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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to find out teacher attitude towards the use of corporal punishment in some selected Senior High Schools in Asokore – Mampong Municipality. The objectives of the study were to find out the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High Schools; identify factors that influence the use of corporal punishment and look into other methods used by teachers to modify student behavior in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality. The researcher used descriptive survey design for the study. The target population of the study was all the headmasters and assistant headmasters and teachers of the three public senior high schools in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality. Purposive sampling was used to select all the 9 headmasters and assistant headmasters. Simple random sampling was used to select 141 teachers. The researcher used closed ended questionnaire to collect data for the study. The data was processed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software package version 20.0. The data was analysed with the use of frequencies and percentages. The study revealed that teachers should use corporal punishment to modify deviant behaviour to come out as the most perceptions of teachers on corporal punishment in senior high schools. The study also revealed that sleeping in class, fighting, unnecessary noise making in class, absenteeism, disobedience, stealing, eating in class, bullying junior students, improper dressing were factors that influence the use of corporal punishment. The study recommended that the Education Directorate of the Asokore-Mampong Municipality should take the lead in harnessing the positive aspects of Ghanaian culture which considers the child a gift to society and discipline as an opportunity for learning to provide a protective environment for children in communities within the Municipality to prevent future occurrences of violence through corporal punishment.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

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 (1987) 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 disciplinary measure, is of great importance.

According to Sonn (2002), 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 punished (Lambert, 2010). This form of punishment has been a classic method of imparting discipline since ancient civilization (Batul, 2011). 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 Middleton (2008).

In England, corporal punishment was used in the 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 the child. 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 (Batul, 2002).

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 (Durrant, 1996). 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 in 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 (Banda, 2006).

The Kenya system of education emerged 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 (Ndichu, 2004). 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.

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 (2006), 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 (Tungata, 2006).

However, it is not clear why Kenya government banned corporal punishment without replacing it with equivalence effective alternatives.

Corporal punishment is pervasive worldwide, and Ghana is no exception. Corporal punishment in Ghana occurs in the home, school, alternative care settings, day care facilities, and penal institutions. According to a 2010 report, in sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East, and North Africa, more than seven in ten children aged 2 to 14 are disciplined using corporal punishment. With a reported 93% of children being subjected to corporal punishment in the home, Ghana ranks second to Yemen in the world, and ranks first in sub-Saharan Africa.

Given how commonly it is practiced, it comes as no surprise that corporal punishment is acceptable to most Ghanaians among both children and adults. In fact, parents and other care-givers who do not use corporal punishment as a corrective measure are often perceived as being ‘too soft’ in their parenting methods (Tungata, 2006).

Ghanaian girls are just as likely to be subjected to corporal punishment as boys. And indeed, corporal punishment in the home is the most common form of violence against children in Ghana. Despite its ubiquitous nature, studies clearly indicate that corporal punishment is detrimental to children’s development, causing negative outcomes that vary, depending on the particular nature, extent and severity of exposure. “These range from immediate impacts to long-term harm that children carry into adult life. Injuries inflicted
by a care-giver on a child can result in death or serious damage, including cognitive and physical impairments.” In addition, “children raised by authoritarian parents who regularly employ harsh and punitive disciplinary methods tend to have reduced self-esteem and lower academic success, are more hostile and aggressive and less popular with peers, and are less independent than children who have not suffered in this way; such children also engage in more substance abuse as adolescents (Swan, 2013).

An impassionate debate has been raging over the media regarding what is permissible and effective in raising children, and although many societies differ in many aspects of their cultures such as religion, mode of worship, rites of passage and language among others, they generally agree on the education or socialization that the young members of the society should receive; that is the transmission of each society’s culture. Parents and other caretakers such as teachers are the most important influences during the early years which are the most crucial in a child’s life. This is because the experiences build on (Basi & Dilekmen, 2009). Parents start the process of socialization where a child experiences receiving, sharing, and giving – the three important aspects of social behaviours in school (Cicognani, 2004). During this early period which is the most formative and most impressionable of the child’s life, schools which serve as a socialization function as the first organization the children become a member (Datta, 1984) lay the foundations of learning in all its various forms. What children learn in this process is not only common practice and institutions of culture such as language, dress code; what is considered edible and expected roles; but also the society’s world view. Datta believes that this is the complex of motivation, perceptions and beliefs that are internalized and they strongly affect interaction with other people and things in nature. A world view is rarely
verbalized, but is inferred by actions. It is a set of feelings and basic attitudes about the world rather than clearly formulated opinions about it.

The world view is concerned with core values; these are the fundamental values that provide the basis of social behaviour. Culture is a society’s common fund of beliefs and behaviours and its concepts of how people should conduct themselves, culture defines the generally accepted principles of child rearing and care of children. These are standards by which members of a culture define it.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Corporal punishment has been used by teachers in Ghana and other countries to serve a disciplinary measure to shape the behaviour of students. In moral training of African children, social sanctions always involve punishment and violation of any of the rules of the society usually would lead to punishment (Cicognani, 2004) which is given in the believe that it would prevent the recurrence of the behaviour for which it was given. Prohibiting corporal punishment would therefore constitute a serious sense of interference with the liberty and interest of parents who judge the possibilities of corporal punishment to benefit their children. For many parents, it is very important that no transgressions go unpunished otherwise the child would become spoilt. Macionis (1991) from this social background therefore, posits that punishment in schools can be understood to serve as a socialization function. It not only facilitates the move from jurisdiction of the family to the jurisdiction of the state, teaching the child that punishment is not always inflicted by family members, but also punishes the guilty. Corporal punishment in Kenya was banned (Goldman, 2004). Through the gazette notice the government scrapped sections of the law
that permitted corporal punishment. Goldman believes that although the government outlawed any form of physical punishment on children in learning institutions, corporal punishment is still practiced in homes and many more institutions countrywide; this includes kneeling for hours, kicking, slapping, giving a lot of academic work and engaging in difficult games. Pressure from parents who want their children punished in the event of misbehaviour has further complicated the issue. Therefore, this study was undertaken to establish the justification of the continued application of corporal punishment in senior high schools, specifically, the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in senior high schools despite the ban (Goldman, 2004). Therefore, it is prudent to research into teacher attitude towards the use of corporal punishment in some selected Senior High Schools in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality of the Ashanti Region.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find out teacher attitude towards the use of corporal punishment in some selected Senior High Schools in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality.

