

UDK: 37.091.5:37.091.212(497.5)
Original scientific paper

EXPERIENCES OF STUDENTS WITH IMPOSED PEDAGOGICAL MEASURES

Andreja Gregurić Jug

*Department of Education, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
Republic of Croatia
agjug11@gmail.com*

Ante Kolak

*Department of Education, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
Republic of Croatia
akolak@ffzg.hr*

Iva Vučić, alumna

*Department of Education, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
University of Zagreb
Republic of Croatia
iva.vucic991@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Statistics on the imposition of pedagogical measures due to inappropriate behaviour show an increase in schools in the Republic of Croatia, while pedagogical theory and practice are not clearly and fully harmonized with its justification. On the one hand, there are those who advocate the application of punishments, and consider them justified and necessary; on the other hand, there are those who claim that punishment strategies do not give the desired result - a change in behaviour. The empirical part of this paper focuses on the experiences of students with the imposed measure. Qualitative research has determined the structure and recurrence of the imposition of pedagogical measures, the justification of the consequences from the student's perspective.

Students express the justification of the measures imposed and negative emotional reactions such as anger, sadness and shame. Different reactions of parents and the environment are visible. Participants believe that pedagogical measures mainly influence a change of behaviour, but for different reasons, and believe that pedagogical measures imposed due to unacceptable behaviour are necessary for the functioning of the school system.

Key words: pedagogical measures, unacceptable behaviours, punishment.

INTRODUCTORY CONSIDERATIONS

The history of pedagogy records different and contradictory approaches to pedagogical measures. The most common school educational strategy was corporal punishment. Over time, such practices have become humanized because corporal punishment is prohibited. Punishments are in line with the Charter of Human Rights and the rights of the child are respected and much milder than those recorded in the history of pedagogy, respecting the principle of avoiding cruelty and the degrading character of punishment. Students' attitudes towards punishment have also changed significantly due to the pedocentric approach to today's students who are perceived as participants in the pedagogical relationship, losing their position of a person who obediently obeys the authorities. From the positioning of students to whom the whole educational process is directed, it is evident that the concept of obedience education has been replaced by the concept of responsibility education.

Considering these significant changes, it remains to point out that the essence of the pedagogical relationship is in the fact that it is a relationship in which the mature being acts on the developing being and has an educational intention, and when imposing pedagogical measures it is necessary to critically consider the dimensions of pedagogical relationship related to authority and responsibility (asymmetry), and the transfer of power and responsibility to the student with a tendency to symmetry.

The imposition of pedagogical measures is based on the principles of gradualness, proportionality, fairness and timeliness. Pedagogical measures are imposed for breach of duty, failure to fulfill obligations, violent behaviour and other inappropriate behaviours. The weight of unacceptable behaviour is also taken into account (Pravilnik o kriterijima za izricanje pedagoških mjera NN 94/2015). A student who behaves unacceptably may be imposed a pedagogical measure in accordance with the provisions of the Law on Education in Primary and Secondary School, the Ordinance on Criteria for Imposing Pedagogical Measures and the school Statute. The purpose of imposing a pedagogical measure in case of unacceptable behaviour is to impose a change in the behaviour of students to whom the measure was imposed and to encourage responsible and appropriate behaviour of other students (Pravilnik o kriterijima za izricanje pedagoških mjera NN 94/2015; Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi NN 64/2020).

“The essence of punishment is that the child feels discomfort because of their previous behavior, which will ensure that such behavior does not repeat.”

(Maleš, Kušević, 2008, 53). Pedagogical measures should encourage students to assume responsibility and adopt a positive attitude towards school obligations and the environment. One of the most common pedagogical measures in the form of punishment in schools is reprimand. Kyriacou (2001) defines punishment as “a formal act that the student should experience as embarrassment”. The author emphasizes that after the punishment, students should understand what they did wrong and develop the need for future acceptable behaviour. Some studies have proven that reprimand is ineffective and it is recommended to replace it with positive reinforcements, unlike other studies that have shown that the application of reprimands with praise is effective (Axelrod, according to Čudina-Obradović, 1991). It has been shown that reprimand is more effective in extroverted individuals, while it is less effective in introverted and anxious individuals (Čudina-Obradović 1991). Hurlock (1925) concludes that praise has more power than punishment, while White (1959, according to Čudina-Obradović, 1991) proves that only six percent of social reinforcers in class occur spontaneously and that reprimands are more common. Dweck et al. (1978) proved that boys receive more praise for learning and girls for discipline. Nadjanović-Tomić (1996) also proved in her research that the ratio of the application of punishment is higher in schools. Punishments should be in the service of maintaining discipline, and Foucault (1994) describes the school penal micro-system by distinguishing categories:

- Time (delays, absences)
- Attitude towards work (negligence, carelessness)
- Behaviour (rudeness, disobedience)
- Expression (chattering, impoliteness)
- Sexuality (vulgarity, impropriety)

Empirical research that had as its subject the students' perception of the effectiveness of pedagogical measures showed that despite the positivist approach, pedagogical measures are most often applied in the form of punishment for bad behavior. Students associated rewards with learning and punishments with behavior. It is interesting that almost half of the respondents pointed out that they would behave more carelessly if they were aware of the fact that teachers do not apply punishment in their work. Based on the aforementioned research findings, the author concludes that without restriction, students respect the teacher's authority less (Ching, 2012).

