TEACHERS' AND STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD DISCIPLINARY STYLES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ENGLAND AND NIGERIA.

OCHEHO U. THANKGOD

Department of Behavioural Studies,
Redeemer's University, Ede,
Osun State.

ABSTRACT

The issue of disruptive behaviour in schools has become a major stress and concern to teachers. However, in order to minimize these behaviours, teachers are utilizing various disciplinary strategies. The aim of this study was to examine students' and teachers' attitudes toward disciplinary styles and to compare the views of the participants from Nigeria and England. Two hundred and eighty five (285) students and 41 teachers from high schools completed the disciplinary styles questionnaires which contained intervention methods commonly reported in high schools. The questionnaire measured individual's attitudes toward the strategies used to regulate behavioural problems in classroom. The results showed significant differences among nationality, gender, students and teachers toward disciplinary styles. In conclusion, the style of discipline adopted in school is associated with students' judgement of behaviour. The implications of the findings to disciplinary styles that may be most effective at regulating disruptive behaviour were discussed.

Keywords: *Disciplinary styles, attitudes, student, teacher.*

INTRODUCTION

Disruptive behaviour among students in high school is currently one of the main challenges confronting the school system today. This is because it serves as a source of stress for teachers (Brouwers & Tomic, 2000) and impact negatively on learning because teachers spend too much time on order and control (Infantino & Little, 2005). Also, it weakens students' motivation and energy, dissolves trust and affects the relationship between teachers and students (Charles & Senter, 2005). However, promoting responsible behaviours helps to develop motivation and social skills (Pullis, 1991); academic performance and positive behavioural outcome (Ma & Willms, 2004).

Improving responsible behaviours among students require that teachers cultivate effective behavioural management skill (Merrett &Wheldall, 1993). One of the ways to do this is through the use of different disciplinary methods or styles so as to create order and control in the classroom and school environment. That is why the disciplinary styles adopt by teachers in classroom are very important consideration in the drafting of school discipline policies. It is very difficult to talk about school discipline without discussing conduct or behaviour and the appropriate interventions needed for order and control. According to Romi and Freud (1999), "Discipline is a system of sanctions that addresses the breakdown when the code of conduct is broken"(p. 54).

Lewis (2001) proposed a classroom management theory by grouping classroom management into six disciplinary styles (Hinting, Punishment, Reward, Decision making, Aggression and Discussion). This theory focuses on the impact each of this discipline style has on students' learning and responsibility and how some of the disciplinary styles are productive and others are unproductive. Also, Pianta (2006) proposed child-teacher relationship as a form of classroom management theory. This theoretical perspective tends to embrace the complex social, psychological and emotional process involved in interactions and relationships between teachers and students in classroom management.

There is a considerable amount of empirical evidence on students' perception toward the various disciplinary styles adopted in classrooms. For instance, Lewis, Romi, Qui, and Katz (2005), carried out a study which reported students' perceptions of the classroom discipline strategies employed in Australian, China and Israel. They examined data from 748 teachers and 5521 students with the use of questionnaire in order to identify how teachers use the various disciplinary strategies and how they relate to students' misbehaviour, and to also compare the

views of students in different national settings. It was found that Chinese teachers were less punitive and aggressive than those in Israel or Australian and more inclusive and supportive of students' voices. Also it was discovered that Australian's students perceived classrooms as having least discussion and recognition and most punishment.

The findings from this study have been found to be consistent with the results of another study conducted in Australia. Lewis (2001) examined classroom discipline and student responsibility and found that teachers are perceived by students to react to classroom misbehaviour by increasing their use of force or aggressive style of discipline. However, the disciplinary style (punishment) Australian students perceived to be the most utilized is regarded by some scholars to be ineffective and serve little or no useful purpose (Caffyn, 1989; Lewis, 2001; Roache & Lewis, 2011). In fact the Lewis' (2001) study which found punishment as the most used disciplinary style by Australian teachers used the same national settings to conduct another study on students' reaction to classroom discipline in Australia, Israel and China. They found that both punishment and aggression distracted students from schoolwork and create negative affect towards the teacher while recognition and discussion with students provided less distraction (Lewis et al. 2008).