1.4 Research objectives

The objectives of the study were to;

1. find out the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High Schools in Asokore – Mampong Municipality
2. identify factors that influence the use of corporal punishment in Asokore – Mampong Municipality
3. look into methods used by teachers to modify student behavior in Asokore – Mampong Municipality

1.5 Research Questions

In order to assist the analysis, the following questions were posed:

1. What are the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High schools in the Asokore – Mampong Municipality?

2. What factors influence the use of corporal punishment in Asokore – Mampong Municipality?

3. What methods are used by teachers to modify student behavior in Asokore – Mampong Municipality?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study will be of importance to the Education Directorate of the Municipality as they will get to know the teacher attitude towards the abolition of corporal punishment in Ghanaian schools. By this, the Ministry will use the information to come up with the ways of dealing with the issue of corporal punishment.

The findings will also be of importance to teachers as they will get to know dignity and worth of a person. The issue of discipline is important to the relationships between children and their parents. Since the Education Directorate of the Municipality hold a core value of the importance of human relationships, the impact of corporal punishment on the parent-child connection is important for social workers to be aware of and address when working with families.
The study will be of importance to the management of the schools as Children deserve to be treated with respect and dignity and worth. The use of physical discipline on a child undermines their dignity and worth and does not treat a child with the respect they deserve. Thus, it is important for social workers to know the impact of corporal punishment so social workers can help educate parents and the community to promote the wellbeing of children. Lastly policymakers may be informed about the ways in which available human resources can be handled the act corporal punishment.

1.7 Limitations of the Study

There existed a scarcity of literature in the Ghanaian context. Existing literature focused on other geographical locations. As such finding literature to espouse the Ghanaian experience was quite challenging.

Also time was a major setback for visiting and gathering information in the schools selected. These limitations did not in any way render the findings of this research unreliable and inapplicable since the researcher managed these limitations effectively to ensure that the objectives of the study were achieved.

1.7 Delimitations of the Study

The study focused on Senior High Schools in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality of the Ashanti Region of Ghana. The population of the study was delimited to teachers and headteachers in the study area.
1.8 Organization of Project Report

This report comprises five chapters: The first chapter is the general introduction dealing with the background of the study, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, objectives of the study, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations of the study, Limitations of the study and the organization of the project report. The second chapter deals with the review of the literature. The third chapter focuses on the methodology of the study; whereas chapter four presents results and discussions of data. Chapter five presents the summary, conclusion, recommendation of the study and suggestion for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the literature review in relation to corporal punishment. In this respect, topics reviewed include: meaning of corporal punishment, history of corporal punishment opposition to corporal punishment, policy framework on corporal punishment, support for corporal punishment, teachers’ perception on corporal punishment in school, behavior modification, classroom management and students’ classroom misbehavior, positive reinforcement, positive reinforcement versus negative reinforcement, corporal punishment and ethnicity, and corporal punishment and religion.

2.2 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 Swan (2013). According to Straus (1997) 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” (p.34). Usually, parents and teachers use spanking, slapping, whipping, caning or some uncomfortable position to punish children. Hyman (1990) 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”. (p.34).

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 (Mali, 2002).

Cohen (1984) 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 (Panital, 2012).

Corporal punishment is physical punishment as distinguished from pecuniary punishment or fine; any kind of punishment 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” (Sonia, Hassan, Javad & Jean, 2010: p.45).

Gershoff (2008) defines corporal punishment as physical punishment which uses physical force intending to cause bodily pain for the purpose of correcting or punishing a child for their behavior. According to the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child, corporal punishment is “any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light” (U.N. Committee, 2001, general comments #1). Corporal punishment may include physical pain created by a variety of methods including paddles, excessive exercise drills, or requiring students to assume painful body positions (Northington, 2007). Corporal punishment may be divided into three types:
Judicial corporal punishment which is punishment ordered by a court of law; Parental or domestic corporal punishment. Parental corporal punishment is permitted in all U.S. States except for the State of Delaware (Clabough, 2012). Thirty four countries around the world have banned the use of parental corporal punishment (Global Initiative, 2012); School corporal punishment which occurs when students are punished by teachers or administrators.

2.3 History of Corporal Punishment

Corporal punishment has a long and evolving history. The first written account of corporal punishment comes from the Old Testament, in the book of Proverbs. This time frame would be approximately as early as 10th century BCE (Before Common Era). Though the classic phrase, “spare the rod, spoil the child” is used to support the use of corporal punishment, it is actually not from the Bible at all (Greven, 1990). However, similar sayings are found in the book of Proverbs, “Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beat him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell (Proverbs, 23:13-14)” (Greven, 1990). The Bible’s book of Proverbs is the first written account that some people refer to for the support or justification of corporal punishment. “For many centuries, the Book of Proverbs has provided parents, preachers, and teachers with the basic aphorisms that have justified their commitment to corporal punishment of children” (Greven, 1990, p.48).

The use of physical punishment on humans can be found throughout history in almost all books. Cooper (1988) describes corporal punishment as being “as old as sin” (p.6). “The practice of flagellating the human body dates from the earliest ages of mankind”
(Cooper, 1988, p. 2). Before Rome was founded, whipping slaves happened daily (Cooper, 1988). Furthermore, in the 5th century of the Christian era, people believed that if they were whipped/beat/flogged that they would pay a penance to God which may save them from the wrath of God, which at the time was a plague. This fear of the plague resulted in people volunteering to be whipped as a way to save them (Cooper, 1988). This belief that physical punishment is a way of saving people, i.e. children, from a bad future, has long roots in history.