Modern pedagogical knowledge considers rewards to be more stimulating pedagogical measures than punishment, although some teachers emphasize that

punishment is necessary to preserve authority and discipline in the classroom (Hastings, Jenkins, 2005; Meščić Blažević, 2007). Authors who point out that punishment strategies usually do not produce the desired result (change in student behaviour), suggest that “empirically proven interventions are more often implemented in schools, which will help students who manifest risky behaviours to choose more socially acceptable and personally constructive forms of behaviour” (Bouillet, 2010, 270).

STATISTICS OF IMPOSED PEDAGOGICAL MEASURES IN THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

The imposition of pedagogical measures of warning, reprimand, severe reprimand, transfer to another school or exclusion from the existing one are the best-known preventive measures that try to suppress undesirable behaviour of primary and secondary school students. The information provided by the Ministry of Science and Education of the Republic of Croatia (Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja [MZO], 2021.) says that in 2013/2014 the trend of imposing pedagogical measures was on a significant increase - so in that school year 76,029 pedagogical measures were imposed. Taking into account everyday situations in which students often present undesirable forms of behaviour, the trend of their expression is decreasing. In the 2014/2015 school year, the number of imposed pedagogical measures amounted to 66,828, in the 2015/2016 school year it was 49,822, in the 2016/2017 school year it was 40,344, in the 2017/2018 school year 37,681, and in the 2018/2019 school year 37,006 measures were imposed. In 2020, with the emergence of the COVID-19 virus and the involvement of students in online classes, the number of imposed measures fell to only 21,465, while in 2020/2021 it was slightly more, i.e. 25,503.

Table 1. Pedagogical measures imposed in total

	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017/ 2018	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021
Number of students in primary and secondary schools in Croatia	508 955	500 980	488 977	480 401	472 321	464 581	460 692	457 919
Number of pedagogical measures imposed	76 029	66 828	49 822	40 344	37 681	37 006	21 465	25 503
Percentage	14.94 %	13.34%	10.19%	8.40%	7.98%	7.97%	4.66%	5.57%

According to the data given in Table 2, we can claim that the measures were imposed much more often in secondary school than in primary school. According to the above, it is evident that between 70 and 87% of pedagogical measures were pronounced in secondary school, while the rest were pronounced in elementary school. It can be seen that the trend of imposing pedagogical measures in primary schools has been constantly increasing in recent years. Thus, almost 13% of pedagogical measures in the 2013/2014 school year were imposed to elementary school students, while last school year (2020/2021), that number was slightly higher than 30%.

Table 2. Total pedagogical measures in primary and secondary schools

	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017/ 2018	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021
Total number of pedagogical measures imposed	76 029	66 828	49 822	40 344	37 681	37 006	21 465	25 503
Number of pedagogical measures imposed in primary school	9 562	8 895	8 928	7 314	8 223	9 143	5 327	7 610
Number of pedagogical measures imposed in secondary school	66 467	57 933	40 894	33 030	29 458	27 863	16 138	17 893

Pedagogical measures are imposed to a much greater extent on boys than on girls. About 70% of pedagogical measures were imposed on boys, and 30% on girls. This is supported by numerous studies of externalizing behaviours in children, which are more often manifested in boys. One such study was conducted

by Zrilić (2017), which shows that 73% of 2nd grade boys and 53% of 4th grade boys manifest behaviours associated with externalized behaviour disorders. Such behaviours are also called predominantly active. They refer to insufficiently controlled behaviours directed towards others (Bouillet, Uzelac, 2007). Bouillet (2010a) describes them as disruptive. They are much clearer, more noticeable and more intense, and therefore more prone to the imposition of pedagogical measures.

Table 3. Total pedagogical measures by gender

	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017/ 2018	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021
Total number of pedagogical measures imposed	76 029	66 828	49 822	40 344	37 681	37 006	21 465	25 503
Number of pedagogical measures imposed on boys	50 851	45 450	34 871	28 125	26 709	26 641	15 859	18 412
Number of pedagogical measures imposed on girls	25 178	21 378	14 951	12 219	10 972	10 365	5 613	7 091

According to Table 4, it can be seen that the most frequently pronounced pedagogical measure was warning. On average, it makes for about 62% of all pronounced measures in the period from 2013/2014 to 2020/2021. It is followed by the pedagogical measure reprimand with 27%. They are followed by a warning before expulsion, a strict reprimand and the most severe pedagogical measures of relocation to another school.

Table 4. Total imposed pedagogical measures by type

	2013/ 2014	2014/ 2015	2015/ 2016	2016/ 2017	2017./ 2018.	2018/ 2019	2019/ 2020	2020/ 2021
Total number of pedagogical measures imposed	76 029	66 828	49 822	40 344	37 681	37 006	21 465	25 503
Warning	42 987	39 957	32 283	26 185	24 547	24 155	14 938	17 491
Reprimand	21 193	18 208	12 817	10 408	9 587	9 489	4 977	6 102
Strict reprmand	839	592	552	513	528	543	269	375

Warning before expulsion	8 615	6 833	3 616	2 803	2 579	2 363	1 047	1 313
Exclusion from school	139	449	531	420	431	428	227	213
Relocation to another school	-	-	18	14	9	28	7	9

According to the data of the Ministry of Science and Education (MZO, 2021), it is evident that the growth of imposed pedagogical measures was greater with the transition to a higher grade. In elementary school, very few pedagogic measures were given in lower grades. Most pedagogical measures were imposed in the 7th and 8th grades, while in high school it was most often at its peak in the 3rd grade.

