaviours of students hurt the emotions of the lecturers. Lecturers expressed dissatisfaction with acts of noncompliance and used punishment as a way of getting back at their offenders; they selected punitive strategies that hurt the emotions of the students with the hope that in order for students to avoid the pain they would refrain from the particular form of noncompliant behaviour.

Revenge on offender: Lecturer T indicated that "these acts of noncompliance of students are hurting and frustrating to us as lecturers. As such, in deciding on a particular punishment, I wish they feel the pain you also feel as a lecturer."

Hurt emotions of students: Lecturer F indicated that "when I punish noncompliant students, my intention is teach them a bitter lesson. I know some of these strategies are harsh but that is what they need to stop their misbehaviours."

Prove superiority of lecturer: Lecturer A indicated that "when I choose a punitive strategy to discipline a learner who talks back at me, my intention is to make sure they are reminded of who is in control of the class and to reduce them to their levels as students."

Create awareness: Lecturer D indicated that "whatever strategy I use, whether I deduct those marks or send them out of my class, my greatest intention is to create awareness in them of the need to submit assignments on time and to always be on time for lessons."

Impact of selected strategies on student's achievements: Data from document analysis confirmed the findings of other researchers (Khuluse, 2009) on the negative impact of noncompliance on student's achievement. Noncompliance had a negative impact on student's achievements. It further confirmed the ineffectiveness of the punitive strategies driven by the current motives of lecturers. In support of this, data from attendance registers revealed a consistency in the names of absentees despite the use of mark deduction and bonus marks for attendance. Data from an analysis on records of noncompliant students in comparison to records of student's performance revealed a relationship between noncompliance and student performance. Those whose names were on the records of noncompliant students were the top underperformers despite all the strategies from sending them out of class to harsh reprimands by lecturers. From the data collected, it is evident that the motive that informed the punitive strategy selected for particular noncompliant behaviour was to hurt the

feelings of students. As such, punitive strategies selected were aimed at the student as a person and not the behavior and were considered as a way of making the student feel bad hence, force them to refrain from the particular non-compliant behaviour. From the data, it was also evident that no attempts were made to inquire about the cause of the noncompliant behaviours. No attempts were made to help modify the behaviour.

Inimical to the empirical findings, the theoretical and conceptual framework that informed this paper indicated that good choices produced good behaviour and bad choices produced bad behaviour. Therefore, the noncompliant behaviour of students at the university maybe the consequence of bad choices they made. In view of this insight, lecturers should rather try to help students make good choices that lead to good behaviour (Andrius, 2007) instead of regarding students as "undesirable". Andrius (2007) reiterates that effective discipline compels educators to focus on helping learners make appropriate behavioural choices that lead to ultimate personal success. In the classroom, it is important for educators to help students envision a quality existence in school and plan the choices that lead to it (Charles, 2008). Charles (2008) further indicates that many students lack the social skills necessary to relate positively to peers and to do well academically. As such, educators who help students develop these social skills, help promote successful classroom discipline.

The findings of this study further revealed that the motives for selecting particular punitive strategies for noncompliance in lecture rooms were driven by emotions because lecturers felt that noncompliant behaviour was directed at hurting them. Instead of being emotional, Canter and Canter (2011) advise that lecturers should rather make commitments to help challenging students succeed. Lecturers sometimes make attempts to advise and help students improve on their behaviour but later give up in the process before the noncompliant behaviour is eradicated. Giving up on students with noncompliant behaviour only reinforces such behaviour. Such behaviour does not disappear without intervention. The behaviour continues unless lecturers make the commitment to help the challenging student. In order for a lecturer to intervene in helping students and being less emotional, Burden (2010) suggests they must control their immediate reaction to the misbehaviour so that their response does not reinforce the misbehaviour. Immediate reaction to misbehaviour is mostly emotional.