Research with teachers (see Burns, 1978, for a review) shows that giving students "a good talking to in private", encouragement of effort, extra work and detention are considered to be most effective styles of discipline. Burns (1978) repeated the study of Highfield and Pinsent (1952) among teachers and pupils in high school, and also used the 15 deterrents and 12 rewards item questionnaire as presented in the original study. Bain, Houghton and Williams (1991) who focused on the effects of a school-wide initiative designed to help teachers to raise the rates of encouragement of students also discovered that encouraging students often helps to manage disruptive behaviour. Nevertheless, the measures used in both Lewis et al.'s (2005) study (which focused on students' attitude towards disciplinary styles) and Burns (1978) study (which focused on teachers' attitude towards disciplinary styles) were observed by the author to have some limitations. First, Lewis et al.' study used a 24- item questionnaire with six subscales (punishment, discussion, recognition, aggression, involvement and hinting) in order to examine the range of behaviours associated with each disciplinary style. This perhaps makes the reliability for some of the subscales to be low and moderate. Second, the same questionnaire developed by Highfield and Pinsent (1952) for the National Foundation for Educational Research was also used by Burns (1978) to examine the relative effectiveness of various incentives and deterrents as judged by pupils and teachers. The time difference between when the questionnaire was developed in the first study and when it was used in the second study was 24 years and this could have posed a challenge to the credibility of the results because of the level of change and development that would have taken place within the 24 years since it was not updated or revised for use in the second study.

Regarding teachers and students' perceptions of the effectiveness of disciplinary styles used in regulating students' behaviour, Shreeve, Boddington, Bernard, Brown, Clarke, Dean, Elkins, Kemp, Lees, Miller, Oakley, and Shiret((2002), explored the perceptions of teachers and students toward the characteristics of systems of rewards and sanctions in seven high schools in Norwich, United Kingdom. They administered questionnaires for year 8, 9 and 10 students, while an interview was conducted for their teachers. It was found that the students across each class grade tend to have more similarities than differences in perception of both rewards and sanctions. For instance, year 8 and 9 perceived giving students gifts, time and marks to be the most effective reward system. But there was a slight difference among year 10 as only gifts was seen to be effective. Also, sanctions such as after-school detentions and a letter or phone call home to their parents had a high degree of agreement among students in year 8, 9 and 10. However, the teachers' attitudes were quite different from the students. The majority of the teachers perceived individual feedback either written or verbal to be the most effective reward system, while some teachers were of the opinion that tangible reward such as sweets, money, vouchers for leisure activities or fast food and certificates of commendation are best at regulating students' behaviour. For sanctions, most of them perceived it to be ineffective instead

they preferred to deal with incidents of poor work or behaviour themselves on a one on one basis.

The findings from Shreeve et al. (2002) research converse with Burns (1978) study which focused on pupils' and teachers' perceptions of the effectiveness of incentives and deterrents. They found that students perceived sending a letter home to their parents to be ineffective, while teachers preferred moral persuasion through private talks. In addition, concerning the reward system, students saw personal achievement to be most effective, while teachers perceived adult approval rather than individual feedback and tangible rewards as suggested in Shreeve et al. study. But Houghton, Merrett and Wheldall (1988); Infantino and Little (2005) works are in high agreement with their results. Both studies discovered that time, marks, detention and an unfavourable report sent home were perceived to be the most effective form of rewards and sanctions.

A study conducted by Veronique, Roger, Badiaa and Faith (2009) examined the effect of age, experience, gender and academic context on the use of sanctions by teachers in the classroom. Two hundred and twenty-two French teachers (64 male, 158 females) took part in a study that employed the use of questionnaire to determine the factors that affect sanction in the classroom. The researchers discovered that for both discipline and schoolwork contexts, the youngest and least experienced teachers were more severe than the oldest and most experienced teachers. Gender was also found not to have significant effect on sanction. Furthermore, there was no difference between teaching level and sanction. That is, both primary and high school teachers judged sanction in the same way. Although the study examined the effect of some demographic variables on teachers' sanction in the classroom, the researchers findings may be restricted if an individual is to examine the effects of these variables on classroom discipline. This is because several scholars have classified the strategies used in regulating students' behaviour into different styles (Burns, 1978; Infantino & Little, 2005; Lewis, Romi, Qui & Katz, 2005). Also, the article may be limited because it focused on the moral judgment of sanction. What an individual or a culture judge to be morally right is different from the judgment of another individual or culture (George, Maureen, &Kunio, 2006). Thus, French teachers views and understanding of sanction could be different from teachers in other nationalities or settings.