METHODOLOGY

Different approaches to rewarding and punishing, and especially to the imposition of pedagogical measures, and the discrepancy between pedagogical theory and pedagogical practice has been the impetus for the empirical part. It has not been sufficiently investigated whether the imposition of pedagogical measures has a clear purpose and what their imposition actually achieves for students, that is, whether pedagogical measures prevent further unacceptable behaviour. According to the Ordinance on criteria for the imposition of pedagogical measures, the purpose of imposing pedagogical measures is not and should not be to punish students for unacceptable behavior, but an incentive not to commit such behaviour again - that is, prevention of further unacceptable behaviour. The topic of punishment as a pedagogical measure is represented in school practice on a daily basis, and from the available research it is evident that the perspectives of students are rarely represented. Research that takes the students' perspective often provides the best source of information to help us understand their experience. Empirical research whose subjects are students is changing its orientation and instead of seeking information about students, they are focusing on obtaining information directly from students (Docherty, Sandelowski, 1999). Students are allowed to express their experience in their own way and express their personal perspective. In the issue of this paper, which is focused on the imposition of pedagogical measures, this method is a valuable source. Car and Jeđud Borić (2016) and Einarsdóttir (2007) emphasize the necessity of respecting the "student's voice", which stems from the belief that children, just like adults, are complete persons who have a unique view of their own experience and the world they live

in and have the right to be heard. Koller-Trbović and Širanović (2017, 48) confirm that such “research” is of particular importance because they bring the perspective of the participants/children, and the above applies especially when it comes to a stigmatized population such as students who have been given a pedagogic measure. The aforementioned authors, respecting the student’s right to participate, conclude that scientific and research production on children’s participation in Croatia is numerically weak. Taking into account all of the above, as well as the specificity of the topic of this paper, the empirical part of this work is focused on the experiences of students as equal participants who deserve the opportunity to express their views on life. The objective of the empirical part of the work is to describe the experience of imposing pedagogical measures. In accordance with the aim of the research, the following research questions were formulated:

Diagnostic questions

1. What pedagogical measure was imposed on the student?
2. Why was the pedagogical measure imposed?
3. Is this the first measure imposed on the student?

I. Justification of pedagogical measures

1. Does the student think that the pedagogical measure was justified?
 - a. Should the imposed measure have been milder/stricter?

II. The consequences of the imposed pedagogical measures

1. How did the student feel after the imposition of the pedagogical measure?
2. How did the student’s parents/guardians react to the pedagogical measure?
 - a. Did the student have some form of “punishment” due to the imposed measure?
3. Has the attitude of the professor or peers towards the student changed due to the imposed pedagogical measure?

III. Reflection

1. Did the imposition of a pedagogical measure affect the student’s behavior?
 - a. Does the student consider that he has learned something through the imposition of a pedagogical measure?

2. Does the student think that the imposition of a pedagogical measure is effective?
 - a. Would the student repeat the behavior for which the pedagogical measure was imposed?
 - b. Would the student behave the same if pedagogical measures did not exist?

Qualitative research methodology was applied in this research. A semi-structured interview was used in order to gain a deeper insight into the student's experience with the stated pedagogical measure. A purposive sample of participants was included in the research, considering that the students' experience with the imposition of a pedagogical measure is important to us. The students' voluntary consent was obtained. Taking into account all of the above, as well as the Code of Ethics for research with children, the sample consisted of a total of nine participants who met all the set criteria.

The research was conducted on a non-probabilistic, purposive sample of respondents. The total sample in this research consists of nine research participants, i.e. six male and three female participants. Most of the participants, namely five of them, are students of the sixth grade. Two are students of the seventh grade, one is a fifth-grade student and one an eight-grade student. The participants were selected purposefully with regard to characteristics relevant to the purpose of the research. When selecting the participants, special attention was paid to include different types of participants in order to get a broader picture of the students' attitudes to the pedagogical measure that was imposed on them. According to Milas (2005), the obtained results gain a higher degree of generality if a larger number of individuals who are in a different situation are analyzed, provided that they have general common characteristics, so we were guided by this when selecting the sample. Participants who had various unacceptable behaviours for which a pedagogical measure was imposed, participants to whom this was the first pedagogic measure, as well as those for whom the imposition of the measure was repeated, different ages of students, as well as the inclusion of both male and female genders, were chosen.

This research, while limited in size, has sought to capture some of the complexity attached to experiences of students with the imposed pedagogical measure. The sample of this research confirms that „samples in qualitative research tend to be small in order to support the depth of case-oriented analysis that is fundamental to this mode of inquiry” (Vasilelou, 2018:149). The sample also confirms that „qualitative samples are purposive, that is, selected by virtue of

their capacity to provide richly-textured information, relevant to the phenomenon under investigation” (Vasilelou, 2018:2). Sandelowski (1995) recommends that qualitative sample sizes should be large enough to allow the unfolding of a ‘new and richly textured understanding’ of the phenomenon under study, but small enough for the deep, case-oriented analysis to be conducted.

