

Teacher Perception on the Ban of Corporal Punishment in Secondary Schools

Lazarus Ndiku Makewa^{1*}, Nyambossibe Myriam², Kinuthia Benson²

¹Lukenya University, Kambu, Kenya

²University of Eastern Africa, Baraton, Kenya

*Corresponding Author:

Lazarus Ndiku Makewa

Email: ndikul@gmail.com

Abstract: This study looked at if there was any significant difference between teachers' and students' perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in school in Kosirai Division, of Nandi County public secondary schools by gender, age, highest level of education and experience in school. Descriptive-comparative survey research design was used. Fifty eight (58) teachers participated. Questionnaires were used to collect data from the respondents. Validity was determined by the use of expert opinion in matters education in the department of educational administration, curriculum and teaching of University of Eastern Africa, Baraton. The reliability of the questionnaire was done through a pilot study done in two (2) public secondary schools in Eldoret Municipality. Thirty (30) teachers participated in the pilot study. Cronbach's alpha of 0.6 was set as the cut-off point. The Cronbach's alpha for teachers' questionnaire was .654 T-test was used to determine the difference between the mean ratings of boys and girls, female and male teachers, age, teaching experience and level of education of teachers. The findings indicated that there was no significant difference between teachers' perception on the ban of corporal punishment in schools in Kosirai Division secondary schools when categorized by gender, age, education and experience. This study recommends that alternative ways of discipline be sourced and applied to avoid physical pain to students.

Keywords: Teacher, Student, Perception, Corporal Punishment, Ban, Kosirai, Nandi

INTRODUCTION

Behavioral problems in schools generally are and have been an area of concern for teachers, educational authorities, policy makers and the general public for as long as one can remember. Cohen and Cohen [1] write about an "... increasing concern ... expressed about the extent and frequency of disruptive behavior in secondary schools and its growing incidence among younger pupils in junior and infant classrooms". The 'growing incidence' (delinquency by students) of disruptive behavior is posing a challenge to everybody and needs to be tackled by every means at everybody's disposal. It is for this reason that a study, on the perennial problem of corporal punishment as a discipline, is of great importance.

According to Sonn [2], discipline refers to 'an understanding of what is right and wrong or self-discipline more than an obedience to rules'. He adds that knowing the difference between right and wrong should be accompanied by understanding 'what learners will gain by being punctual and what they will lose if they are late' (to school). Learners will also be self-disciplined if they understand their rights as much as they understand their responsibilities and behave accordingly. In the classroom, or in a learning situation or during a 'valued activity', the intended outcomes of teachers and learners may not be achieved if there is a

lack of discipline from participants. Actions that are or can be linked to any anti-social behavior, laziness or acts of violence, are always associated with lack of discipline. Even learners themselves in coming to the classroom with learning goals to achieve, expect their classmates to be well disciplined or display behavior that will not interrupt their own learning or that of their classmates.

Corporal punishment is derived from Latin word "corpus" meaning body. In the past, corporal punishment was very common and it was not just limited to the students or children but even adults were also being punished (Lambert, 2010). This form of punishment has been a classic method of imparting discipline since ancient civilization [3]. Corporal punishment was an important part of the educational experience for many children educated during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It has often been assumed that it was an uncontroversial and widely accepted means of maintaining school discipline [4].

In England, corporal punishment was used since middle ages until the 19th Century. It was practiced in prison, at home, in society, in the army, and in school. The ban of corporal punishment in England has been going on progressively and it was banned in 1999 (Lambert, 2010).

In the United States, corporal punishment has been practiced since ancient civilization, it was acceptable for the teachers and school authorities to spank, whip the child as a means of correcting theory. Educators used to think that corporal punishment was the only way to discipline students and make them more studious. Corporal punishment has been banned in thirty states, but it is still widely used by at least twenty states in United States [3].

Sweden was the first European nation to abolish corporal punishment. For 5 years, from 1979-1984, Sweden was unique in the industrialized world for having passed the first explicit ban on corporal punishment [5]. The increase of parents and student's complaints, and the students' physical and psychological traumatism were the reasons for the abolition of corporal punishment in school in most countries in Europe.