Illustrations in history have shown the use of corporal punishment of children both at home and at school. There are numerous historical illustrations showing the use of a rod as a form of disciplining slaves, women, criminals, students, and children. There is an illustration from Hans Holbein’s Illustration to Erasmus’ “Praise of Folly” titled “The Mother’s Correction”, shows a mother with a child over her lap and her hitting the child on the buttocks with a whip (Cooper, 1988). A school scene in the Middle Ages shows a teacher using a whip on a student’s buttocks while other students sit at their desk, looking on, “the flogging scene at school appears to have been rather a favorite subject among the early caricaturists, for the scourge was looked upon as the grand stimulant to scholarship. In those good old times, when a man recalled to memory his schoolboy days, he did not say, ‘When I was at school,’ but ‘When I was under the rod’ (Cooper, 1988, p. 250).

In the United States, the early settlers had a firm belief in the use of the rod as a way of instilling morality in people (Cooper, 1988). A whipping post was established in a public place and used for public lashings for the punishment of crimes (Cooper, 1988). Furthermore, spanking was also used in the home. “Domestic flogging, or what is called “spanking,” prevails more or less all over America, so far as the younger branches of
families are concerned. Whipping was a common punishment for both sexes in the time of the Puritans. Sons and daughters, we are told, had to endure the Rod till they were of a marriageable age” (Cooper, 1988, p.300).

In the United States, various literature points to the use of corporal punishment in U.S. history. In the 17th century, a school in Massachusetts declared that the rod should be used for classroom discipline as ordered by God (Glenn, 1984). An autobiographical book, titled *The Wandering Boy*, was published in 1839 and narrated the life of Lane, born in 1788. This book pointed to the common use of corporal punishment in the late 18th and first half of the 19th century (Glenn, 1984). A book by Benjamin Wadsworth, titled *The Well Ordered Family*, published in the 18th century, stated that parents should use the rod to punish children (Glenn, 1984).

However, there became public concern regarding the use of corporal punishment with prisoners, navy men, men of war, and children during the late 1820s to the late 1850s (Glenn, 1984). In 1826, in Auburn, New York, people petitioned to end prisoner floggings. In 1847, the Brooklyn *Daily Advertiser*, *Boston Post*, *New York Daily Globe*, and the *North American Review* reported that corporal punishment should be abolished in schools. Horace Mann was the first Secretary of the Board of Education in Massachusetts, serving from 1838 to 1849, to oppose corporal punishment in the schools. Articles against corporal punishment were prominent in educational journals and the book, *The Evil Tendencies of Corporal Punishment*, was published during this time period as well, in 1847. *The New York Tribune* in 1850 reported that the common practice of flogging men in the navy is cruel and that that practice should be abolished, and Congress did abolish it in 1850. Also, the public petitioned the US Congress to end flogging men of war in 1850. Furthermore,
popular writings during this same time period, encouraged parents to use methods of discipline other than corporal punishment. However, the crusade against corporal punishment declined in the 1850s due to a change in the U.S. society’s focus to issues of slavery and the Civil War (Glenn, 1984).

In the early 1890s in England, the use of corporal punishment in schools by teachers was widely debated (Middleton, 2012). At this time, many parents did not find corporal punishment, i.e. hitting children’s knuckles with slates or hitting children in the head with classroom pointers, to be an acceptable form of discipline in the classroom. However, it took over 100 years before corporal punishment was banned in British schools, which happened in 1987 (Middleton, 2012).

The issues of spanking became widely debated and discussed again in the US in the 1920s. The child development movement and Freudian psychiatry in the 1920s and 1930s were influential in the discussion about appropriate child rearing practices, including spanking (Evans & Fargason, 1998). The reality of the repercussions of certain child rearing practices was highlighted during this time and came to the public’s attention. The emotional traumas caused by childhood experiences became more widely known among the public. As a result, the discussion about corporal punishments’ effects on children’s emotional development became a topic of debate that continues to this day (Evans & Fargason, 1998).

The acceptable nature of corporal punishment as a form of discipline has evolved and changed over time. According to Straus (1996), in the late 1960s, 94% of US adults found spanking to be an acceptable way for parents’ to discipline their children. In a study by Straus and Stewart in 1999, the reporting of using spanking for three and four year old
children was very high at 94%. However, in 2000, a poll by Yankelovich found that only 61% of US adults agreed with spanking as an acceptable method of disciplining children (Cummings, 2001).

2.4 Opposition to Corporal Punishment

There has been a lot of research on the effects of corporal punishment. Those in opposition to using corporal punishment to discipline children cite research that points to the negative outcomes to children from this disciplinary method. They oppose corporal punishment since it can have emotional and psychological consequences to the child (Andrew & Stewart, 2002; Benjet & Kazdin, 2003; Flynn, 1998; Gershoff et al., 2002; Gromoske & Maguire-Jack, 2012; Hicks-Pass, 2009; Larzelere & Kuhn, 2005; McLoyd & Smith, 2002; Straus, 1996 & 2001; Simons & Wurtele, 2010; Turner & Muller, 2004).

Andero and Stewart (2002) oppose corporal punishment on the basis that it is an ineffective discipline method. They argue that it is ineffective because it does not teach a child an alternative behavior to the undesirable behavior for which discipline is warranted. Instead, experiencing physical pain without the ability to defend oneself can result in a child having feelings of anger, shame, humiliation and helplessness. As a result, the child ultimately learns to avoid getting caught for misbehaving so as to avoid these feelings that often accompany spanking.

