



## Research Article

© 2019 Ukpabio et al.  
This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons  
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License  
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>).

# Revisiting Disciplinary Control in Secondary Schools: The Issue of Corporal Punishment in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria

Dr. Godfrey E. Ukpabio

Dr. Mbon F. Usen

Dr. Comfort Etor

*Department of Educational Management,  
University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria*

Doi: 10.36941/mjss-2019-0080

### Abstract

*This research investigated the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Nigeria with particular reference to Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. The concept of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism with the social issues associated with it was discussed. Three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study which adopted survey research design. A questionnaire titled: "Corporal Punishment and Disciplinary Control Questionnaire" (CPDCQ) was the instrument for data collection. The simple random sampling technique was used in selecting 200 teachers for this study. The data obtained was analyzed using Independent t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test statistics at 0.05 level of significance. The findings of the study showed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' gender and teachers' teaching experience. The findings also revealed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of teachers working in public or private secondary schools in the study area. It was recommended among other things that since appropriate application of corporal punishment is associated with disciplinary control in these schools, a mechanism be put in place to guide usage and to check abuses.*

**Keywords:** *Disciplinary Control, Secondary Schools, Corporal Punishment*

## 1. Introduction

Teaching and learning is said to flourish more in peaceful and orderly environments. Compliance of students to school proceedings is of utmost importance in creating such environments. Children in secondary schools are often observed to have problems of concentration and teachers regularly express frustration in arresting their attention. This level of education host children from different backgrounds, beliefs and value systems, thus demanding that activities and interactions be supervised for their own good, safety and general effectiveness of the school. Furthermore, for students to be wielded into an effective unit, and an environment of tranquility, control and discipline created for effective teaching and learning, a proactive behavioral management mechanism is desired. According to Farooq (2014), school disciplinary control system for regulating students and keeping schools and classrooms in order consists of three principal strategies: code of conduct, punishment and other behavioral management methods. Many suggest that corporal punishment,

in spite of the controversy around it should still be implemented as part of that proactive behavioral management mechanism. This group justifies corporal punishment at this educational level as a control mechanism because it is age appropriate. They argue that since most of the students at this stage average about fourteen years of age or slightly above, though deemed to be at the verge of breaking into the age of reason: the term often used to describe when a person becomes morally responsible, though criminally not indictable according to Legal Dictionary (2018), they are also according to Reach Out Australia (2019) at a volatile period in their developmental cycle. As teenagers, many are grappling with distractive self-esteem issues which are associated with negative moods such as feeling sad, anxious, ashamed or angry, low motivation, poor body image and many other teenage problems. Many teachers see corporal punishment as a necessary shock therapy to arrest the attention of a distracted generation in order to create teaching learning ambience in schools. In the secondary schools of Calabar south, it is widely practiced.

## 2. The Concept of Corporal Punishment and its Practice across Cultures

Corporal Punishment is seen as a viable option through which order and discipline can be made effective in the secondary school system. Many justify its inclusion as a disciplinary control measure in schools by invoking the ancient Biblical dictation of sparing the rod and spoiling the child to show that the recommendation of corporal punishment is not human but divine. American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2014) defined corporal punishment as a disciplinary method in which a supervising adult deliberately inflicts pain upon a child as a response to the unacceptable behavior and/or inappropriate language displayed by the child in which the immediate object of the punishment is to instantly put an end to the offense, prevent its recurrence and use that as an example to scare other children from copying the bad behaviour. The source also suggested that corporal punishment is often executed through hitting various parts of the child's body with a hand, canes, paddles, yardsticks, belts, or other objects which are expected to cause pain and fear. The purported long-term goal according to the same source is to change the child's behavior and to make it more consistent with the adult's expectations. Corporal punishment which is further defined by Phil for Humanity (2017) as the intentional act of disciplining by inflicting physical pain, is also seen by the same source as having both retributive and preventive functions: retributive because it chastises for a wrong done, and preventive because it associates fear with these undesired acts hoping to stop it from happening again. A 2007 United Nation Committee on the Rights of the Child quoted in Gershoff (2017) define corporal punishment as any punishment which applies physical force, and is intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light. Corporal punishment summarily, is the act of deliberately inflicting pain upon a child's body by an adult in response to a child's unacceptable behavior or inappropriate behaviour, intended to serve a retributive and preventive purposes usually by spanking, hitting the child's body with cane, hand or paddle. In some Nigerian secondary schools, it may include such punishments as standing under the hot sun, sitting on the wall, "sitting in the air" to cutting grass, digging trees, running around the field or any type of manual activity that brings physical pains depending on the age of the child.