In Africa corporal punishment is seen like a cultural practice. It is taken to be a vital tool on the educational process. Parents and teachers who are not practicing corporal punishment are seen as being negligent (Maurel, 2011). Some parents and children tend to like practicing corporal punishment because of the belief that children do not grow to be well-mannered adults if they are not spanked or beaten when they make mistakes. Some even say that abolishing corporal punishment is a Western-centric concept that will cause havoc in African cultures and lead to moral decay [6].

The Kenya system of education was copied from the British colonial system. Even the corporal punishment was based on British colonial system. Most Kenyan adults were caned frequently when they were children [7]. Yet the Ministry of Education decided to ban corporal punishment with the realization that it was being indiscriminately applied in schools and children were continuously suffering from injuries and even death.

Corporal punishment was banned in Kenyan schools in 2001 through Legal Notice No. 56 of 2001. This notice effectively canceled Legal Notice No 40 of 1972, which introduced corporal punishment into the Education Act [8].

Education is one of principal area for the future of a country, many studies have been done to use, improve and upgrade educational system.

The behavior problems encountered by teachers in schools pose problems to all those directly affected, as well as other stakeholders in the field of education. What seems to confront teachers mostly is the legal position of what was once believed to be the effective remedy to bad behavior. Corporal punishment is no longer legal in Kenya and cannot be administered as a corrective tool. The legal position of corporal punishment on children has added to the teachers' issues with respect to ill-disciplined learners. According to Tungata [9], many teachers have been subjected to some form of discipline related to corporal punishment. Parents observe that the legal position on caning is unequivocal; it criminalizes educators, who technically can be found guilty of common assault even if a learner is touched with a feather duster [9].

However, it is not clear why Kenya government banned corporal punishment without replacing it with equivalence effective alternatives. This study therefore sought to establish the perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in public secondary schools in Kenya particularly in Kosirai Division.

The Meaning of Corporal Punishment

In general, corporal punishment is defined as a disciplinary action involving the infliction of physical pain upon one person by another [10]. According to Straus [11] corporal punishment against a child "is the use of physical force with the intention of causing a child to experience pain, but not injury, for the purposes of correction or control of the child's behavior". Usually, parents and teachers use spanking, slapping, whipping, caning or some uncomfortable position to punish children. Hyman [12] provides a definition that reflects practices in school situations. He said that "corporal punishment in the schools is the infliction of pain or confinement as a penalty for an offense committed by a student".

To be more explicit, it is any punishment in which physical force is intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort: hitting children with a hand, with a cane, strap or other object, kicking, scratching, pinching, biting, pulling their hair, forcing them to stay in uncomfortable position, locking, tying them up, burning scalding, forced ingestion- for washing mouths out with soap [13].

Cohen [14] endorses the definition of corporal punishment by identifying specific forms of corporal punishment such as paddling, floggings and beatings. Corporal punishment can be defined as a painful, intentionally inflicted (typically, by striking a child) physical penalty administered by a person in authority for disciplinary purposes. Corporal punishment can

occur anywhere, and whippings, beatings, paddling, and flogging are specific forms of corporal punishment [15].

Corporal punishment is "physical punishment as distinguished from pecuniary punishment or fine; any kind of punishment of or inflicted on the body" or "the infliction of pain by a teacher or other educational official on the body of the student as a penalty for doing something which has been disapproved of by the punisher" [16].

Importance of Corporal Punishment in School

Corporal punishment is not just a school issue involving students, but is a societal issue involving families and cultures. Using corporal punishment has been an integral part of the discipline until recent times when social scientists have disagreed on its effectiveness as a disciplinary measure [17]. Corporal punishment has been practiced in many countries in the world and Kenya is one of them. Punishment is quick to administer and an effective reason why teachers are still using it and claiming that it is important. The teacher will order the child to write some passages repeatedly for example [18].