The sample of this research was guided by saturation which is the most widely used principle for determining sample size and evaluating its sufficiency.

In the presentation of the results related to gender, the data grafting technique was used in order to increase protection of the anonymity of the research participants. The same technique was used in the analysis of the results and interpretation if the participants stated the gender of the teacher or the gender of the participants in the incident. The interview used was designed specifically for the needs of this research. The first part of the interview consisted of introductory questions, from which an attempt was made to determine basic data about the student, as well as data on the obtained pedagogical measures of the student and the severity of unacceptable behaviours that led to the imposition of the pedagogical measure. The second part of the interview sought to obtain data on the consequences of the imposed pedagogical measure, that is, the influence of the pedagogical measure on the student and their environment and the attitude of the environment towards the student after the pedagogical measure was imposed. The third part of the interview examined the student’s attitude to pedagogical measures, their role and effectiveness in preventing further unacceptable behaviour. The conversation was recorded with a voice recorder with the consent of the respondent as well as the parent/guardian, all for the purpose of presenting the opinion of the respondent as accurately as possible for the purposes of this research and later processing of the obtained data.

Data processing was carried out in such a way that each audio recording was carefully listened to and later a written record was made for easier visibility, as well as a comparison of all examined participants. Milas (2005) states that in this type of research, comparing the obtained data enables a deeper understanding of the individually obtained information - and thus guides the further processing of the data. The answers were analyzed, those relevant to the research were selected and divided into categories. The determined answers were compared and those that matched or did not match were grouped with the ultimate goal of presenting a final conclusion, that is, a unified answer to each individual research question.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the search for an answer to the first research question from the interview with the students and related to the imposed pedagogical measures, it is evident that of the interviewed students, five students were reprimanded for fighting, two for falsifying a test, one for recording a fight and one for falsifying an apology letter. Out of the total number of respondents, four repeated the unacceptable behaviour, while for five respondents this was the first imposed pedagogical measure.

This is not the first pedagogical measure imposed on research participant S1. In the first semester, he received a warning, and in the 2nd semester, he received two reprimands. He received a warning for fighting. He received the first reprimand because he presented someone else's work as his own, and he received the second reprimand again for fighting. It all started over messages in which another student insulted him and called him derogatory names, and he retaliated in kind. It resulted in a fight behind the school. At first they pushed each other, and then another student fell on the floor "... then I kicked him, after that he cursed at me and he threw my glasses on the floor and I punched him in the head." (S1) He claims that the student had no more serious consequences than the blows received in the fight. When asked if the fight solved the problem in the end, he replied that it was better for a month, he did not insult him, but that it started again. This time he decided to just block and ignore him. S6 received a pedagogical reprimand for recording a fight between two boys with a cell phone. He claims that at the beginning he did not think that it would be such a strong fight. "...at the beginning I thought it would be completely normal because they had already agreed on a fight and then went behind...and then they said I should film it." (S6) This is the first pedagogical measure imposed on the research participant. Research participant S4 also got the first pedagogical measure of reprimand for falsifying an exam. He was one point short of a good grade (3), which meant he had a very good success in that subject at the end of the year. He got a pass (2) and thought that was his only choice. Research participant S8 received the first pedagogic reprimand for fighting. "...A boy stabbed me twice in the butt, like...in the chest...and twice in the butt, and then I stabbed him once...and then we started fighting...here at school..." (S8) Research participant S7 has already been given a pedagogic warning or reprimand several times for using a cell phone and participating in a fight. He received the last reprimand for fighting. "...A boy has been challenging me constantly for a couple of days. And that one day he came to the toilet and attacked me there. And there we had a little fight, this and that." The S9 student had previously received a

warning, and this was the first reprimand given to him also for fighting. "...I was going to the toilet and a boy came who was causing problems... I was going to go out and now, typical of me, I said something to him, but I didn't because I don't hang out with him at all. And at the end he swung his hand at me, he was going to hit me...And then we fought and went to class. I said it to the class teacher, and she said it to the pedagogue. "Research participant S5 received the first pedagogic reprimand for forging an apology letter. The student was absent from class due to nausea and his mother knew about the absence, but he did the above due to fear of the consequences for being late with the apology letter. "I was late with the apology letter and since I got scared and forgot and I signed the apology and gave it to the class teacher. She asked me if I had signed it, I said that I had so..." Research participant S2 received the first pedagogic reprimand for, as he states, two problems "...I copied the math test from the student behind..." "...the geography exam. We got the results and I was missing a point up to get a good mark. I was missing one line because I just drew a circle, then I just wrote a line and then the teacher figured it out and then..." (S2). Research participant S3 declares that this is one of the many pedagogical measures imposed on him, but that this time it was by no means correctly imposed "...two boys were hitting each other. I got a pedagogical measure just for trying to stop the fight."