Previous investigations have examined the impact of cultural influences on teachers and students perceptions toward disciplinary styles (Irene, 2004; Lewis, Romi, Qui, & Katz, 2005). Specifically, a study on attitudes of British secondary school teachers and pupils to rewards and punishments discovered that teachers found punishment as an effective disciplinary method in changing students' behaviour (Caffyn, 1989). This is consistent with a research carried out on teachers' disciplinary approaches to students' discipline problem in Nigeria secondary schools. It was found that punishments reduced students' misbehaviour in school (Nakpodia, 2010). However, another study among British teachers found frequent use of encouragement to be most effective at regulating students' disruptive behaviour (Bain, Houghton & Williams, 1991). Caution must be taken when interpreting punishment. This is because different nationalities tend to perceive punishment differently. For instance, British teachers see sending letter home complaining about the pupil and being put on report to be the most effective punishment (Houghton, Merrett & Wheldall), 1988), while Nigeria teachers perceive the use of physical punishment to be effective in correcting and maintaining discipline among secondary school students (Abrifor, 2008).

These reviewed literatures above, provide evidence on the attitudes of students or teachers towards disciplinary strategies utilized in regulating disruptive behaviour. But no evidence was found on how both students and teachers perceived this variable. Also studies on various intervention approaches among Western and Asian cultures were carried out. However, little or no study compared Africa culture with others. This is an important area to research on because the two studies (Abrifor, 2008; Nakpodia, 2010) above which were conducted in Nigeria with Nigerian's participants found punishments to be an effective disciplinary strategies, which is contrary to some findings in other cultures (See Roache & Lewis, 2011; Shreeve et al. 2002 for review). In addition, although several researchers (Lewis, 2001; Romi, Lewis & Katz,

2009; Lewis et al., 2005; Soleiman, Aida, Samsilah & Sharifah, 2011) used the disciplinary styles questionnaire with six disciplinary strategies (discussion, punishments, reward, involvement, decision making and hinting) in their studies, the author observed the limitation of using a 24 – item questionnaire to measure six different variables. This is because each variable in the questionnaire consisted of 4 items, which is perhaps quite small to substantially cover each construct.

Consequently, this study is designed to examine what teachers and students think and feel about some of the disciplinary styles adopted by teachers in classroom. The study also compares the attitudes of students and teachers in Nigeria and England. England is an European country, while Nigeria is an Africa country. This is especially important since it is generally recognized in some secondary schools in Nigeria that teachers still adopt unproductive disciplinary techniques as compared to the percentage among British counterparts. The differences or similarities in the two national settings will also give insights into students and teachers attitudes toward disciplinary styles. In line with this, the following hypotheses were tested.

1) There would be a significant difference between British and Nigeria on their attitudes toward disciplinary styles.
2) There would be a significant difference between Male and Female on their attitudes towards disciplinary styles
3) Students and teachers would have significant difference in their attitudes toward disciplinary styles.

METHOD

Design
Survey design was used to test the hypotheses. That is, it was used to quantify students' and teachers' attitudes towards the different types of disciplinary approaches used in regulating disruptive behaviour in classroom. The dependent variables are attitudes towards disciplinary styles.

Participants
Participants were recruited in Nigeria and in England. In Nigeria, a total of twenty six high school teachers (9 males, 15 females) and one hundred and six high school students (60 males, 46 females) participated in this study. Both students and teachers were recruited from 3 randomly selected private secondary schools in Calabar, Nigeria. These students were selected from Junior Secondary School Class 3, Senior Secondary School Class 1 and Senior Secondary School Class 2, while the teachers who participated in the study were from Senior Secondary School Classes 1 and 2. The age range of the students and teachers was between 12 to 17 years and 26 to 52 years respectively. The mean age of the participants was 16.3.