Strauss, Arif and Rafi (2007) warn on the danger of learners' negative attitude towards any school work that has been 'defined' punishment. As much as this approach is easy to apply, it may be overused by teachers. This, they claim, may render it useless as a disciplinary approach. A study done in 2010 about the mothers' attitudes toward the ban of corporal punishment has demonstrated that 80% of parents use corporal punishment to bring their children up. Corporal punishment used to have a great place in education. Parents' philosophy to the use of corporal punishment is to educate their children to respect them [19].

According to Batul [3] there are three types of corporal punishment:

1. Parental or domestic corporal punishment, which is found in family, practiced by parents, a member close to the family or a guardian.
2. School corporal punishment is when a student is punished by his teacher, the head master or any other administrator of school.
3. Judicial corporal punishment as part of a criminal sentence ordered by a court of law. It means if you have stolen someone's money, there is a corporal punishment attributed to the level of the crime.

The Ban of Corporal Punishment in Kenya

Corporal punishment in kids is on the decline. In Kenya, corporal punishment was introduced as an adjunct of the British Colonial Education package. Kenya, then a British colony, copied the colonial education system just as it did with other systems. After the attainment of independence, the practice was

instituted in the 1968 Education Act and promulgated in 1972 [7].

Before the ban, corporal punishment was allowed to be inflicted in cases of continued neglect of work, lying, bullying, indecency, truancy, gross insubordination and the like. In Kenya, the corporal punishment was effected place in 2001 through a Kenya Gazette notice [20].

The Ministry of Education decided to ban corporal punishment in 2001. Apart from physical injury, the Ministry of Education recognized that this kind of punishment had overall negative effects on children and adversely affected not only their academic performance but also their psychological wellbeing. Among various reasons, the ban came after Kenya had been cited as having institutionalized violence and promoting child abuse by permitting corporal punishment in a 2000 conference in Dakar [21].

Kenya is part of over 190 countries that approved the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, a 1989 treaty that aimed to protect children. The treaty, which has been approved by all UN member countries except the United States, Somalia and South Sudan, states that countries must protect children from all forms of physical or mental violence [21].

Teachers' Perceptions on the Ban of Corporal Punishment in School

Teaching is one of the noblest professions where one imparts knowledge to others. The teacher must consider his students as his own children, and treat them as lovingly and caringly as possible. He should applaud a student's achievements, and help him to overcome his shortcomings by motivating him to pursue his interests [22]. A teacher should be there to guide a student to become responsible, educated and a well groomed citizen of a country. While handling students, it must always be kept in mind that they are like flowers. They have to be nurtured with great care to help them blossom and spread their fragrance [22].

Teachers play an important role as educators and disciplinarians, and thus, to assume their responsibilities, they sometimes resort to the use of physical punishment (Youssef et al, 1998). Corporal punishment is useful for teachers, because it helps them to maintain students in the right way and through use of punishment they can ensure discipline in school. In another aspect, fearing to be punished makes children to perform in school [23]. Mtsweni [24] observes that after the banning of corporal punishment in schools, most educators feel incapacitated and helpless in dealing with learner indiscipline in schools. However, in South Africa, learners continue to bring weapons into school

premises and at times use them against other learners and their educators [25].

The parents are using corporal punishment at home because they are working to the same goal; the same discipline method has to continue in school environment. Since corporal punishment is prohibited in schools, there is increase of the use of drug, and addiction among students [26]. The training given at the government and the personality of the teacher is enough for educators to maintain classroom discipline. According to Fonkoua [27] teachers' ability to control and be in charge of the classroom situation depends on his/her power and authority, so good teachers really don't need some tools, like the cane, to keep their classroom in discipline, their discipline should emerge from ethics of school, their personality and their traditional role like teachers.

A student must also be free and friendly with his teachers, ask questions, and clarify his doubts and so on. At the same time, he should always respect and obey his teachers. However, this obedience and respect cannot be demanded forcibly through corporal punishment. It can only come spontaneously through deep regard for one's teachers [22]. A teacher is a role model for a student. He must set an example for his students through his behavior and actions. He must deal with his students patiently, advising and guiding him to excel in every sphere of life such as academics, sports, music and various other extra-curricular activities [22].