Using the social learning theory, Benjet and Kazdin (2003) opposed corporal punishment because it teaches children that violence is a way to solve problems. In other words, children are learning every day from the modeling and behavior of their parents and the society around them. If parents use physical pain to handle a problem they have with
their child, then they are teaching the child that hitting is an acceptable way to handle a problem. Furthermore, this teaches children to associate hitting with those who love them. In other words, children learn from their parents how to behave in the world, including how to solve problems. Research has shown that children who are spanked are more likely to use hitting as a way to solve a problem with a sibling or other children (Simons & Wurtele, 2010). This research also found that the more children experienced corporal punishment, the more likely they would resort to hitting to solve small problems with other children. On the other hand, children who were not spanked did not choose to use hitting to solve a small or larger conflict with a peer or sibling.

Similarly to Benjet and Kazdin, Straus (1996) argued that spanking children contributes to societal violence. Straus philosophy is called “cultural spillover.” Straus argues that violence and overall crime would be lower in a society that does not use physical pain or violence with their children. Furthermore, there have been many studies that have found that children who are spanked have more internalizing problems (Flynn, 1998; Straus, 2001; Straus & Stewart, 1999). Internalization problems are problems such as depression, suicidal ideation, and low self-esteem as well as having anxiety and withdrawn behaviors (Gromoske & Maguire-Jack, 2012). Gromoske and Maguire-Jack also found that children who were spanked at age one, had more externalizing behaviors at age three and more internalizing behaviors at age five, suggesting a transactional effect over time.

A study by McLoyd and Smith (2002) also cautions against the use of spanking due to the emotional distress it can cause children. They found that spanking does evoke feelings of anger and other negative feeling states and can result in less positive
relationships between the parent and their child over time. McLoyd and Smith’s study took place over a six year time period and they also found that spanking children was a predictor of an increase in problem behavior over these six years.

Corporal punishment has also been linked to children having more externalization behavior problems. Externalization problem behaviors include physically aggressive behaviors, defiant behavior, and delinquent behavior (Lansford et al., 2012). Several studies have found that adolescents who were spanked were more likely to have aggressive and delinquent behaviors (Straus, 2001; Straus & Mouradian, 1998; Turner & Muller, 2004). In addition to adolescents, Gershoff et al. (2002) also found that frequency of spanking was positively correlated to child misbehavior and aggression. Gromoske and Maguire-Jack (2012) found that children who were spanked at age one had more externalizing behaviors at age three. Also, mothers who reported more externalizing behaviors in their children did report using spanking more frequently with that child or using a harsher spanking (Lansford et al., 2012).

High spanking frequency is related to more detrimental outcomes. Larzelere and Kuhn (2005) found that children who were spanked one to three times per week had more detrimental outcomes as a result of spanking than those less frequently spanked. Gershoff et al. (2002) also found that the higher the frequency of corporal punishment, the more detrimental the outcomes.

In addition to detrimental outcomes with spanking, the desire result of children learning more appropriate behaviors due to this discipline technique has not been supported. Lansford et al. (2012) found that spanking did not decrease the child’s problem
behaviors. Therefore, Lansford et al. argues that spanking should not be used since it is not achieving the desired results while also having detrimental consequences.

Another opposition to corporal punishment is the possibility of spanking escalating into physical abuse. Recent study by Lansford et al. (2012) found that a parent who used mild spanking one year had a 50% chance of using heavy spanking a year later. In addition, according to Saadeh et al. (2002), the effectiveness of spanking decreases over time. Therefore, spanking may need to escalate to get the same behavior change that worked a year earlier. As a result, the line between spanking and abuse can be crossed and result in physical injury. The line can also be crossed when emotions are high (of the parent) and a child needs increased spankings for the same result. This escalation from spanking into abuse and possible serious injury is one major caution against using this type of discipline method.

Since it is difficult to prove causality between spanking and negative behavior outcomes, there have been many debates over results found in the research as well as many research studies to address the debate and add to the body of knowledge currently in literature. To summarize the findings of the literature on corporal punishment, Gershoff et al. (2002) analyzed 88 studies on corporal punishment and found that corporal punishment was linked to many negative outcomes for children, such as aggressive behavior, more delinquent and antisocial behaviors in children, lower levels of internalization of morals, lower levels of mental health, and a less positive relationship quality between a parent and their child.

A study by McLoyd and Smith (2002) supported Gershoff et al.’s findings. The researchers followed children over a four year period and found that children who were
Spanked at high levels had more behavior problems. When the spanking levels for these children decreased, their problem behaviors also decreased. This finding suggests a direct connection between spanking and subsequent problem behaviors.

As a result of these studies, the question of causality arose. There was a debate about whether spanking caused aggression or if children who are more aggressive are more likely to be spanked. To address this issue, a recent study was completed by Gromoske and Maguire-Jack (2012) which found children’s externalization problem behaviors affects a parents’ discipline choice and parents’ choice of spanking also affects a child’s externalization problem behaviors. The study found a transactional relationship between spanking and a child’s externalization behaviors. The same connection was not found for children’s internalization problem behaviors. For example, children’s internalization problem behaviors did not affect a parents’ discipline choice but parents’ choice of spanking did affect a child’s internalization problem behaviors.

Also, the goal of spanking is to deter the child from an undesired behavior but often spanking is a parents’ emotional response to a situation instead of a discipline only technique. According to Saadeh et al. (2002), most of the parents studied reported being angry at the time that they spank their child, thus indicating a more impulsive decision than a thoughtful discipline technique. The question then arises about whether parents arespanking due to their own stress levels, i.e. anger, or if they are spanking for the child’s actual behavior issue.

Despite all this research, corporal punishment, as defined in this literature review, is not against the law in any state in the United States. Physical punishment of a child is only illegal in the USA if it causes physical harm to a child (Benjet & Kazdin, 2003).
However, corporal punishment has become outlawed in eleven countries: Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Norway, and Sweden.

The ban on corporal punishment is supported by Jenny (2009) in the article, Spanking Should Not Be Lawful. Jenny argues that just because corporal punishment is legal, it does not make it right to hit children. She compares corporal punishment of children to domestic violence between a husband and wife, which also use to be legal. Jenny justifies this ban on corporal punishment by comparing the death rates of children in the USA to the death rates of children in Sweden, which outlawed corporal punishment in 1979. During the years 1980 to 1996, only one child in Sweden died from the physical abuse inflicted on them by a parent. In the USA, during the same 16 years, 26,000 children died at the hands of their parents’ physical abuse. Based on these results, Jenny argues that corporal punishment should be made illegal in the USA since it can have deadly consequences.