In England, a total of fifteen high school teachers (5 males, 10 females) and one hundred and thirty seven high school students (29 males, 108 females) participated in this study. Students were recruited from JSS 3, SS 1 and SS 2 in two schools with low and average socio-economic class within Lancaster. The teachers were randomly selected from one of the schools. The age range of the students is between 12 – 17 years, while the age range of the teachers was between 23 – 50 years. All the participants were included in the final analysis.

Measures
A standardized questionnaire on disciplinary styles was used to assess the attitudes of students and teachers towards disciplinary styles.

Disciplinary styles: Disciplinary styles were assessed using a 24-item questionnaire designed by Lewis (2001) to measure what teachers and students think and feel about classroom discipline styles. It measures six discipline styles including punishment, recognition or rewarding, discussion, hinting, involvement and aggression. The first part of the questionnaire

consisted of the demographic variables such as nationality, gender, age and school type, while the second parts requested participants to indicate their attitudes to the extent each of this disciplinary style is used. Each disciplinary style has four questions. Among the questions listed were yells angrily at student who misbehave (aggressive subscale), remind misbehaving students about the class rule (hinting subscale), Gets students to understand why their behavior is a problem for others by discussing it with them(discussion subscale), Organizes the class to work out the rules for good behaviour(decision making), reward individual student who behave properly (reward/recognition subscale) and increase the level of consequences if students did not do as they were told (punishment subscale). Participants responses were indicated on a five - point likert - type scale (1= strongly agree, 5 = strongly disagree) which measured how students and teachers feel and think about each of the disciplinary styles. The scale has a Cronbach alpha of .86

Procedure

        The 24- items questionnaire on disciplinary styles was administered to the teachers and students who participated in the study in both England and Nigeria. The teachers, who were randomly selected read the information about the research and gave their consent to participate, while the students obtained guidance consent. The teachers filled the questionnaires in their offices and returned them to the researcher. The researcher was given the opportunity to administer the questionnaires to the students in their various classrooms during the free period allocated to each class. Also, the researcher was available to explain the objectives and importance of the study. It took the teachers 30 minutes to fill the questionnaire. The questionnaire was also distributed to the students in two schools in England and three schools in Nigeria. The class teacher filled the consent form on behalf of the students and took them to a class where they filled the questionnaire. Prior to the filling of the questionnaire, the researcher explained the content of the questionnaire and how they are expected to answer the questions. They also took about 30 minutes to fill the questionnaire. In Nigeria, Senior Secondary School Class 3 and Junior Secondary School Class 3 were exempted from the survey because of their entrance examination. They were busy writing their examination, so there was not time to conduct the survey for them

Data Analysis

        Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to analyze the data and make inferences. Independent t test was used to quantify differences in nationality and gender on participants' attitudes toward disciplinary styles.

RESULTS

        The results from this study show the attitudes of 285 British and Nigerian teachers' and students' attitudes toward disciplinary styles. The data were analyzed through the use of Factor Analysis, and Independent Sample Test. Three factors (aggressive style, relationship based style and reward/punishment style) were generated from disciplinary styles questionnaire.

        Factor Analysis was employed in order to reduce the data and obtain the latent variables from the observed variables. Also, the differences in nationality, gender and student or teacher disciplinary styles were found through Independent Sample Test.

        Analysis of the data shows that some subscales have significant differences for disciplinary styles with other related variables such as nationality, gender, age and student or teacher while others do not have. Nevertheless, to avoid repetition of data, only significant findings are reported. Details of the results are presented as follows.

Descriptive statistics of demographic variables

        The information below shows the descriptive statistics of the mean, standard deviation and percentage of students and teachers who participated in the study, their nationality, age, and gender. The number of students and teachers involved in this research were 85.5% and 14.4% respectively ($M = 1.14$ $SD = .35$). Among the students and teachers, Nigerians were 46.7% while British were 53.3% ($M = 1.53$ $SD = .50$). The male participants were 36.1%, while

the female participants were 63.1% (M = 1.64 SD = .48). The mean and standard deviation of the participants' age are 16.3 and 6.48 respectively.