Children have rights which are supposed to be respected, and the use of corporal punishment work against these rights, the worst is that the use of corporal punishment in school affects the students and his childhood and there is a percentage of the risk to improve the violence attitude in the future life of the student [28]. After the ban of corporal punishment, many teachers started complaining about the increase of indiscipline in school.

A study done by Cosmas [29], Researcher in the University Teaching and Learning Office in South Africa found that educators generally feel disempowered in their ability to maintain discipline in schools in the absence of corporal punishment. The thrust on children's rights and subsequent banning of corporal punishment has ushered in an era of freedom for learners who no longer have respect or fear for their educators [29]. Corporal punishment should not be used all the time, but just in case it can help educators to give a correction which will help students to understand their mistake.

A study done by Loretta [30] describes a teacher attitude toward the ban of corporal punishment. It has been noted that despite the ban of corporal

punishment in most countries, there are still reported acts of corporal punishment being used by teachers. Although corporal punishment is banned by law, the practical banning of corporal punishment in classrooms, with the introduction of alternatives, has not been easy for some teachers.

In Australia, corporal punishment is banned. However most teachers still support the use of corporal punishment and this view has not changed much since corporal punishment was first banned in schools. Research conducted in Australia found that most teachers view the use of corporal punishment as necessary and many would like to use the cane as a last resort. In Pakistan where corporal Punishment has existed in schools for nearly 143 years [31], has recently upgrade the effort to ban corporal punishment. Teacher's opinions supporting this ban are growing but it still finds some teachers, who support corporal punishment and use it also.

In Trinidad, where corporal punishment has been banned for nearly ten years today, teachers and parents are requesting its reinstatement. Teachers in Bangkok are unhappy about the ban on corporal punishment and fear that it will result in students becoming more aggressive [30]. Cohen [32] conducted a study on teachers' and pupils' attitudes towards corporal punishment. He has concluded that "teachers are ambivalent towards corporal punishment; their views are still not totally in line with the literature, nor with the aims of the new education policy". Furthermore, the majority of the teachers in the study felt that corporal punishment was necessary in order to maintain discipline [30].

The majority of studies which talk about the perception or attitudes of teachers toward the ban of corporal punishment in school seem to have a similar conclusion, that most of teachers want the return of corporal punishment in school. It seems that numerous educators continue to believe that corporal punishment has benefits [30]. In South Africa, teachers report that the department is not instrumental in assisting them with abusive and disruptive children. Teachers further feel they need training to manage a classroom of 40-50 learners, as they do not often have alternate methods of disciplining difficult children [30].

In Kenya, Muchira (2009) in the end of his study conclude that 85% of the teachers preferred guidance and counseling services than the administration of corporal punishment. It is therefore recommended that guidance and counseling services be implemented in every Kenyan secondary school. A study similar to "perceptions' on the ban of corporal punishment in public secondary school in Kosirai Division" done by Kimani *et al* [33] in Starehe

Division found that head teachers, teachers, and pupils perceived corporal punishment as part of school ethos and culture. The study concluded that school administrators and teachers are not thoroughly prepared to deal with indiscipline in the absence of corporal punishment. The study recommended that the Ministry of Education should train head teachers and teachers on alternative strategies to deal with discipline problems other than use of corporal punishment

There are few teachers with training in guidance and counseling skills other than child psychology that they learnt during their training as teachers. And since government policies on education elicit diverse attitudes from teachers who are key stakeholders in education, the teachers should always be consulted whenever the government intends to change any policy affecting education. Corporal punishment should be reinstated and its use controlled by the Ministry of Education because the teachers attitudes towards it is positive. More teachers are trained in guidance and counseling to handle some discipline problems like drug abuse (Muchira, 2009).

The use of corporal punishment by teachers is reinforced by its use in the home; teachers use corporal punishment because it is expected by parents. Parents endorse the use of corporal punishment, as it is the method they themselves use to discipline their own children [33]. But one is left to wonder why educators think that use of corporal punishment is the most appropriate method to maintain discipline in schools.