The suggestion of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control strategy in schools raises a lot of issues and polarizes opinion of people in favor and against. The controversy is due, largely, to the fact that while many cultures accept it as being proper and an immediate source of discipline at little or no cost, many other cultures do not. Many are opposed to it on grounds of it being suggestive of violence as a way of solving problems and as an inroad to abuse of the minor. The United Nation Committee on the Rights of the Child in Gershoff (2017) condemns corporal punishment as a sort of violence against children. Different regions of the world react differently to application of corporal punishment in schools. For example, Yaghambe and Tshabangu,(2013) indicated that corporal punishment is regarded as lawful in Tanzania under the National Corporal Punishment Regulation of 1979. UNESCO (2001) reported that, many teachers in Kenya argue that without corporal punishment, schools would descend into chaos possibly causing pupils to become even more unruly by the time they reached high school. According to this report, teachers argued that corporal punishment is one of the few disciplinary tools available for effective control of large class sizes. Furthermore, Agbenyega (2006), who reported on the practice of corporal punishment

in two basic schools in the Greater Accra District in Ghana, held that an overwhelming majority of the teachers in the range of 94 and 98 percent use corporal punishment to enforce school discipline, and a large number of teachers from all the schools indicated their unwillingness to discontinue corporal punishment in their schools. Many teachers often expressed a sense of despair at the possibility of banning corporal punishment due mainly to students' disruptive behavior and the perception that their authority could be taken away. In Nigeria, the reports of Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (2017) seems to infer that since article 295 of the Criminal Code (South), article 55 of the Penal Code (North) and the Sharia's penal codes in the Northern States confirm the right of parents to use force to "correct" their children, then teachers who, by assumption of the principle of "*in loco parentis*" as parents of their pupils have rights to use force or corporal punishment to enforce discipline in schools. A further breakdown of above legal tenets as that contained in article 295(4) of the Criminal Code (South), which states that "a schoolmaster or a person acting as a schoolmaster" is automatically considered as having been entrusted with "authority for correction, including the power to determine in what cases correction ought to be inflicted", and article 55 of the Penal Code (North), which states: "Nothing is an offence which does not amount to the infliction of grievous hurt upon any person and which is done by a schoolmaster for the purpose of correcting a child under eighteen years of age entrusted to his charge." are all seen as conferring a status of legality to the practice of corporal punishment in Nigeria.

Corporal punishment is legally prohibited in schools in 128 countries of the world and allowed in 69 (35%) according to Gershoff (2017). It is banned, according to this source, in all of Europe and most of South America and East Asia. Three industrialized countries continue to allow school corporal punishment: Australia, the Republic of South Korea, and the United States. In Australia, school corporal punishment is banned in 5 of its 8 states and territories, while in the United States it is banned from public schools in 31 of 50 states. While corporal punishment may be legal in some places and illegal in others for cultural, religious and other reasons, Phil for Humanity (2017) proposes the advantages of corporal punishment to include: its effectiveness and affordability, its acting as deterrence, increasing immediate short-term compliance, its cost and time saving quality and others. However, the same source raises the negative issues associated with corporal punishment to include: the tendency of corporal punishment to lower self esteem to both the punisher and punishee, its delayed psychological impact in the long term; Its tendency to increase rage and hostility and the purported training of children to become violent prone in their attitude to other children. Phil for Humanity (2017) concludes that corporal punishment educates children to believe that violence an acceptable means of solving problems and can eventually lead to child abuse

### 3. Literature Review

Literature was reviewed in the area of practices of corporal punishment as they vary between teachers' gender, school ownership in terms of private and public schools and also the influence of years of experience of teachers. Plan International (2013) observed generally that the threshold of tolerance of teachers for noise by students sometime plays an important intervening variable in teachers' decision to use corporal punishment in the school. The source observed that teachers with low threshold for noise are associated with use of corporal punishment than teachers who are not irrespective of the age, experience or gender. These set of teachers, seeing students' noise as signs of indiscipline and non compliance, are likely to use corporal punishment more out of habit than as disciplinary action. Furthermore, the same source suggested that teachers' concept of children may also influence their likelihood of use of corporal punishment. This is based on a study carried out by Shah and Pervez (1994) in Charsadda, a district in Pakistan which found that children in Pakhtun society were considered as toys when they were very young, and as inferior adults when they started to grow up. The individuality of the child as a human being seem to be diminished thus focusing attention on the child's development as a process of obeying and adoption of the values and knowledge provided by adults, rather than on growth, nurturing, creativity, or individuality. Cheruvalath and Tripathi (2015) carried out a study on secondary school