In conclusion, all of the examined students received a pedagogical measure of reprimand. Five students were reprimanded for fighting, two for falsifying a test, one for recording a fight and one for forging an apology letter. Out of all the examined students, five received the pedagogical measure for the first time, while four had already been imposed a measure before.

Table 5. Distribution of respondents according to class and type of pedagogical measure

Participant	Class	Pedagogical measure	Reason	First pedagogical measure	Repeated pedagogical measure
S1	6th	Reprimand	A fight		+
S2	6th	Reprimand	Exam falsification	+	
S3	6th	Reprimand	A fight		+
S4	6th	Reprimand	Exam falsification	+	
S5	8th	Reprimand	Forgery of apology	+	
S6	6th	Reprimand	Filming a fight	+	
S7	7th	Reprimand	A fight		+
S8	5th	Reprimand	A fight	+	
S9	7th	Reprimand	A fight		+

In search of an answer to the second research question, we focused on examining students' attitudes to the justification of the pedagogical measure from their perspective. When asked if they think the pedagogical measure was justified, eight out of nine students answered affirmatively, that is, they considered the pedagogical measure justified, but six students disagree with the severity and criteria for imposing pedagogical measures. S1 considers the stated pedagogical measure "fair", as does student S2, who concludes that others worked hard while he decided to copy. He realized that this was not right and that he deserved a pedagogical measure. S5 agrees with the reprimand because he would never dare to do something like that again. She claims that at the beginning she did not understand why such a severe pedagogical measure was imposed on her, but now she understands and regrets her unacceptable behaviour. Students S6, S4, S8 and S9 also agree with the reprimand given as a pedagogical measure, but they think it could have been somewhat milder. Student S7 believes that the reprimand was justified, and he believes that he should have received a stricter pedagogical measure for the tresspass committed. Only one participant (S3) believes that the pedagogical measure of reprimand that was last given to him was not deserved. He claims that he only separated the students in the fight, and he received the same pedagogical measure as the students who were fighting. Regarding the previously imposed pedagogical measures, he thinks that they were justly imposed. The

mentioned last statement of the research participant leaves open the question of the stigmatization of students with the imposed pedagogical measure, with a tendency to punish them even in cases where they are not responsible for the behaviour.

To questions concerning the repetition of unacceptable behaviour for which students received a pedagogical measure, that is, whether they would repeat such behaviour if it had been imposed to them earlier, they answered mostly with the answer that they would not. Seven out of nine students answered that they would not, while two students answered the opposite. Students S6, S4, S8 think that they would not repeat the unacceptable behaviour if they had been given a pedagogical measure in advance. S5 and S2 believe that they would not repeat such behaviour because they were aware of the consequences. They believe that because of "... reprimand, he must not do such things". S9 also claims that he would not have repeated the unacceptable behavior if he had been given a pedagogical measure earlier, but now got into a fight because the children were teasing him. He tried to solve the problem with words, but failed. S1 claims that the imposed pedagogical measure meant to him in the first semester when he stopped fighting due to its imposition, until the situation when he forgot that it had been imposed on him. S7 states that despite the previously pronounced pedagogical measure, he repeated the same unacceptable behaviour again because he was not thinking at that moment. Now he knows that he wouldn't do it again because he already has one reprimand. S3 claims that the pedagogical measure of reprimand was repeated because he is such a person. He always says that he learns from his mistakes, and his mistakes are repeated. At that moment, he hits someone, and then later regrets the hit, but realizes that there is no going back.

From the above, we can conclude that eight out of nine respondents believe that the pedagogic measures imposed on them were justified, but six students disagree with the severity and criteria of imposing the pedagogical measures. They believe that the pedagogical measure in relation to the unacceptable behaviour they committed should have been milder, that is, they do not think that such behaviour deserved a pedagogical measure of reprimand, but a warning. From the responses of the research participants, it is evident that the majority would not knowingly repeat the offense for various reasons (most often the consequences are mentioned), but it is also evident that one participant does not distinguish his own behaviour from his own personality.

In search of an answer to the third research question, we focused on the consequences of the pronounced pedagogical measure in relationships, the emotional reactions of students and the reaction of the environment.

Regarding the emotional reactions of the participants, S1 claims that he felt stupid. He realized that he didn't need something like that. It was not normal for S6 to receive a pedagogical measure. He thought a lot about the situation in which he recorded the fight with his cell phone and decided that he would not do something like that again. He was sad because he would be given a bad behaviour note, and this may affect his enrollment in the desired secondary school. S4 had the highest reaction to this question of all respondents. The answer was emotional. S4 cried from this question until the end of the interview. The student claimed that he was very sorry for the falsified test: "...I feel sad." S8, like S9, felt bad and sad after the imposed pedagogical measure. S2 and S7 claimed that they didn't care "...I didn't care anymore. I knew what I had done and everything...I knew that I was guilty so that at some point I knew that there would be a reprimand or something...(S7)" After the reprimand S5 was worried about what his parents would say to him. S3 didn't know how he felt at that moment "...I don't know... I was reprimanded...I have no words...I don't know what to say. Most of the time I say okay, shut up and go back to class. And I feel angry with myself and not with others because I shouldn't have done that thing." He was mostly sorry that he might not be able to enroll in the desired secondary school.