Students' Perception on the Ban of Corporal Punishment in Schools

Corporal punishment is applied differently according to the sexes. Gender discrimination is also prevalent. For example, in Nepal, girls reported that they were beaten more often than boys.

The problem found in girls was the sexual abuse. A study conducted by the African Child Policy Forum (2003) in Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria and Senegal found that hitting, beating and forced hard work were the most prevalent forms of violence against girls, and that most of the physical violence experienced by girls was corporal punishment [34]. The ban of corporal punishment is seen by the students, like time to revenge to take their time to hurt teacher. In the knowledge that teachers can't punish corporally anymore, students enjoy involving every bad behavior and tell teachers that they have the right, so he is not allowed to beat them anymore. Learners are believed to have now

become ill disciplined to the extent that they even openly challenge the teacher's authority because they know that nothing will be done to them [35].

The instrument of punishment must be a straight piece of wood which has a diameter not exceeding 1.5cm, and a length not exceeding 60cm. Corporal punishment must be restricted to buttocks (for boys) and thighs (for girls). The number of strikes per punishment must not exceed 10" (as cited in the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, 2009, Current legality of corporal punishment, section, para. 3).

In another case the research found those students who think that despite the harming corporal punishment was doing, it is very important for education to reintroduce corporal punishment in school. Because, according to them, many values are disappearing and they assist at the increase of delinquency. Students have rights which need to be respected but not those which allow them to abuse teachers face to face, abuse their classmate, beaten their classmate, rape, kill, use drug, alcohol in class [29].

METHOD

Research Design

This study used a descriptive-comparative survey research design. This approach sought to collect data without manipulating the variables or the respondents in an attempt to find out the perceptions of teachers and students on the ban of corporal punishment in schools. This research design was used because it allows the research to describe and explain perceptions of respondents on ban of corporal punishment [36].

Study Population

Kosirai Division has six (6) public secondary schools, named: St Joseph's Girls Chepterit, Christ the King, AIC Kosirai Girls, Kosirai High school, St Patrick Ndaptabwa, and St. Paul Kamoijil. St. Paul Kamoijil secondary school has not been included in this study because it only opened recently in 2010. The target population of analysis comprised: teachers and students in Form II, Form III and Form IV in Kosirai Division public secondary schools in Kenya.

Kosirai Division has one thousand one hundred and thirteen (1113) students in form II, Form III and Form IV in secondary public schools. The study focused on student in form II, form III, and form IV because at that level students are much more mature and likely to understand and respond to the survey.

Table-1: Total number of students in form II to form IV

Name of schools	Form2 girls	Form2 boys	Form3 girls	Form3 boys	Form4 girls	Form4 boys	Total girls	Total boys	TOTAL students
1	65	----	50	-----	29	-----	144	00	144
2	46	49	22	40	20	30	88	119	207
3	24	56	18	33	9	36	51	125	176
4	20	18	11	16	9	9	40	43	83
5	161	-----	172	-----	170	-----	503	00	503
Sub-total	316	123	273	89	237	75	826	287	1,113

Table-2: Total number of teachers

Name of schools	Female Teacher	Male teachers	TOTAL
1	5	7	12
2	6	6	12
3	5	7	12
4	6	5	11
5	6	5	11
Sub-Total	28	30	58

Data were collected from fifty eight (58) teachers in five schools: St Joseph's Girls Chepterit (n=12), Christ the king (n=11), AIC Kosirai Girls (n=12), Kosirai High school(n=12), St Patrick Ndaptabwa (n=11). Three hundred thirty four (334) students participated, St Joseph's Girls Chepterit (n=67), Christ the King (n=66), AIC Kosirai Girls (n=67), Kosirai High School (n=67), St Patrick Ndaptabwa (n=67) (See Table 2).

Sample size and Sampling Techniques

Mugenda and Mugenda (1999) recognize that 30% as a substantial population for a sample. All the fifty eight (58) teachers formed the first categories of respondents. The second categories of respondents comprised 30% of 1113 students which was approximately 334 students selected from form II, form III, and form IV in Kosirai Division public secondary schools. Form I students were left out because of their limited experience in secondary school life.