Despite the overwhelming research that links spanking and negative outcomes for children both in internal and external behavioral problems; spanking is still a common practice for parents in the United States. Other research outcomes support its practice.

2.6 National legal and policy framework on Corporal punishment

Following its pioneering ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1990, Ghana passed the 1998 Children’s Act (Act 560) and the 2007 Domestic Violence Act (Act 732). Ghana also enacted many other policies meant to protect children, including the National Plan of Action on Child Labour and the Worst Forms of Child Labour (2009 – 2015), the National Plan of Action on Orphans and Vulnerable Children
(2010 – 2015) and the Early Childhood Care and Development Policy in 2004. In spite of these laws and policies, there is still no overarching national policy framework on children and a systematic approach to delivering child and family welfare services. Consequently, the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection (MoGCSP) developed a national Child and Family Welfare Policy (CFWP) in 2015 to establish a “well-structured and coordinated Child and Family Welfare System that promotes the wellbeing of children, prevents abuse and protects children from harm.” Among the objectives of the CFWP are the design of child and family welfare programmes and activities to protect children from all forms of violence, including corporal punishment, abuse, neglect and exploitation, as well as the reform of existing laws to conform with the new policy direction. So far, the Policy is still being implemented at the pilot phase in 20 Districts in the country and any significant improvements in the child and family welfare system are yet to be recorded. The Department of Children under the MoGCSP has embarked on a public education campaign to change societal attitudes about corporal punishment and promote positive parenting through billboard messages, television spots, and radio announcements in Accra and other cities in Ghana.

While corporal punishment has been prohibited in Ghana’s schools per a directive from the Ghana Educational Service, the practice still persists in the home. The Children’s Act and the Criminal Offences Act lag behind these other hallmarks of progress, and are yet to be amended. Article 13(2) of the Children’s Act currently allows “justifiable” and “reasonable” corporal punishment of a child. Section 41 of the Criminal Offences Act allows the use of a “blow or other force” against a child under the age of 16 years by a
parent, guardian, or their delegate, master, and the master of an apprentice, for misconduct or disobedience, so long as the force is reasonable in kind and degree.

2.5 Support for Corporal Punishment

Despite all the research in opposition to corporal punishment and the detrimental effects of spanking, there continues to be supporters of corporal punishment and other researchers that have found evidence that supports the use of corporal punishment. Studies by Larzelere and Kuhn (2005) and Straus (2001) have shown that corporal punishment can be an effective way to raise obedient children. Furthermore, a meta-analysis of 70 studies by Paolucci and Violato (2004) found that there is no evidence that spanking causes several emotional or behavioral problems in children.

A study by Slade and Wissow (2004) found that spanking children before the age of two did not result in significant problem behaviors four years later. Instead, these researchers found that problem behaviors displayed by children, four years later, who were spanked before the age of two, were equivalent to problem behaviors displayed by their non-spanked peers. This study did not find a connection between spanking and an increase in later externalization problem behaviors.

Those who support corporal punishment will sometimes argue that a child’s entire context in which they are reared needs to be considered in order to make an association between spanking and negative outcomes. Lansford et al. (2012) and Larzelere and Kuhn (2005) found that some contexts in which children were raised resulted in spanking not being as harmful to these children. These researchers argue that some environments can actually decrease the possibility of harm that the child might experience from corporal
punishment. For example, according to Benjet and Kazdin (2003), when a child feels accepted by their caregiver, as opposed to rejected, it results in less negative effects of the spanking. Also, the meaning children attach to their spanking influences how it affects them. Furthermore, the other contexts of the child’s environment, such as their age, sex, race, family structure, relationship with parents, all affect the outcome of spanking on a child’s later behaviors (Benjet & Kazdin, 2003).

Larzelere and Kuhn (2005) studied the context of a child’s age on the effects of spanking. The results of the study found that spanking benefited children who are under the age of six. Detrimental effects of spanking were found for children over the age of six. Gershoff et al. (2012) also found a more detrimental effect related to spanking as children got older, specifically an increase in child’s aggression and antisocial behavior. McLoyd and Smith (2002) found that the context of a child’s relationship with their mother had an effect on the child’s outcomes from spanking. These researchers found children who had high emotional support from their mother, while also being spanked as a method of discipline, did not experience the increase in problem behaviors. Instead, the children who had low levels of maternal emotional support had an association between spanking and behavior problems. MacKenzie et al. (2012) followed up on this study and found that maternal warmth did not moderate the effects of spanking. Instead, they found that all children who were spanked at the age of three, regardless of mother’s maternal warmth or emotional support, had more externalizing problem behaviors at the age of five.

There are some researchers that support corporal punishment as a discipline method that has positive outcomes. Larzelere and Kuhn (2005) found that corporal punishment can be beneficial for children age two to six who are given mild or occasional spankings. Benjet
and Kazdin (2003) argue that spanking can be positive since it teaches children to respect authority. They further argue that not spanking a child can result in a child learning to be disrespectful of authority. This disrespect can result in these children becoming more unlawful as adults and more likely to be violent. Taylor et al. (2011) also argues a similar idea. They stated that spanking was used with past generations as a common method of discipline. They pointed out that adults from those generations grew up to be better functioning members of society than children in this current generation where spanking is less common (Taylor et al., 2011). Most studies of the effects of corporal punishment have found that it does work in the short term. Larzelere and Kuhn (2005) and Gershoff et al. (2012) found that children who were spanked were more immediately compliant following the spanking.