Rather than selecting punitive strategies with the hope of hurting student's emotions or as a means of revenge on the offender or proving the superiority of the lecturer, Burden (2010) suggests that when selecting a punitive strategy, the main intention should be to modify learner behavior; this should have a lasting impact on the learners. When attempting to modify student's behaviour, lecturers have to teach them the consequences of their noncompliant behaviour. This has been given less attention in higher education since it is believed that students at this level are mature enough to know the consequences of their behaviour but Colvin (2009) holds strongly that not all students at all times are aware of the consequences of their actions until they do them. It is therefore the responsibility for educators to constantly teach learners the consequences of their actions. Glasser (2004) also indicates that the classroom is a complex environment for students as well as for educators. Students are confronted with challenges, temptations and circumstances that cause them to make poor decisions about their behaviour because of their personalities. Therefore, while focusing on modifying learner behaviour, lecturers should strive to teach students about the consequences of their behaviour. By neglecting the notion of modifying student's behavior as well as the motives that inform the selection of a particular punitive strategy, lecturers ignore the third clause of Miltenberger (2008) definition of what should constitute a punishment, namely that the behaviour is likely to occur again in the future; the behaviour is weakened.

An analysis of the attendance registers of lecturers, lecturer's records of noncompliant students and performance records of students revealed a consistency in the names of noncompliant students constantly absenting from school and underperforming. Not only does this reveal ineffectiveness in the motives and the punitive strategies used by lecturers on noncompliance in lecture rooms but it also points to the need to orientate the motive of selecting punitive strategies from hurting the emotions of the wrongdoer to helping the wrongdoer make better choices that lead to good behaviour. In line with this view Naong (2007) suggests that schools must rethink their discipline policies and seek new ways to address today's unprecedented learner's behaviour problems. Data from document analysis further confirm the negative impact of noncompliance on student's performance even at the level of the university. Students whose names appeared on the records of noncompliant students are all underperformers. Kauffman (1997) so aptly noted that low achievement and problem behaviour go hand in hand. This is further confirmed by Sutherland *et al.* (2002) who reported that academic deficits in student's achievements are further exacerbated by the modified instruction they receive which is brought about by their disruptive classroom behaviour.

CONCLUSION

When deciding on a punitive strategy for noncompliant learner behaviour in the classroom lecturers should strive to help students rather than reject or condemn. With the motive of helping students, lecturers should chose punitive strategies that are less emotional and which focus on the noncompliant behaviour and not the student as a person. When this occurs, the noncompliant behaviour of students is not eradicated in an instance or meant as retaliation but rather becomes an attempt to modify the student's behavior to make it is less likely to occur again in future. In this way, noncompliance in the long run will be eradicated in the classroom and the culture of teaching and learning necessary for fostering learner achievement will prevail.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The motives for selecting particular punitive strategies for noncompliant student behaviour should be informed by the need to help leaners make good behavioural choices. In doing this, lecturers need to abrade students of the consequences of their behaviours. Moreover, when deciding on a punitive strategy, focus should be on ensuring that the punitive strategy used will improve the likelihood that the noncompliant behaviour would be less likely to occur in future. In doing this, there is need to apply punishment based on the behaviour modification strategy suggested by Miltenburger (2008) in which:

- A particular behaviour occurs
- A consequence immediately follows the behaviour
- As a result, the behaviour is less likely to occur again in the future (the behaviour is weakened)

REFERENCES

Andrius, J., 2007. Educators Matters: Advancing Knowledge for Educators. Quality Education Programs Inc, San Pedro, Los Angeles,.

Blanche, M.T. and K. Durrheim, 1999. Histories of the present: Social science research in context. Res. Pract. Appl. Methods Social Sci., 2: 1-17.

Burden, R.P., 2010. Classroom Management: Creating a Successful K-12 Learning Community. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, New Jersey, USA.,.

Canter, L. and M. Canter, 2011. Succeeding with Difficult Students: New Strategies for Reaching your Most Challenging Students. Solution Tree Press, Australia,.

Charles, C.M., 2008. Building Classroom Discipline. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, Massachusetts,.

Colvin, G., 2009. Managing Noncompliance and Defiance in the Classroom: A Road Map for Teachers, Specialists and Behavior Support Teams. Corwin Press, New York, USA., ISBN:978-1-4129-60885, Pages: 130.

Creswell, J.W., 2009. Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. Sage Publications, New Delhi, India,.

Dressler, J., 2005. Black Letter Outlines Criminal Law. Thomson Reuters, New York, USA.,.