Factor analysis of the disciplinary styles questionnaire

Previous analyses have not conducted a factor analysis for this 24- item questionnaire, so a factor analysis was conducted on the scale. From the analysis, three factors were generated. Also, all the factors displayed have an eigenvalues greater than 1. The scree plot starts to flatten after factor number 5. However, 3 factor solutions was the clearest in term of attaining simple structure, however, the scree plot did indicate that a 5 factor solution was also a potentially good fit. But the 5 factor solution was not effective because it did not form a simple structure. The combination of factors 1, 2, and 3 accounted for 37.604% of the total variance and 29.781% after extraction. In addition, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test and the Bartlett's Test of Sphericity also show that the data is suitable for factor analysis.

Furthermore, the pattern matrix of the three factors provided a simple structure after performing Promax rotation. The criteria used to classify low and high scores in each subscale are factor loadings less than or equal to .30 or greater than or equal to .40 respectively. Items with high loadings in each factor were categorized into relationship based style, aggressive style and reward/punishment style. Also, the guidelines used to consider low and high scores in each subscale are factor loadings less than or equal to .30 and greater than or equal to .40 respectively. The Relationship subscale consisted of 8 items (α = .68), the reward/punishment subscale consisted of 7 items (α = .73), and the aggressive style subscale consisted of 4 items (α = .57)   (See Table 1). The Cronbach's alpha for all the items in the questionnaire is .67. This is lower than the reliability that was gotten from the previous study (Lewis, 2001) that used this questionnaire.

Item 6, 14, 15, 16 were not considered further because of low loading.

Table 1
Factor loading high on items for disciplinary styles

Item no	Description	Factor		
		1	2	3
1	Yell angrily at student who misbehave			.64
2	Deliberately embarrasses student who misbehave			.74
3	Keep the class in or detain the class because some students misbehave			.63
4	Makes sarcastic comments to students who misbehave			.36
5	Describes what the students are doing wrong, and expect them to stop	.58		.
7	Remind misbehaving students about the class rules	.53		
8	Describes how students are misbehaving to make them decide whether to stop or not	.52		
9	Discusses students' behavior with them to allow them figure out a better way to behave in the future	.64		
10	Let students talk about their side of things so that it can be understood	.43		
11	Gets students to understand why their behavior is a problem for others by discussing it with them	.71		
12	Gets student to change the way they behave by helping them understand how their behavior affects others	.62		
13	Organizes the class to work out the rules for good behaviour	.39		
17	Rewards individual students who behave properly		.50	
19	Praises individual students for good		.62	

	behaviour	
20	Rewards the class when students behave well	.55
21	Give out consequences to students who misbehave (e.g. move their seat, detention)	.68
22	Increases the level of consequences if students will not do as they are told (e.g. move seat, detention)	.68
23	Increases the level of consequences if a misbehaving student argues	.39
24	Increases consequences if a student continue to misbehave.	.48

Nationality differences on disciplinary styles

It was also hypothesized that there would be a significant difference between British's and Nigerian's attitudes in respect to disciplinary styles. This was in order to observe the influence of cultures on these variables. Table 2 shows means and standard deviation for the attitudes of English and Nigerians teachers and students for the disciplinary styles subscales. The following subscales were found to have significant difference: Aggressive style subscale for British (M = 10.67, SD = 2.78), and for Nigerians (M = 7.79, SD = 3.02), t (283) = -8.41, p < .05; relationship based style for British (M = 14.87, SD = 4.67), and for Nigerians (M = 13.47, SD = 4.43), t (283) = -2.59, p< .05. These results suggest that British appear to be more supportive of aggressive and relationship based style of discipline than Nigerians. Therefore, the hypothesis is supported.