From the statements of the research participants, a different spectrum of emotional reactions is visible. Some of them regret their own transgression, some because of the consequences, some because of the reactions of the environment. It is clearly visible from the interview that some have a hard time forgiving themselves. From the aforementioned statements, it can be concluded that the research participants have a low level of emotional literacy and do not clearly distinguish basic emotional reactions.

When asked about parental reactions, the participants expressed different experiences. S1 claimed that the parents' reaction was milder when he received a warning. Then his dad and sister suggested that if he got hit first, he was allowed hit back. When he was reprimanded, his mother was angry with him, while his father told him that he had managed, but not to do it again. Because of the above, he was not allowed to use a cell phone or playstation for one to two weeks. S6 claims that his parents reacted better than expected. The mother talked to him and suggested that he no longer did such things, while the father did not understand why he received the same pedagogic measure as the students who fought and did not receive a parental punishment. S4's parents were sad, but the student felt much worse than they did, so he was not punished for that. S8's parents talked to him after the pedagogic measure was imposed and told him not to do something like that again. He was left without a cell phone for a long time due to unacceptable

behaviour. Student S7 claims that his parents had a little talk with him because of the imposed pedagogical measure and took away his cell phone for a week. During that period, he began to function better than usual without his cell phone, but now that his cell phone has been returned, everything is as before. The S9 student thought that the parents' reaction would be much stricter, but it wasn't. He didn't even get the expected punishment, but a conversation. He realized that he was wrong and they hope that the reprimand will be erased due to good conduct in the future. S5's parents were a bit surprised because something like that had never happened in their family. Dad was a little angry, but he did not receive a punishment because the parents knew that he did normally not present unacceptable behaviours, and they thought that a reprimand was enough punishment in itself. Although aware of the entire situation, student S2 claimed that his parents were surprised because he himself did not inform them of the situation. A pedagogic measure arrived at their home address and he explained it only then. The parents talked to the student and gave him the punishment of confiscating his mobile phone, which was the worst for him, and reduced going out. S3 claimed that the mother reaction was much stricter, so it was the same this time, while the father spoke to him. The mother raised her voice and set a punishment in which he could not use his cell phone and had to study and correct all his grades. Only after that he could play a little in the yard with his brother. He believes that the punishment is not too severe, but it is severe enough for a child.

In conclusion, the research participants had different emotional reactions. They felt sad, angry and disappointed, and some visibly expressed remorse for what they had done. From the statements of the research participants, different educational styles are visible. The parents had reactions of negative surprise, i.e. the unexpectedness of such unacceptable behavior. Five out of nine students received additional punishment from their parents due to the imposed pedagogical measure. It was mostly confiscation of mobile phones for a few weeks. Some parents did not use punishment but conversation, while some considered a reprimand as a sufficient punishment.

All students agree that there was no change in the attitude of their peers towards them after the pedagogical measure was imposed on them, but the attitude of the teacher was somewhat different towards some of them. Students S1, S6 and S8 did not even notice that the teachers treated them differently because of the unacceptable behavior they had committed. S4 claimed that maybe one could feel a little difference, but nothing significant because a lot of them did not even know about it. S7 claimed that the teacher's attitude towards him had changed a lot since the pedagogical measure of reprimand was imposed on him. S9 claimed that the

teachers considered him rude and he felt that their focus is now on him because of the unacceptable behavior he committed. S5 agreed that the relationship had changed a bit. S2 felt that everyone had lost trust in him, that is, mostly the female classmates, and since everyone from the class council knew about the fact that he received a reprimand, he felt that the teachers only looked at him. S3 did not feel that the teachers treated him differently than usual, but he noticed this for other students who received the pedagogical measure. Different experiences of the students, the activation of defense mechanisms, as well as an open question about the student's self-image, which is extremely important in further pedagogical activity, are visible from the above statements.

In search of an answer to the last research question, we focused on examining attitudes about the effectiveness of pedagogical measures. The final questions were based on the respondent's attitude to pedagogical measures, whether they consider them effective and whether they would repeat unacceptable behaviours, given that they were given a pedagogical measure because of them. S1 considered pedagogical measures to be effective because by imposing them, the school can eliminate potential problems. The pedagogical measure taught him that he did not want to repeat unacceptable behaviours because they affected his environment, and ultimately him. S6 claimed that after receiving a pedagogical measure, he learned to listen more to himself, and not to others who often had a bad influence on him. He would not repeat the behaviour for which he was reprimanded and believed that the pedagogical measure affected not only the person to whom it was imposed, but also his peers, who also presented less unacceptable behavior as a result. S4 believed that the pedagogical measure did not affect him that much, because even before the pedagogical measure was imposed, he had no unacceptable behaviour. He was aware that he had done a bad thing and would not repeat it. Although he considered pedagogical measures to be strict, he supported their imposition for students to know that there is a punishment for certain unacceptable behaviour. S8 claimed that the imposition of pedagogical measures served to change those who were bad. He realized that he could not solve problems in a rude way, but should tell the teachers or the professional service. S7 considered pedagogical measures to be effective because, as he said, without them, everyone would be fighting and no one would have the control they have now. Now, he would not repeat the behaviors for which the pedagogical measure was imposed on him. S9 claimed that it was very difficult for him after receiving the reprimand, he withdrew into himself and did not want to talk to anyone. He received a lot of support from his teachers and friends, and then he realized that he could be better and that he could make

progress. He claimed that in the end the imposition of the pedagogical measure actually had a very positive effect on him.