In addition, according to a study by Benjet and Kazdin (2003), spanking as a form of punishment did not have any more detrimental effects than any other type of punishment. Benjet and Kazdin compared four types of punishment: verbal punishment, loss of privilege, grounding and spanking; and found that there are harmful effects from punishment as a whole; not specifically from the form of spanking.

2.6 Teachers’ Perceptions on 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 (Kabua. 2011). 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 (Rajkoomar, 2012).

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 (Mweri, 2010). Mtsweni (2008), 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 (Mweri, 2010).

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 (2009) 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 teachers, ask questions, and clarify his doubts and so on. At the same time, student 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 (Rajkoomar, 2012). 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 (Rajkoomar, 2012).

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 (Cosmas, & Almon, 2010). After the ban of corporal punishment, many teachers started complaining about the increase of indiscipline in school.

A study done by Cosmas (Cosmas, & Almon, 2010), 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 (Cosmas, & Almon, 2010). 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 (2004) 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. (Iqbal, 2003), 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 (Loretta, 2004). Iqbal (2003), 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 (Loretta, 2004).
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 (Loretta, 2004). In South Africa, teachers report that the department is not instrumental in assisting them with abusive and disruptive children. (Loretta, 2004)

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, Kara & Ogetange (2012) 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.

Reviewing the prevailing teachers’ attitude toward CP might help to further ponder into the intricacies involved in its widespread use in schools. Teachers hold attitudes such as CP is the best way of motivating students to behave well and maintain school discipline (Basci and Dilekmen, 2009; Kimani, Kara and Ogetange, 2012) and it will reduce specific problems of behavior and consequently maintain the general level of school discipline (Bowd 1987). Further, teachers see other methods of discipline as time consuming and difficult to administer whereas CP as the most convenient, quickest and more effective form of discipline and is feared by students.

They argue that without CP, discipline could not be maintained and it is indispensable to their work (Damien 2012; Morrell 2001; Nakpodia 2012). However, studies also reported the unacceptability of CP by teachers (see UmezinwaandElendu2012). In addition to using it as a safeguard to protect the school environment from chaos created by misbehaving students, teachers use CP to maintain their own respect because they believe that students cannot learn unless they respect their teachers (Wasef 2011). Ironically, 50% of the students, in the same study, asserted that they never respected teachers who beat them. Teachers believed that pupils looked down
upon their teachers in the absence of CP (Kimani, Kara & Ogetange 2012). A study conducted in South Korean schools indicated that teachers use CP because they hold the following attitudes on the benefit of using it; (a) it quickly ends any negative behaviors from student, (b) it quickly sends a message to other students of how not to behave in the classroom, (c) it creates an atmosphere that allowed all students to focus on the class material, and (d) it creates an atmosphere that allowed the teacher to complete the designated material so that students could earn high scores on their exams (Mamatey 2010). Karaj (2009) further summarized the prevailing teachers’ attitudes as (a) a good child is always to obey, (b) who punishes a child does it for his/her best, (c) it is more appropriate to punish young children because they do not understand when spoken to, (d) teachers have the same right as parents to punish a child, (e) CP is not completely harmful for the child, (f) the child cannot be educated if he/she is not afraid, and (g) if a child is not punished, he/she will be without control. The teachers in Mamatey’s (2010) study felt that CP’s benefits were more important than potential negative effects.

Several studies stand testimony to teachers’ awareness of the disadvantages of CP but their continued use of it. For example, Karaj (2009) found that teachers believed that CP had very little disciplining and educative values and had a harmful consequence on children, but they still believed that when the child could not be disciplined using other means, CP was the best alternative.

2.7 Behavior Modification

Classroom disruptive behaviors are one of the main challenges for teachers (Demir, 2009; Pane, 2010). Indeed classroom misbehavior is the most common reason for teachers
to refer to school administrators and other school personnel and for teacher burnout (Wang, Hall, & Rahimi, 2015). Research consistently shows that students’ misbehavior disrupts classroom order and learning, negatively affecting academic achievement (Sun & Shek, 2012).

Disrespect for rules and procedures, wandering around the room, talking out of turn, passive engagement in the classroom, disruption of classmates’ work and moving the furniture in the classroom, are just some of a wide range of behaviors referred by teachers as classroom misbehavior (Briesch, Briesch, & Chafouleas, 2015; Postholm, 2013; Sun & Shek, 2012). Often teachers attribute these classroom misbehaviors to students’ lack of interest in school contents, to wrong educational politics, to school and society permissiveness about misbehavior and violence, and most of all to poor parenting (Ding, Li, Li, & Kulm, 2010; Lopes & Santos, 2013; Riley, Lewis, & Wang, 2012). Research also shows that teachers, schools, and even societies perceive and deal with school and classroom misbehavior in rather different ways (Hagenauer, Hascher, & Volet, 2015). As far as we know, there is no extensive study conducted in Portugal relating perceived teacher’s classroom management, and teacher’s perceived classroom misbehavior. This may not be surprising since classroom management, one of the most important ways of inhibiting classroom misbehavior (Doyle, 1986), is almost absent from pre-service teachers’ education in Portugal (Lopes & Oliveira, 2017). This does not happen only in Portugal, however. Landau (2001), for instance, reviewed 20 teacher education programs in the United States and found that only one had a course with the explicit name of Classroom Management. Gore and Parkes (2007) found an identical pattern in Australia.
2.8 Classroom Management and Students’ Classroom Misbehavior

Teacher’s classroom management is classically identified as one of the most important variables to understand students’ classroom misbehavior (Doyle, 1986; Brophy, 1996). Classroom management refers to the set of strategies used by the teacher to increase students’ cooperation and engagement and to decrease students’ disruptive behaviors, thus keeping an appropriate learning environment (Postholm, 2013). This involves the management of classroom space, time and activities, as well as the management of student behavior, taking into account teacher’s characteristics, skills and competencies (Djigić & Stojiljković, 2011). Classroom management also encompasses the establishment of clear rules and procedures to coordinate classroom activities (Brophy, 1996). The rules are intended to control students’ behaviors that may disturb classroom activities and environment whereas the procedures represent classroom actions allowed by the teacher, i.e., according to classroom’s activities and tasks (Doyle, 1986).