teachers' perception of corporal Punishment using India as a case study. The study varied the perception of corporal punishment according to gender and concluded that thirty-eight percent of the female and 48 percent of the male teachers believe that corporal punishment is necessary to maintain discipline in the class. Thirty-six percent of the female teachers disagree with the idea that no corporal punishment is good for the child as most of them agree that corporal punishment gave children opportunity to be corrected. The majority of the female teachers were against abolishing corporal punishment in schools because of the believe that such action will lead to indiscipline as half of the female teachers believed that corporal punishment improves performance and is an effective disciplinary measure. In other words, more male teachers are likely to use corporal punishment than female teachers.

Makewa, Myriam and Benson (2017) conducted a study into teacher perception on the ban on corporal punishment in public secondary schools of Kosirai in Nandi County of the North Rift of Kenya in which comparisons of perception was varied by gender. The result showed that there was no significance difference between the perception of male and female teachers on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public schools. In the same study, comparison of perceptions by teaching experience revealed that the group descriptive statistics showed 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. However, the study carried out by Plan International (2013) concluded that more older teachers used corporal punishment than younger teachers though it is not clear if by older teachers, it also meant those who had more experience in teaching. The same study also compared the difference in use of corporate punishment by teachers in public and private schools and concluded that the difference was not statistically significant even though views of participants were divided with some of them saying that corporal punishment was more prevalent in government schools, and others saying there was no difference

#### **4. Objectives of the Study**

The objective of this study was to:

1. establish if administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State is influenced by teachers' gender.
2. determine if the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State differ according to teachers' teaching experience.
3. ascertain if administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary mechanism differ among teachers working in public and private secondary schools in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State

#### **5. Hypotheses**

1. There is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' gender.
2. There is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' teaching experience.
3. There is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of teachers working in public and private secondary schools in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State

#### **6. Methodology of the Study**

The study investigated the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control

mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State using the survey design. The survey research method was used because the study was an assessment of the state of use of corporal punishment in secondary schools of the study area as Kellinger in Isangedighi, Joshua, Asim, and Ekuri (2004) see survey research as focused on determining the nature of a situation which exists during the time of investigation by studying large and small populations through selected samples or the population. The population of the study consisted of teachers of public and private secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State. By use of simple random sampling method, a sample of 200 teachers was drawn for the study. The instrument for data generation was a modified 4-point Likert-type scale questionnaire with 30 items titled "Corporal Punishment and Disciplinary Control Questionnaire" (CPDCQ). It was divided into two sections. Section A dealt with the generation of demographic information of teachers while section B contained items on corporal punishment as disciplinary control mechanism. The validity of the instrument was obtained through scrutiny by experts in the field of Measurement and Evaluation. To determine the reliability of the instrument, the questionnaire was administered to 20 teachers drawn from the population who did not participate in the final study, the data collected from their responses was analyzed using the Cronbach alpha procedure and an overall reliability coefficient of 0.82 was realized. Data analysis done through the Independent t-test statistical tool and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) which tested the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

## 7. Presentation of Result

### 7.1 Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Ibiono Ibom LGA of Akwa Ibom State based on teachers' gender.

**Table 1:** Independent t-test Statistics on the Difference in the Administration of Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Control Mechanism in Secondary Schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on Teachers' Gender

Variables	N	Mean	SD	df	t-calculated	t-critical
Male	121	58.79	14.5	198	3.924	1.962
Female	79	50.44	14.9			

Calculated  $P > 0.05$ , calculated  $t > 3.924$ , at  $df$  198

Results of the independent t-test statistics in Table 1 shows that the calculated t-value of 3.924 was found to be greater than the critical t-value of 1.962 when tested at 0.05 level of significance using 198 degree of freedom. This implies that the result is significant. The result of the analysis revealed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' gender, thus the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternative hypothesis is accepted. The mean responses of male and female teachers were also shown and their mean scores were 58.79 and 50.44 respectively. This analysis reveals that male teachers tends to have greater influence in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism than their female counterparts.