Research Instruments

The questionnaire of teachers and students sought the following information: Personal background information, Perceptions on ban of corporal punishment in school the alternative for corporal punishment being used in schools, and the effectiveness of alternative for corporal punishment being used in school and the last part concerned only teachers was about to know if they think they are adequately trained.

Reliability of instrument

In order to ensure the reliability of the questionnaire a pilot study was conducted. Piloting of the instrument was done in two (2) public secondary schools in Eldoret Municipality. Thirty (30) teachers and twenty (20) students participated for the pilot study.

The purpose of the pilot was to ascertain the reliability of the questionnaire instrument before it was distributed to the respondents in the actual study. Cronbach's alpha of 0.6 was set as the cut-off point. The Cronbach's alpha for teachers' questionnaire was .654 and for students questionnaire was .777. The research instruments, with these levels of alpha, were considered reliable.

Statistical Analysis

T-test was used to determine the difference between the mean ratings of boys and girls, female and male teachers, age, teaching experience and level of education of teachers, and ANOVA was used to determine the difference between the mean ratings of ages and level of education of students.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study looked at if there was any significant difference between teachers' perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in school in Kosirai Division, of Nandi County public secondary schools by gender, age, highest level of education and experience in school. To answer this concern, *t* test was used. The *t*-test was used for the comparison by gender, age, experience of teaching and highest level of education of teachers.

Comparisons of perception by gender

Table 3 below shows the results of the comparisons of teachers' perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools by gender. Group descriptive statistics showed that the mean scores of both groups (male and female) fell on "Tend to Agree". In addition, the *t*-test yielded *p*-values greater than the level of significance 0.05.

Table 3: Descriptive and T-test for mean Teachers' perceptions by Gender

Gender	N	Mean
Male	29	2.5599
Female	28	2.5705

T-test for mean Teachers' perceptions by Gender

F	p-values	T	Df	Sig-2 tailed	Mean difference
.185	.669	-.118	55	.906	-.01055

The null hypothesis stating that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of male and female teachers towards the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools. The results indicate that the p-values (.669) superior at 0.5, the equal variance is assumed. The t value used is: -.118, the mean difference is: -.01055, it means that there is no significance difference between the perception of male and female teachers on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public schools.

Comparisons of perception by age

Table 4 below shows the results of the comparisons of teachers' perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools by age. Group descriptive statistics showed that the mean scores of both groups (30 years and below and 31 years and above) fell on "Tend to Agree". In addition the t-test yielded p-values greater than the level of significance 0.05.

Table 4: Descriptive and T-test for mean Teachers' Perceptions by Age

Age of Respondent	N	Mean
30 yrs. and under	24	2.5724
31yrs and above	33	2.5598

T-test for mean Teachers' Perceptions by Age

F	p-values	T	df	Sig-2 tailed	Mean difference
.114	.737	.140	55	.889	-.01261

On if there was significant difference between the perceptions of ages of teachers on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools, the results show that p-values (.737) superior at 0.05, the equal variance is assumed. The t value used is: .140, the mean difference is: .01261, it means that the null hypothesis is accepted and there is no significant difference between the perceptions of ages of teachers towards the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools.

Comparison of Perceptions by Teaching Experience

The Table 5 below shows the results of the comparisons of teachers' perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools by experience. Group descriptive statistics showed that the mean scores of both groups (5 years and below and 6 years and above) fell on "Tend to Agree". In addition the t-test yielded p-values greater than the level of significance of 0.05.

Table 5: Descriptive t- test for Means and of Teachers' perceptions by teaching experience.

Teaching Experience	N	Mean
5 yrs. and bellow	31	2.5483
6yrs and above	26	2.5851

t- test for Means on Teachers' perceptions by teaching experience.

F	p-values	T	Df	Sig-2 tailed	Mean difference
104	.748	-.412	55	.682	-.03682

The above test indicates that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of teaching experience of teachers towards the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools. The p-values (.748) superior at 0.05, the equal variance is assumed. The t value used is: -.412, the mean difference is: -.03682, it means that the null hypothesis is accepted and that there was no significant difference between the perceptions of teaching experiences of teachers on the ban of corporal

punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools.