It is not unusual however to find classrooms where rules and procedures are not explicit. This may happen if the teacher both believes that the students are familiar with classroom rules and that the students do not need to be reminded about those rules (Piwowar, Thiel, & Ophardt, 2013). Inconsistencies in rules’ setting between teachers may also trigger disruptive behaviors. Also, when there are no rules or when rules are not explicit, some students may test the boundaries of classroom order and may disturb the class, thus interfering with classroom activities (Tauber, 2007).
2.9 Teachers’ Self-efficacy and Students’ Classroom Misbehavior

The research suggests that teachers’ behaviors and actions in the classroom and the way the teacher deals with classroom misbehavior may be mediated by teacher’s self-efficacy beliefs (O’Neill & Stephenson, 2012; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Bandura (1982) defines perceived self-efficacy as a set of judgments about one’s ability to perform a certain action or to deal with a specific situation. However, self-efficacy does not refer to the number of skills that a person owns but to what the person thinks she can perform with those skills (Hicks, 2012). Different people with similar skills can, therefore, perform the same actions differently, according to their efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1993).

Within the classroom context, self-efficacy beliefs seem to arise mostly from judgments about the learning process (O’Neill & Stephenson, 2012). Specifically, teachers’ self-efficacy beliefs have much to do with the teacher’s perceived ability to promote positive changes in the students (Gibson & Dembo, 1984). High self-efficacy seems to be associated with effective classroom management and to be positively correlated with democratic classroom management (Dârjan, 2012). Consequently, a teacher with high self-efficacy will likely allow more independent students’ behaviors in the classroom. Instead, a teacher with low self-efficacy will likely try to strengthen control over the students, limiting their actions.

Gordon (2001) suggests that teachers with high self-efficacy feel more confident managing students’ misbehavior. These teachers seem to hold a more humanistic perspective about behavior management and seem to attribute less negative consequences for students’ disruptive behaviors. Usually, teachers with high self-efficacy are also more effective in both classroom management and classroom instruction (Dârjan, 2012). In
contrast, teachers with low self-efficacy may feel less apt to manage students’ behavior. These teachers seem to assume a less humanistic approach, using more negative consequences for students’ misbehavior (Khani & Mizaee, 2015). Nevertheless, while authors like Hicks (2012) stress that there is a direct relationship between the perceived behavior of the students and teacher’s self-efficacy, others (e.g., Main & Hammond, 2008) caution that perception and reality are separate entities and that teacher’s confidence in the management of student’s behavior may not translate into practice.

2.10 Students’ Classroom Misbehavior and Teaching Time Spent with Misbehavior

The maximization of instructional time is crucial for the teachers to reach her teaching goals and to increase students’ learning opportunities (Berliner, 1991; Rogers & Mirra, 2014). The classroom instructional time, however, seldom or never equals the allocated time (the amount of time made available for teaching by a national or local authority) because of classroom events such as delays or the transition between activities (Abadzi, 2007). The available learning time is the time left for teaching and learning after classroom time loss is deducted from the classroom allocated time. (Rogers & Mirra, 2014). Time spent with misbehavior has been identified as a significant cause of classroom time loss and a source of impoverished students’ performance. Conversely, an orderly and positive classroom climate has been positively related to student’s performance and with the reduction of the impact of students’ socioeconomic status on academic performance. Not surprisingly, significant differences between teachers, schools, school neighborhoods, and even countries have been reported (Abadzi, 2007; Organisation for Economic Co-
operation and Development, OECD, 2013). Interestingly there seems to be a mismatch between students and teachers’ perceived classroom time spent with misbehavior.

An OECD (2013) study about classroom order and student performance, conducted with 15-year old students in 65 countries worldwide (Portugal included) show that two out of three students report that never or almost never is there noise or disorder in the classroom. An even more recent study from the OECD (2015) conducted with students from 39 countries (Portugal included) shows that discipline in classroom improved from 2003 to 2012. On the other hand, a study conducted in Portugal with k-1 through k-12 (6-12 years old) teachers found that teachers report spending an average of 10 to 30% of their classroom time with misbehavior and that more than 85% of the participants feel that classroom disruption significantly increased in the last five years (Lopes & Oliveira, personal communication, National Parliament, May 11, 2015). This mismatch apparently shows that classroom discipline is at least in part a perceived construct and that the classroom status may significantly influence the perception of how orderly classrooms are. The literature does not usually explore the relation between teachers’ perceived time spent with misbehavior and teachers’ perceived classroom misbehavior. Although we could expect that teachers that perceive to spend more classroom time with misbehavior also perceive more classroom misbehavior, we have no clear evidence about that or of the circumstances under which that relation may occur. It can happen for instance that highly controlling teachers perceive that they are spending too much time with misbehavior even if they perceive that misbehavior is unusual in their classrooms.
2.10.1 Positive Reinforcement

Reinforcement refers to “a stimulus which follows and is contingent upon a behavior and increases the probability of a behavior being repeated” (Smith, 2017). The simplest way of conceptualizing positive reinforcement is that something pleasant is ‘added’ when a specific action is performed (Cherry, 2018).

Positive reinforcement is an aspect of the construct of Operant Conditioning that was developed by B. F. Skinner (Cherry, 2018). Skinner studied rats, and he found that if the rats consistently pressed a bar which then administered food to the rat, the rat would press the bar more and more in order to get the food reward. Like those rats, if people find a particular behavior rewarding, it is more likely that they will repeat this behavior.

When thinking about positive reinforcement in teaching and education, the overarching purpose is to provide an incentive for students to repeat desired behaviors (Revermann, n.d.). In other words, by providing students with a positive outcome when they accomplish achievements or display certain behaviors, students are encouraged to do so again.