### 7.2 Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' teaching experience.

**Table 2:** Mean Analysis of the Difference in the Administration of Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Control Mechanism in Secondary Schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on Teachers' Teaching Experience

Teaching Experience	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
1-10 years	29	55.35	15.39
11-20 years	54	47.72	13.93
21-30 years	83	56.30	14.87
31 years and above	34	66.00	11.10
<b>Total</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>55.49</b>	<b>15.24</b>

The analysis of data in Table 2 shows the mean responses of teachers on the influence of age of peers on their attitudes towards academic work. The mean scores of teachers' teaching experience ranging from 1-10 years, 11-20 years, 21-30 years and 31 years and above years were 55.35, 47.72, 56.30 and 66.00 respectively. This analysis reveals that teachers who have taught for 31 years and above tends to have greater influence in the administration of corporal punishment than other teachers who have lesser teaching experience.

**Table 3:** Summary of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Statistics on the Difference in the Administration of Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Control Mechanism in Secondary Schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on Teachers' Teaching Experience

Status	Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F-ratio	F-critical	Remarks
Between group	7069.140	3	2356.380	11.803	2.65	Significant
Within groups	39128.855	196	199.637			
Total	46197.995	199				

The result of the analysis in Table 3 shows that the calculated F-ratio value of 11.803 was found to be greater than the critical F-value of 2.65 when tested at 0.05 level of significance using 3 and 196 degree of freedom. This implies that the result is significant. The result of the analysis revealed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' teaching experience, thus the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Given the significant F- value, a post hoc test of significance was done using Scheffe's Multiple Comparison statistics which is as shown in Table 4.

**Table 4:** Scheffe's Test Analysis on the Difference in the Administration of Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Control Mechanism in Secondary Schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on Teachers' Teaching Experience (N= 200)

Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Corporal Punishment						
(I) Teachers' Teaching Experience	(J) Teachers' Teaching Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1-10	11-20	7.62261	3.25285	.143	-1.5502	16.7954
	21-30	-.95638	3.04784	.992	-9.5511	7.6383
	31 and above	-10.65517*	3.57151	.033	-20.7266	-.5837
11-20	1-10	-7.62261	3.25285	.143	-16.7954	1.5502
	21-30	-8.57898*	2.47027	.008	-15.5450	-1.6130
	31 and above	-18.27778*	3.09332	.000	-27.0008	-9.5548
21-30	1-10	.95638	3.04784	.992	-7.6383	9.5511
	11-20	8.57898*	2.47027	.008	1.6130	15.5450
	31 and above	-9.69880*	2.87697	.011	-17.8117	-1.5859
31 and above	1-10	10.65517*	3.57151	.033	.5837	20.7266
	11-20	18.27778*	3.09332	.000	9.5548	27.0008
	21-30	9.69880*	2.87697	.011	1.5859	17.8117

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The Scheffe's test analysis as indicated in Table 4 shows six possible pair-wise comparison of mean difference in teachers' teaching experience (1-10, 11-20, 21-30, 31years and above). There is a significant mean difference between 1-10 years and 31years and above (10.65), 11-20 years and 21-30 years (8.57), 11-20 and 31years and above (18.27), 21-30 years and 31years and above (9.69). There is no significant mean difference between 1-10 years and 11-20 years (7.62), 1-10 years and 21-30 years (0.95). The largest mean difference was between teachers whose teaching experience was 11-20 years and 31 years and above.

### 7.3 Hypothesis 3:

There is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of teachers working in public or private secondary schools in Calabar South LGA of Cross River State.

**Table 4:** Independent t-test Statistics on the Difference in the Administration of Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Control Mechanism of Teachers Working in Public or Private Secondary Schools in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Df	t-calculated	t-critical
Public	144	58.10	14.7	198	4.029	1.962
Private	56	48.79	14.6			

Calculated  $P > 0.05$ , calculated  $t > 4.029$ , at  $df$  198

Results of the independent t-test statistics in Table 4 shows that the calculated t-value of 4.029 was found to be greater than the critical t-value of 1.962 when tested at 0.05 level of significance using 198 degree of freedom. This implies that the result is significant. The result of the analysis revealed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of teachers working in public or private secondary schools in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, thus the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternate hypothesis is accepted. The mean responses of teachers working in public and private schools were also shown and their mean scores were 58.10 and 48.79 respectively. This analysis reveals that teachers working in public school tend to have greater influence in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism than their counterparts in private schools.