Table 2. Independent t-test of British and Nigerian attitudes toward disciplinary styles

Variable	British		Nigerian			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
Relationship based	14.87	4.67	13.47	4.43	-2.59	.01
Aggressive	10.67	2.78	7.79	3.02	-8.41	.00

Gender difference on disciplinary styles.

The independent sample t-test was also used in Table 3 test the hypothesis that significant difference existed between the attitudes of male and female on disciplinary styles. This was tested in order to examine the influence of gender. This subscale reveals a significant difference: Aggressive style subscale for male (M = 8.47, SD = 3.02), and female (M = 9.81, SD = 3.25), t (235) = -3.43, p< .05. This result indicated that females tend to support aggressive style of discipline than males. Thus, the hypothesis for this subscale is supported.

Table 3. Independent t-test of Male and female attitudes on disciplinary styles

Variable	Male		Female			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	*p*
Aggressive	8.47	2.78	9.81	3.25	-3.43	.01

Student and teacher difference on disciplinary styles

The independent sample t-test was employed in Table 4 to demonstrate the differences between student and teacher on disruptive behaviour and disciplinary styles. The following subscales reveal significant differences: relationship based style for student (*M* = 14.52, *SD* = 4.58), and teacher (*M* = 12.43, *SD* = 4.40), *t* (283) = 2.72, *p* = < .05; reward/punishment style for student (*M* =13.40, *SD* = 5.33), and teacher (*M* =11.42, *SD* = 5.76), *t* (283) = 2.17, *p* = < .05; Aggressive style for students (*M* =9.14, *SD* = 3.28), and teacher (*M* =10.42, *SD* = 2.71), *t* (283) = -2.37, *p* = < .05. The results showed that students are more supportive of relationship based style and reward/punishment style of discipline than teachers. However, teachers appear to be more supportive of aggressive style of discipline than students.

Table 4. Independent t-test of Student and teachers attitudes on disciplinary styles

	Student		Teacher			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	*P*
Relationship based	14.52	4.58	12.43	4.40	2.72	.00
Reward/punishment	13.40	5.33	11.42	5.76	2.17	.03
Aggressive	9.14	3.28	10.42	2.71	-2.37	.02

P < 0.05

DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to examine the attitudes of Nigerian and British students and teachers toward disciplinary styles. The hypothesis which indicated the differences in Nationality, gender, student or teacher regarding disciplinary styles was partially supported.

It was also hypothesized that there will be a significant difference between the attitudes of students and teachers in Nigeria and England on disciplinary styles. The results showed that the hypothesis was partially supported as a significant difference was discovered between Nigerians and English students and teachers on disciplinary styles. That is, a significant difference was found between British and Nigerian on their attitudes toward relationship based style and aggressive style of discipline. These results confirmed previous research that found cultural differences in disciplinary styles (Irene, 2004; Obidah, 2004). Specifically, these current results are consistent with the findings of Abrifor (2008), as it was discovered that Nigerians teachers perceived the use of coercive discipline to be most effective in maintaining order and control, while English teachers perceived the use of encouragement and establishing relationship with the students to be the most effective disciplinary style (Bain, Houghton & Williams, 1991). This result gave a clear picture of the discipline policies adopted in both countries. For instance, in Nigeria although some schools banned the use of physical punishment, it has not yet become a national law. But in England, such disciplinary style is an offence.

It was hypothesized that females would perceive the severity of the use of disciplinary style more than their counterparts. The results showed a significant difference between male and female on aggressive style of discipline. Female participants were found to be more supportive of the use of aggressive style of discipline than male participants. This is in contrast with the findings that boys tend to be more aggressive (Wheldall & Merrett, 1993; Wright &

Dusek, 1998). A plausible explanation to the result which shows that females are more supportive of aggressive style of discipline may be due to the fact that the content of the aggressive subscale in the disciplinary style questionnaire focuses more on verbal aggression. Kaj (1994) study confirms that males engage more in physical aggression, while females use more verbal aggression. Although the results in these studies show significant difference between males and females on aggressiveness, the researchers only used young boys and girls in high school between ages 13 and 17 without the involvement of their teachers.