“It changes the person, how he is mentally, and that’s why I think that reprimands should still be there... To warn children that what you did will not go through your fingers... but something will be given to you for what you did.”

S5 thought that the reprimand had a lot of effect on him. He would never do anything like that again. He realized that what she did was very bad and that it could affect enrolment into high school. S2 considered pedagogical measures as a valuable punishment that taught you a lesson. He learned his lesson and would not repeat the unacceptable behaviour for which he was reprimanded. S3 would repeat the behaviour for which he was reprimanded, but provided there were no consequences.

When asked whether the research participants would behave in school the same way as they had until then, if pedagogical measures did not exist, they responded with the following answers. S1 claimed that he would have behaved the same, that is, that he would not have solved the problems himself, but would have reported them to the professional service. S6 claimed that he would have behaved the same even if there were no pedagogical measures, all because of his father’s reactions that would follow due to unacceptable behaviour. S4 wants pedagogical measures to remain a form of punishment, she would not like them not to exist. He learned that for some things you needed to work harder, and not to get them in a way that is not right. S8 believed that he would behave differently if pedagogical measures did not exist. S6 also believed that he would probably behave differently if there were no pedagogical measures. It would be much easier to get involved in conflicts than now. S9 also claimed that if there were no pedagogical measures he would behave as he had until then.

“t would still be good because it would still count toward my credits.”

S5 said that she would be a little more relaxed about rewriting, but she wouldn’t do anything differently than then. For his peers, she thought that they would behave differently, that is, that there would be more problems at school than then. S2 thought about repeating the same unacceptable behaviour if he did not receive a pedagogical measure. S3 is the only one of the research participants who claimed with 100% certainty that he would certainly behave differently if there were no pedagogical measures. He did not do certain actions solely to avoid being reprimanded, not because the action itself is unacceptable. He believed that his colleagues from school would also present more unacceptable behaviour if there were no pedagogical measures.

In conclusion, all respondents claim that they would not repeat the behavior for which they received a pedagogical measure – some of them because the imposition of such a measure taught them that such behaviour is not acceptable, and some because they do not want to receive a pedagogical measure again. One research participant states that he might repeat the unacceptable behaviour if it did not have a consequence, while one student claims that he would certainly repeat the undesirable behaviour if it did not have a consequence, that is, if a pedagogical measure was not imposed on him. Research participants consider pedagogical measures to be effective and think that there should be some kind of punishment for unacceptable behaviour.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Pedagogical theory and pedagogical practice do not have a single answer when it comes to pedagogical measures and their imposition. The aforementioned discrepancy can be observed from two key starting points: pedocentric and sociocentric. The first focuses on the focus on the student and his needs, and the second focuses on the needs of society. Pedocentric viewpoints point out that punishment strategies do usually not produce the desired result (change in student behaviour). In support of the sociocentric perspective is the operant conditioning by which society as a whole ensures the control of its individuals. Rewarding desirable behaviour increases the continuation of such behaviour in the future, and punishing undesirable behaviour in order to reduce it in the future. This research has confirmed that research participants confirm the justification of punishment, they consider pedagogical measures of punishment as justified. They believe that the punishment had a positive effect on them as well as on the other students, and it is difficult to imagine a society in which there are no punishments. They have different experiences about the mildness and severity of the measures, depending on their personal equation. Research participants express different emotional reactions related to the imposition of negative pedagogical measures (anger, sadness, shame). Different parenting styles are also visible. The most significant finding of this research can be seen in the fact that the pedagogical measure influenced the behaviour of the students in the direction of a positive change in behaviour among the majority of the participants. All students agree on the need for pedagogical measures in school. They are of the opinion that without pedagogical measures, the behaviour of the majority of students would be more undesirable than the current one. Just like adults, children and students need structure as well as clearly defined rules and consequences for breaking them – according to the

research participants. Despite the mentioned violations, after the steps taken and the imposition of the measure itself, it is clear from the interview with the students that they make a distinction between correct and incorrect procedures, that is, acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. The research participants agree that by imposing a pedagogical measure, they learned that such behavior is unacceptable and they generally do not want to repeat it. Part of the students agree that they do not want to repeat it precisely because of the unacceptability of the behaviour itself, and part of the students because of the consequences that such behaviour carries with it. In any case, the pedagogical measure has its purpose in this sense, which is to prevent undesirable forms of behaviour. The question of the students' self-image after the implemented pedagogical measure remains open, because for some students who presented unacceptable behavior, school is a real opportunity to change their status in the society hierarchy in order to have an experience of progress and success and a positive vision of the future.