## 8. Discussion

The results of the hypothesis one as shown in Table 1 indicates that the calculated t-value of 3.924 was found to be greater than the critical t-value of 1.962 when tested at 0.05 level of significance using 198 degree of freedom. This implies that the result is significant. The result of the analysis revealed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State based on teachers' gender, thus the null hypothesis was rejected while the alternative hypothesis was accepted. This means that male teachers use corporal punishment more than female teachers which agrees with the findings of Cheruvalath and Tripathi (2015) whose study on secondary school teachers' perception of corporal Punishment using India as a case study varied on the bases of gender. Male teachers were seen to be more frequent in use of corporal punishment than female teachers. This conclusion became possible because thirty-eight percent of the female and 48 percent of the male teachers believe that corporal punishment is necessary to maintain discipline in the class. This conclusion stands in disagreement with the findings of Makewa, Myriam and Benson (2017) who conducted a study into teacher perception on the ban on corporal punishment in public secondary schools of Kosirai in Kenya, and varied it by gender. The conclusion showed that there was no significant difference between the perception of male and female teachers on the ban of corporal punishment in Kosirai Division public schools.

The second hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference in the administration of

corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism in secondary schools of Calabar south Local Government based on years of experience. The analysis of this hypothesis as shown in table 2 reveals that teachers who have taught for 31 years and above tend to have greater influence in the administration of corporal punishment than other teachers who had lesser teaching experience. It therefore means that there is a significant difference based on years of experience leading to the abandoning of the hypothesis in favour of the alternate. This conclusion is in disagreement with the findings of Makewa, Myriam and Benson (2017) who in conducting a study into teacher perception on the ban on corporal punishment in public secondary schools of Kosirai in Kenya, and varying it along years of experience found it insignificant. However, Plan International (2013) which conducted a study on why teachers use corporal punishment in Schools concluded that more older teachers than younger teachers use corporal punishment. The tendency of the older or more experienced teachers to use corporal punishment more is somehow perplexing because they should have developed patience with students along the years. The explanation could be threshold of tolerance of teachers for noise by students which is sometime said to play an important role in teachers' decision to use corporal punishment in the school. The assumption here according to Plan International (2013) is that teachers with low threshold for noise are associated with use of corporal punishment than their opposite number irrespective of the age, experience or gender. Such teachers, seeing students' noise as signs of indiscipline and non compliance, are likely to use corporal punishment more out of habit of hatred for noise than as disciplinary action.

The third hypothesis stated that there is no significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of teachers working in public or private secondary schools in Calabar South LGA of Cross River State. The results of the analysis as shown in table 4 indicate that the calculated t-value of 4.029 was found to be greater than the critical t-value of 1.962 when tested at 0.05 level of significance using 198 degree of freedom thus implying that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of teachers working in public or private secondary schools in Calabar South LGA of Cross River State leading to the rejection of the null hypothesis and the acceptance of the alternate hypothesis. This is in disagreement with Plan International (2013) which found that the values obtained in finding the difference in application of corporal punishment in Pakistani schools varied according to school proprietorship in terms of public or private schools were found to be statistically insignificant even though some reports indicated a slight variation in favour of more use of corporal punishment in public schools

## 9. Conclusion

It is clear that corporal punishment is used in the secondary schools of Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State. What may not be clear is the statistical values for its frequency, severity and nature of the punishment in use. It is also clear that the use of corporal punishment vary according to years of experience of teachers, the gender of the teacher and according to school proprietorship. Use of corporal punishment ranges from administering certain number of stroke of the cane on a child to digging out a tree; and from cutting grass to kneeling with hands raised for hours. Corporal punishment is legally prohibited in schools in 128 countries of the world and allowed in 69 (35%) according to Gershoff (2017), and only three industrialized countries continue to allow school corporal punishment: Australia, the Republic of South Korea, and the United States according to this source, and even at that it is still banned in parts of the United States and Australia. The United Nation Committee on the Rights of the Child in Gershoff (2017) condemns corporal punishment as a sort of violence against children. But in spite of the controversy around the use of corporal punishment, many school administrators and teachers see in its use, the last resort to bringing some sort of order and sanity to schools and classrooms for teaching and learning to happen. These call for a line to be drawn between child abuse in the name of disciplinary control which is condemned as criminal, and the genuine and sincere effort at creating order in schools through some physical punishments which is sometime exaggerated and blown out of proportion.