The hypothesis that teachers would judge the severity of the use of disciplinary styles less than students between students was supported. It was discovered that there is a significant difference between student and teacher on relationship based style, reward/punishment style and aggressive style of discipline. That is, for the disciplinary styles, all the subscales show a significant difference.

The current result indicated that students are more supportive of relationship based style of discipline than teacher. However, two different studies conducted by Lewis et al. (2005) and Lewis et al. (2008) found Chinese teachers to be more relational and supportive of students' voices in their disciplinary approach and also discovered that students perceived discussing about disruptive behaviour with teachers to be more effective than punishment.

In addition, students agree more to the use of reward/punishment style of discipline than teachers. That is, there is a significant difference between students and teachers regarding reward/punishment. This is consistent with the study of Shreeve et al. (2002). They found that students perceived giving gifts, time and marks to be the most effective reward system, while after-school detentions and a letter home or phone calls to their parents were found to be the most effective method of punishment. But for teachers, they discovered that tangible rewards such as sweets, vouchers, certificates and fastfood were seen to be the most effective reward system, while they were of the opinion that teachers should determine the disciplinary style to be utilized in classroom. This was further confirmed in Burns (1978) study, as he found that students perceived personal achievement to be the most effective form of reward, while teachers saw adult approval to be most effective.

Students and teachers preferences or needs could be one possible reason for the differences in their perception of the use of reward/punishment style of discipline. For instance, the preferences or needs of most students is to get good marks, be given quality time by the teacher and to achieve their goals in school (Shreeve et al., 2002). Therefore, it is not out of place to discover that these were what they consider to be the most effective reward system. Also, sending letters home or phone calls to parents was seen to be most effective probably because students do not want to appear irresponsible before their parents.

Furthermore, there is a significant difference between students and teachers on aggressive style of discipline. Teachers are found to be more supportive of this style of discipline than students. This may be because teachers are the ones using this approach, so they might not fully understand the impact of such an approach on students. This result is consistent with Australian and Chinese research in which 49% of Chinese and 59% of Australian teachers adopt aggressive behaviours rarely to sometime; 9% of Chinese and 13% of Australian teachers sometimes or more frequently (Riley, Lewis & Wang, 2012), while students perceived the use of aggressive approach to be ineffective and often leads to more classroom misbehaviour (Miller, Ferguson & Byrne, 2000). Although not all teachers are in support of the use of aggressive style of discipline, the two studies provide a clear difference between teachers and students perceptions toward aggressive strategies in classroom.

A limitation to this current study was that the sampling of schools was a problem in this study. The study did not just compared nationalities; instead it compared a small sample of schools within each nation. 153 students and teachers from two schools in England participated in the study, while 132 students and teachers from three schools in Nigeria were involved in the study. Therefore, considering the population in both nations, it is difficult to generalise with great confidence to the whole nation. Also, the questionnaire on attitudes toward disciplinary styles was used for Nigeria population without carrying out a pilot study.

Future research in this area should be conducted with a larger sample in England and Nigeria or any other European and African countries in order to enhance generalization of the findings. Future research should also use the same nationalities to conduct a study on the disciplinary styles used by teachers rather than their judgements of disciplinary styles.

In conclusion, participants in each nationality had different opinions as regards the severity of the types of disciplinary styles appropriate in regulating such behaviour. Students and teachers also had different attitudes toward disciplinary styles. But males and females differ only in their attitudes toward aggressive style of discipline. Consequently, it is very important for teachers and school authorities to understand the disciplinary strategies that are appropriate and effective in regulating specific disruptive behaviour and maintaining order or control in classrooms.

REFERENCES

Abrifor, C.A. (2008). Teachers' perception on the effectiveness of physical punishment as a disciplinary measure in selected secondary schools in Ile-Ife, Osun State. *Ife PsychologIA*, 16(2), 275-294.

Aravanis, G. (1998). *Discipline in education: the role of punishments and rewards in school and kindergarten*. Athens, Publication Grigori.

Bain, A., Houghton, S., & Williams, T. (1991). Effects of a school-wide behaviour Management programme on teachers' use of encouragement in the classroom. *Educational Studies, 17(3),* 249-260.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*, 239-253.