REFERENCES

1. Bouillet, D. (2010). Pedagoške mjere u sustavu intervencija prema učenicima rizična ponašanja: kritička analiza. *Napredak*, 151(2), 268-290.
2. Bouillet, D. (2010a). *Izazovi integriranog odgoja i obrazovanja*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
3. Bouillet, D., Uzelac, S. (2007). *Osnove socijalne pedagogije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
4. Ching, G. S. (2012). Looking into the issues of rewards and punishment in students. *International Journal of Research Studies in Psychology*, 1(2), 29-38.
5. Čudina-Obradović, M. (1991). Motivativno djelovanje nagrade i kazne. U V. Kolesarić, M. Krizmanić, B. Petz (Ur.) *Uvod u psihologiju* (137-174). Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske.
6. Docherty, S., Sandelowski, M. (1999). Focus on qualitative methods: interviewing children. *Research In Nursing & Health*, 22(2), 177-185. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-240X\(199904\)22:2<177::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-H](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-240X(199904)22:2<177::AID-NUR9>3.0.CO;2-H)
7. Dweck, C. S., Davidson, W., Nelson, S., Enna, B. (1978). Sex differences in learned helplessness: II. The contingencies of evaluative feedback in the classroom and III. An experimental analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 14(3), 268-276. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.14.3.268>
8. Einarsdóttir, J. (2007). Research with children: methodological and ethical challenges. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 15(2), 197-211, DOI: 10.1080/13502930701321477
9. Foucault, M. (1994). *Nadzor i kazna – rađanje zatvora*. Zagreb: Informator.
10. Hastings, S., Jenkins, S. (2005). *Sanctions and reward*. TES. <https://www.tes.com/magazine/archive/sanctions-and-rewards> (1/7/2022)
11. Hurlock, E. B. (1925). An Evaluation of Certain Incentives Used in School Work. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 16(3), 145-159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0067716>
12. Koller-Trbović, N., Širanović, A. (2017). Istraživanja u području participacije djece. U I. Jedud Borić, A. Mirosavljević, N. Koller-Trbović, A. Širanović, S. Car, B. Kušević (Ur.) *Poštujmo, uključimo, uvažimo: Analiza stanja dječje participacije u Hrvatskoj*. Zagreb: Ured UNICEF-a za Hrvatsku.
13. Kyriacou, C. (2001). *Temeljna nastavna umijeća*. Zagreb: Educa.
14. Maleš, D., Kušević, B. (2008). Kako djeca doživljavaju kažnjavanje u obitelji? *Dijete i društvo*, 10(1/2), 49-70.
15. Meščić-Blažević, Lj. (2007). Pedagoška prevencija poremećaja u ponašanju adolescenata. *Pedagojska istraživanja*, 4(2), 301-306.
16. Milas, G. (2005). *Istraživačke metode u psihologiji i drugim društvenim znanostima*. Jastrebarsko: Naklada Slap.
17. Ministarstvo znanosti i obrazovanja [MZO] (bez dat.) ŠeR - Školski e-Rudnik (Vol. 2). <https://gov.hr/hr/ser-skolski-e-rudnik/1092> (22/10/2021).
18. Nadjanović-Tomić, J. (1996). Nagrađivanje i kažnjavanje dece u porodici i školi. *Nastava i vaspitanje*, 45(4-5), 735-743.
19. Narodne Novine (2015). *Pravilnik o kriterijima za izricanje pedagoških mjera*. Zagreb: Narodne novine d.d.

20. Narodne Novine (2020). *Zakon o odgoju i obrazovanju u osnovnoj i srednjoj školi*. Zagreb: Narodne novine d.d.
21. Sandelowski, M. (1995). Sample size in qualitative research. *RN Health*. 18(2),179-183.
22. Vasilelou, K., Barnett, J., Thorpe, S., Young, T. (2018). Characterising and justifying sample size sufficiency in interview-based studies: systematic analysis of qualitative health research over a 15-year period. *BMC MR Metodology*. 18, 148-167. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0594-7>
23. Zrilić, S. (2017). Razlike u prevalenciji poremećaja u ponašanju s obzirom na dob i spol učenika nekoliko zadarskih osnovnih škola. *Školski vjesnik*, 66(1), 27-41.

ISKUSTVA UČENIKA S IZREČENIM PEDAGOŠKIM MJERAMA

SAŽETAK

Statistika izricanja pedagoških mjera zbog neprimjerenih ponašanja bilježi rast u školama u RH, a pedagojska teorija i pedagoška praksa nisu jasno i u potpunosti usklađeni s njezinom opravdanošću. S jedne strane su zagovornici koji primjenu kazne smatraju opravdanom i nužnom, a s druge oni koji tvrde da strategije kažnjavanja ne daju željeni rezultat – promjenu ponašanja. Empirijski dio ovoga rada usmjeren je na iskustva učenika s izrečenom mjerom. Kvalitativnim istraživanjem utvrđena je struktura i opetovanost izricanja pedagoških mjera, opravdanost i posljedice iz učeničke perspektive.

Učenici iskazuju opravdanost izrečenih mjera te negativne emocionalne reakcije poput ljutnje, tuge i srama. Vidljive su različite reakcije roditelja i okoline. Sudionici smatraju da je pedagoška mjera uglavnom utjecala na promjenu njihova ponašanja, ali iz različitih razloga te smatraju kako su pedagoške mjere zbog neprihvatljivoga ponašanja neophodne za funkcioniranje školskoga sustava.

Ključne riječi: pedagoške mjere, neprihvatljiva ponašanja, kazna.