## 10. Recommendation

1. Government through the Ministry of Education should intervene by making laws to regulate the frequency, severity and nature of corporal punishment in schools to avoid abuses
2. Government through the Ministry of Education should decide age appropriate punishment for schools
3. Government through the Ministry of Education should state consequences for abuse of use of corporal punishment by teachers
4. In line to reduce and eventually outlaw corporal punishment in schools, Government through the Ministry of Education should incorporate educational and behavioral interventions related to corporal punishment into teacher training programmes. Other interventions that focus on decreasing teachers' use of corporal punishment and increasing positive discipline in school settings should also form part of teacher training curriculum.
5. The Ministry of Education should launch public awareness campaigns as part of national strategies to curb abuse of children in the name of discipline to reduce teachers' use of corporal punishment. For instance, information about the abuses of corporal punishment be printed on exercise books, writing materials.
6. Government through the Ministry of Education should stipulate offences for which punishment can be given, the type of punishment and who should administer the punishment
7. Principals should strictly keep corporal punishment records for reference purposes

## References

- Agbenyega, J. S. (2006) Corporal punishment in the schools of Ghana: Does inclusive education suffer? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(3) , 107-122.
- American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (2014) Corporal punishment in schools [https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/Policy\\_Statements/1988/Corporal\\_Punishment\\_in\\_Schools.aspx](https://www.aacap.org/AACAP/Policy_Statements/1988/Corporal_Punishment_in_Schools.aspx). (14 May, 2017)
- Cheruvath, R & Tripathi, M (2015) Secondary School Teachers' Perception of Corporal Punishment: A Case Study in India. *The Clearing House*, 88 (4): 127–132
- Farooq, U (2014) Essay on Discipline in School Meaning, Definition & Concept. <http://www.studylecturenotes.com/foundation-of-education/essay-on-discipline-in-school-meaning-definition-concept>. (September, 20th, 2019)
- Gershoff, E. T. (2017) School corporal punishment in global perspective: prevalence, outcomes, and efforts at intervention. *Journal of Psychology, Health & Medicine* 22: 224-239 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13548506.2016.1271955> (September, 20th, 2019)
- Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (2017) Corporal punishment of children in Nigeria. <http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/assets/pdfs/states-reports/Nigeria.pdf> (20th May, 2018)
- Legal Dictionary (2018) Age of Reason. <https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Age+of+Reason>. (September, 20th, 2019)
- Makewa, L. N., Myriam, N. Benson, K. (2017) Teacher Perception on the Ban of Corporal Punishment in Secondary Schools. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317033349\\_Teacher\\_Perception\\_on\\_the\\_Ban\\_of\\_Corporal\\_Punishment\\_in\\_Secondary\\_Schools](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317033349_Teacher_Perception_on_the_Ban_of_Corporal_Punishment_in_Secondary_Schools). (September, 20th, 2019)
- Plan International (2013) Why do Teachers use Corporal Punishment in Schools. [https://www.academia.edu/30259344/Why\\_do\\_Teachers\\_use\\_Corporal\\_Punishment\\_in\\_Schools](https://www.academia.edu/30259344/Why_do_Teachers_use_Corporal_Punishment_in_Schools) (September, 20th, 2019)
- Phil for Humanity(2017) The Pros and Cons of Corporal Punishment. [http://www.philforhumanity.com/Corporal\\_Punishment.html](http://www.philforhumanity.com/Corporal_Punishment.html)
- Reach Out Australia (2019) Self Esteem and Teenager. <https://parents.au.reachout.com/common-concerns/everyday-issues/self-esteem-and-teenagers> (July, 12 2018)
- Shah, M. H. & Pervez, M (1994) Profile of Pre -school Charsardda Child: Entry Cognitive, Cultural and Psychomotor Characteristics of Pukhtoon Children. Primary Education Charsadda District Project [https://www.academia.edu/30259344/Why\\_do\\_Teachers\\_use\\_Corporal\\_Punishment\\_in\\_Schools](https://www.academia.edu/30259344/Why_do_Teachers_use_Corporal_Punishment_in_Schools) (August 22nd, 2019)
- Yaghambe, R. S. an Tshabangu, Icarbord (2013) Disciplinary Networks in Secondary Schools: Policy dimensions and children's rights in Tanzania. *Journal of Studies in Education* Vol. 3, (4), 42-56
- UNESCO. (2001).Monitoring report on education for all 2001. [http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/monitoring/monitoring\\_rep\\_contents.shtml](http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/monitoring/monitoring_rep_contents.shtml) (08th September, 2018)