Burns, R.B. (1978). The relative effectiveness of various incentives and deterrents as judged by pupils and teachers. *Educational Studies, 4(3),* 229-243.

Caffyn, R.E. (1989). Attitudes of British secondary school teachers and pupils to rewards and punishments. *Educational Research, 31(3),* 210-220.

Charles, C.M., & Senter, G.W. (2005). *Elementary classroom management* (4thed.). New York: Pearson Education.

George, G.B., Maureen, A.M., & Kunio, S. (2006).Children's reasoning about aggression: Differences between Japan and the United States and implications for school discipline. *School Psychology review, 35(1),* 62-77.

Highfield, M.E & Pinsent, A. (1952).In Burns, R.B. (1978).The relative effectiveness of various incentives and deterrents as judged by pupils and teachers. *Educational Studies, 4(3),* 229-243.

Houghton, S., Merrett, F. &Wheldall, K. (1988). The attitudes of British secondary school pupils to praise, rewards, punishments and reprimands. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 23(2),* 203-214.

Infantino, J., & Little, E. (2005). Students' perceptions of classroom behaviour problems and the effectiveness of different disciplinary methods. *Educational Psychology, 25(5), 491-508.*

Kaj, B. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal, and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles, 30 (4),* 177-188.

Lewis, R. (2001). Classroom discipline and student responsibility: the students' view. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17(2), 307-319*

Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y.J. (2005). Teachers' classroom discipline in Australia, China and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21(6),* 729-741.

Lewis, R., Romi, S., Qui, X., & Katz, Y.J. (2008). Students' reaction to classroom discipline in Australia, China and Israel. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(3)* 715-724.

Little, E. (2005).Secondary school teachers' perceptions of students' problem behaviours. *Educational Psychology, 25(4), 369-377.*

Ma, X., & Willms, J.D. (2004). School disciplinary climate: Characteristics and effects on eight grade achievement. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 50(2), 169-188.*

Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1993). How do teachers learn to manage classroom behaviour? A study of teachers' opinions about their initial training with special reference to classroom behaviour management. *Educational Studies, 19(1),* 91-106.

Nakpodia, E.D. (2010). Teachers' disciplinary approaches to students' discipline problems in Nigeria secondary schools. *International NGO Journal, 5(6),* 144-151.

Nancy, R., & Christopher, T. (2004). Aggressive and violent behaviour in youth: Implications for clinical assessment and intervention. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 35,* 260-277.

Pianta, R.C. (2006). Classroom management and relationships between children and teachers implications for research and practice. In C.M.Evertson & C.S.Weinstein (Eds.), *International Handbook of Classroom Management Research, Practice and Contemporary Issues* (pp. 685-709). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pullis, M. (1991). Practical considerations of excluding conduct disordered students: An empirical analysis. *Behavioral Disorders, 17,* 9-22.

Riley, P.*,* Lewis, R. & Wang, B. (2012). Investigating teachers' explanations for aggressive classroom discipline strategies in China and Australia. *Educational Psychology, 32(2),* 389-403*.*

Roache, J.E., & Lewis, R. (2011). The carrot, the stick, or the relationship: what are the effective disciplinary strategies? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *34(2),* 233-248.

Shreeve, A., Boddington, D., Bernard, B., Brown, K., Clarke, K., Dean, L., Elkins, T., Kemp, S.,Lees, J., Miller, D., Oakley, J., & Shiret.(2002). Student perceptions of rewards and sanctions. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 10(2),* 239-256.

Stephen, K.S. (2000). Gender disparity between the attitudes of senior secondary school students toward juvenile delinquency in Botswana. *Education, 120(2),* 369-377.

Veronique, S., Roger, F., Badiaa, B & Faith, F (2009). Teachers' sanction in the classroom: Effect of age, experience, gender and academic context. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25,* 1-11.

Wheldall, K., & Merrett, F. (1993). How do teachers learn to manage classroom behaviour? A study of teachers' opinions about their initial training with special reference to classroom behaviour management. *Educational Studies,* 19(1), 91-106.