Glasser, W., 2004. Every Student can Succeed: Finally a Book that Explains how to Reach and Teach every Student in your School. William Glasser Institute, Los Angeles, California,.

Hoy, A.W. and C.S. Weinstein, 2006. Student and Teacher Perspectives on Classroom Management. In: Handbook of Classroom Management: Research, Practice and Contemporary Issues, Evertson, C. and C.S. Weinstein (Eds.). Routledge, Abingdon, England, UK., pp: 181-222.

Ingweson, D.W., 2000. Classroom management: A California resource guide: Los Angeles county office of education. Division of Student Support Services, Safe Schools Center, California Department of Education.

Jacobs, M., N.C. Vakalisa and N. Gawe, 2013. Teaching-Learning Dynamics. 4th Edn., Pearson Education, South Africa, Africa,.

Karen, M.C., 2009. What is the Difference between Discipline and Punishment? University Center for Early Education and Development. St Paul Publisher, Minnesota, USA.,.

Kauffman, J.M., 1997. Characteristics of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders of Children and Youth. 65th Edn., Merrill/Prentice Hall, One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey, USA.,.

Khewu, N.P.D., 2012. A study of practices in the alternative to corporal punishment strategy being implemented in selected primary schools in Buffalo city metro municipality: Implications for school leadership. Ph.D Thesis, University of Fort Hare, Fort Hare..

Khuluse, N.L., 2009. The effect of discipline on academic achievement in Secondary School. M.Ed Thesis, University of Zululand, Zululand.

Lane, K.L., J.H. Wehby and C. Cooley, 2006. Educator expectations of student?s classroom behaviours across the grade span: Which social skills are necessary for success?. Exceptional Children, 72: 153-167.

Maag, J.W., 1999. Behavior Management: From Theoretical Implications to Practical Applications. Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California,.

Maree, K., 2010. First Steps in Research. Van Schaik, Pretoria, South Africa,.

Miltenberger, R.G., 2008. Behaviour Modification Principles and Procedures. 4th Edn., Belmond, Wadsworth, Ohio,.

Mtsweni, J., 2008. The role of educators in the management of school discipline in the Nkangala region of Mpumalanga. M.Ed Thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Naong, M., 2007. The impact of the abolition of corporal punishment on teacher morale: 1994-2004. South Afr. J. Educ., 27: 283-300.

Nazri, M.K.N.Z., M. Ahmad, A.M. Yusoff, F.M. Amin and M.B.M. Ishak *et al.*, 2011. The concept of rewards and punishments in religion: A special reference to Kitab Al-Adab of Sahih Bukhari. World J. Islamic History Civilization, 1: 249-254.

Punch, K.F., 2001. Developing Effective Research Proposals. Sage, London, England, UK.,.

Punch, K.F., 2009. Introduction to Research Methods in Education. Sage, London, England, UK.,.

Skinner, B.F., 2002. Beyond Freedom and Dignity. Hackett Publishing Company, New York, USA.,.

Smith, J. and M. Osborn, 2007. Qualitative Psychology: A Practical Guide to Research Methods. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, California, USA.,.

Smith, K., 2002. Behaviour modification, a proactive intervention for the classroom. Masters Thesis, University of Minesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.3

Stein, J., 2005. To punish or not to punish, that is the question. Intl. Child Youth Care Netw., 77: 1-12.

Sun, R.C. and D.T. Shek, 2012. Student classroom misbehavior: An exploratory study based on teacher's perceptions. Sci. World J., 2012: 1-8.

Sutherland, K.S., J.H. Wehby and P.J. Yoder, 2002. Examination of the relationship between teacher praise and opportunities for students with EBD to respond to academic requests. J. Emotional Behav. Disord., 10: 5-13.

Walker, H.M., 1995. Antisocial Behavior in School: Strategies and Best Practices. Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA., ISBN:9780534256449, Pages: 481.

Walker, H.M., E. Ramsey and R.M. Greham, 2004. Antisocial Behaviour in School: Evidence-Based Practices. 2nd Edn., Wadsworth/Thomson Learning, Belmont, CA., Pages: 414.