Comparison of Perceptions by Level of Education

Table 6 below shows the results of the comparisons of teachers' perceptions on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools by level of education. Group descriptive statistics showed that the mean scores of both groups (Diploma and Degree and above) fell on

“Tend to Agree”. In addition the t-test yielded p-values greater than the level of significance of 0.05.

Table 6: Descriptive and t- test for means of Teachers’ perceptions by level of education

Highest Level of Education Attained by the Respondent	N	Mean
Diploma	12	2.5761
Degree and above	45	2.5622

t- test for mean of Teachers’ perceptions by level of education

F	p-values	T	Df	Sig- 2tailed	Mean difference
.013	.908	.128	55	.899	-.01396

The hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of level of education of teachers towards the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public schools was tested. The p-values (.908) superior at 0.05, the equal variance is assumed. The t value used is: -.128, the mean difference is: -.01396, it means that the null hypothesis was accepted there is no significant difference between the perceptions of level of education of teachers on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public secondary schools.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has established that teachers’ perception on corporal punishment was leveled when measured towards gender, age, teaching experience and level of education. This is important to note as the findings tend to point to the fact that corporal punishment should be continued but with monitored observation and management. Although many governments have discouraged corporal punishment, steps should be taken to form a policy which outlines procedures and guidelines for administering this practice. This study therefore, recommends strict measures to be taken by the stakeholders on how and when such punishment should be administered or even look for ways to have alternative ways to handle indiscipline. Further research on the why of the corporal punishment should be carried out with the major focus on the attitude of scholars, professionals, and parents. An additional study could investigate relationship between academic excellence between schools dressed with corporal punishment and those which advocate for alternative punishment structures.

REFERENCES

- Cohen, L. & Cohen, A. (1987). *Disruptive behaviours: A source book for teachers*. London: Harper & Row.
- Sonn, B. (2002). Discipline in schools. Discipline in a culture of human rights. *Cape Town: Via Africa*.
- Batul, N. B. (2011). *History of Corporal punishment*. Retrieved from <http://www.buzzle.com/articles/history-of-corporal-punishment.html>
- Middleton, J. (2008). The experience of corporal punishment in school, 1890- 1940. *History of education*, 37(2), 253-275.
- Durrant, J. E. (1996). The Swedish Ban on Corporal Punishment: Its History and Effects. *Family Violence Against Children: A Challenge for Society, New York*, 19-25.
- Banda, L. H. (2006). *Negative effects of corporal punishment on children*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cyc-net.org/features/viewpoints/c-corporalpunishmenteffects.html>
- Ndichu, M. F. (2004). *An examination of the philosophical foundations of corporal punishment in Kenyan educational systems*. Retrieved 2012, from <http://www.researchkenya.org/?ID=8469&search=Ministry+of+Education+%28Kenya%29>.
- African Network for the Prevention and Protection against Children Abuse and Neglect. (2012). *Positive Discipline Projects Background*. (ANPPCAN No.17) Developed & Maintained By: Gateway Technologies Ltd Powered by Joomla.
- Tungata. (2006). *Maintaining Discipline In Schools in The Post-corporal Punishment Era*. Retrieved from <http://www.nmmu.ac.za/documents/theses/MTungata.pdf>
- Swan, R. (2013). *Children health care Is a legal duty, Inc.* retrieved from http://childrenshealthcare.org/?page_id=146
- Straus, M. S. D., & Giles-Sims, J. (1997). Spanking by parents and subsequent antisocial behavior of children. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 151, 761–767.
- Hyman, I. A. (1990). *Reading, Writing, and the Hickory Stick: the Appalling Story of Physical and Psychological Abuse in American Schools*. Lexington books: United States of America.
- Mali, N. (2002). *Save the Children Sweden*. Russell Press, Nottingham, England.
- Cohen. (1984). *Freedom from Corporal Punishment: One of the Human Rights of Children* (Vol2, Part 1). New York Law School Human Rights Annual.
- Paintal, S. (2012). *Banning Corporal Punishment on Children*. Retrieved from Questia:

- <http://www.questia.com/googleScholar.qst?docId=5002337670>
16. Maree, J. G. (1995). Lyfstraf op jeugdige in skole: 'n opvoedkundige-sielkundigeperspektief. *Acta Criminologica*, 8, 68-73.
 17. Wairuri, C. W. (2009). *A Study on Teachers' Attitudes Towards The Withdrawal of Corporal Punishment as Discipline art Measures from public Secondary school in Kikuyu Division*. Retrieved from http://www.uonbi.ac.ke/faculties/turntopdf.php?project_id=180
 18. Evertson, C. M., Emmer, E. T., & Worsham, M. E. (2003). *Classroom management for elementary teachers*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
 19. Sonia, Hassan, Reza, Parveneh, Javad & Jean, L. (2010). Mothers' attitudes towards the corporal punishment of children in Qazvin-Iran. *Springer Science + Business Media, LLC.J.* 25, 159-164.
 20. Jack, O. A., & Enose, M. W. S. (2010). The Role of Guidance and Counselling in Promoting district. Student Discipline in Secondary Schools in Kenya: A case study in Kisumu *Educational Research and Review*, 5(5), 263-272.
 21. Kabura, S. (2011). *Corporal punishment can cause long term harm, says new study*. Retrieved from Kenya Kidz: www.africanlaughter.com.
 22. Rajkoomar, M. (2012). *Essay on the corporal punishment in School*. Retrieved from Publish Article : <http://www.publishyourarticles.org/knowledge-hub/essay/an-essay-on-the-corporal-punishment-in-schools.html>
 23. Mweri, M. (2010). Why are Kenyan teachers still using corporal punishment is still using eight years after the ban on corporal punishment? *Child abuse review*, 248-258.
 24. Mtsweni, J. (2008). *The role of educators in the management of school discipline in theNkangala Region of Mpumalanga*. MEd dissertation, University of South Africa.
 25. Zulu, B. M., Urbani, G, Van der Merwe, A., & Van der Walt, J. L. (2004). Violence as an impediment to a culture of teaching and learning in some South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 24, 170-175.
 26. Walker, M. (2008). *Indiscipline in schools – Parents demand caning (API)*. African Press International. Retrieved from <http://africanpress.me/2008/04/03/indiscipline-in-kenyan-schools-causes-parent-to-demand-caning-students/?like=1>.
 27. Fonkoua, P. (2009). *Psychological parameters In Teaching*. Yaounde: L'Africaine d'Edition et de Service.
 28. Becker, C, W. (1975). *Teaching 1 Classroom Management*. United States of America: Inc. all rights.
 29. Cosmas, M., & Almon, S. (2010). Educators' disciplinary capabilities after the banning of corporal punishment in South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 30, 87-399.
 30. Loretta, C. (2004). *To punish or to Discipline? Teachers' attitudes towards the Abolition of Corporal Punishment*. Retrieved from <http://wiredspace.wits.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10539/175/Dissertation.pdf?sequence=1>.
 31. Iqbal, N. (2003). *Rights-Pakistan: call to spare the rod in schools grows louder*. Global Information New York.
 32. Cohen, S. (1996). *Teachers and Pupils Attitudes and Practices Regarding the Abolition of Corporal Punishment in schools in the Gauteng Area*. Unpublished Masters Research.
 33. Kimani, N. G., Augustine, M., Ogelange, T. B. (2012). Teachers and Pupils views on persistent use of Corporal Punishment in Managing Discipline in Primary Schools, in Starehe Division, Kenya . *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*. Centre for Promoting Ideas, USA
 34. Human Rights Watch. (2003). *The Nature And Extent Of Corporal Punishment-Prevalence And Attitudinal Research In West And Central Africa*. Togo: Borderline Slavery: Child Trafficking.
 35. Masitsa, G. (2008). Discipline and disciplinary measures in the Free State Township schools: unresolved problems. *Acta Academica*, 40, 234-270.
 36. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2009). *Research methods in Education*. London Routledge Falmer