The timing and delivery of positive reinforcement is the key to effectively promote certain behaviors (Revermann, n.d.). In order for positive reinforcement to be effective, the reinforcement must be appropriate for a student’s age, it should be genuine, and it should be awarded straight after the target behavior (Revermann, n. d.).

Perhaps the easiest way to explain how positive reinforcement is used in the classroom, and also to introduce some areas that I will go into in more detail, I will provide an example: Timmy is a grade two student in Ms. Fisher’s class. He fidgets and fiddles, and doesn’t stay in his seat for more than a minute or so at a time. Ms. Fisher decided to
use positive reinforcement. Timmy loves stickers, so Ms. Fisher decides that after Timmy sits still for more than a cursory period of time, he will get a sticker. This works well, with Timmy motivated to stay in his seat. As the week progressed, Ms. Fisher deliberately leaves it longer for Timmy to earn the sticker. Timmy begins staying seated for extended periods of time in order to get stickers.

There is a lot that will be discussed in relation to this scenario’s details, for now, it suffices to say that Ms. Fisher provided positive reinforcement (stickers) for Timmy sitting in his seat, therefore meaning that he is more likely to do the desired behavior (staying seated).

Positive reinforcement refers to not only those stimuli that increase the likelihood of a desirable behavior but that cause an increase in ANY behavior (Smith, 2017). For example, a student calls out during class to get attention. When the teacher responds, i.e. pays attention to the disruptive student, this response acts as positive reinforcement – therefore, the probability that the student will call out again increases (Smith, 2017). Without meaning to, by paying attention, the teacher has made it more likely that the behavior will recur. It can therefore be seen how, although simple in concept, positive reinforcement must be used carefully and strategically.

Positive reinforcement is occasionally misunderstood by teachers – for example, those teachers who were trained using different techniques (Rumfola, 2017). However, more and more teachers are understanding this evolving and effective form of teaching and classroom management (Rumfola, 2017).
2.10.2 Positive Reinforcement versus Negative Reinforcement

What is the difference between positive and negative reinforcement? Well, negative reinforcement is not the same thing as punishment, even though this is commonly mistaken. Punishment involves using the delivery of an aversive (unpleasant) stimulus to decrease the likelihood that a behavior will recur (Smith, 2017). For example, if someone handles a hot oven tray without wearing gloves or mitts, the burn that they will get will result in the person being less likely to handle the tray without gloves in future. Rather, on the other hand, negative reinforcement is the REMOVAL of aversive stimuli in order to INCREASE the likelihood that the behavior is repeated (Smith, 2017).

A simple example of this is an alarm clock. The annoying loud buzzing stops when the man turns it off, leading the man to quickly turn it off in future. Positive reinforcement, as explained earlier is the ADDITION of a pleasant stimulus in response to a desired behavior. So, the difference between positive and negative reinforcement is the consequence of the target behavior – the addition of a desirable stimulus versus the removal of an aversive stimulus.

To demonstrate what negative reinforcement looks like, here is an example: if a student is sent out of the classroom due to disruptive behavior, the teacher has actually been reinforced! The teacher is negatively reinforced for removing the noisy student because this act has removed the unpleasantness of the student’s behavior (Maag, 2001).

Negative reinforcement can also allow students to ‘escape’ the task that they are looking for a break from. For example, a student ‘acts out’ leading to the teacher intervening, and the student therefore avoids the task at hand (Rumfola, 2017). Then, furthermore, when the disruptive behavior is negatively reinforced, it can even lead to
socially inappropriate behavior of other students who also wish to ‘escape’ a situation (Rumfola, 2017).

### 2.11 Core Factors Linked with Corporal Punishment

There are several factors that play a role in the use of corporal punishment. This section discusses two factors researched in connection with corporal punishment: ethnicity and religion.

#### 2.11.1 Corporal punishment and ethnicity

Corporal punishment has not been found to have the same detrimental effects among all ethnicity. A study by Stacks et al. (2009) found that spanking as a predictor of future aggression was only true for Caucasian families but not true for Hispanic or African American families. Previous research by Deater-Deckard et al. (2003) and Lansford et al. (2005) found similar results and argued that ethnicity could be a moderating effect on spanking. These studies found that African American children who were spanked did not have an increase in externalization problem behaviors. However, white children who were spanked did have more externalization problem behaviors. The researchers argue that the reason for this difference is based on cultural norms. The African American culture generally has a more positive view of spanking and, subsequently, this view may affect the outcomes.

Most studies on ethnicity found that Black mothers used spanking more than other ethnicities. Huang and Lee (2008) found that black mothers were more likely to spank their children than white mothers. Gershoff et al. (2012) also found that of 11,040 American mothers, Black mothers spanked the most frequently. Hispanic mothers spanked more than
White or Asian mothers. However, unlike the studies described above, Gershoff’s study did not find that there is a culture normative mediation effect of spanking. Instead, he found that the more children were spanked the more externalization problems behaviors they displayed and that there was not a difference in effects by race. McLoyd and Smith (2002) also found that spankings prediction of aggression was not different among the races.

Horn et al. (2004) studied discipline practices in the African American community. Horn found that Black parents used spanking regardless of their socioeconomic status. Another study by Vittrup and Holden (2010) found the opposite to be true. They found that there were no racial differences in spanking but that the difference was socioeconomic status. They found those with lower socioeconomic status spanked more frequently than those of higher socioeconomic status. The difference found in regards to black parents is based on the parents’ socioeconomic status, not race.

It is evident that there is conflicting research results on ethnicity and corporal punishment. Some studies (Deater-Deckard et al., 2003; Lansford et al., 2005; Stacks et al., 2009) have found that ethnicity has a moderating effect on the negative aspects of spanking while other studies, Gershoff et al. (2012) and McLoyd and Smith (2002), do not find that to be true. A study by Vittrup and Holden (2010) found that discipline practices among black people are based on socioeconomic status while a study by Horn et al. (2004) found that discipline practices are based on race, not socioeconomic status.

2.11.2 Corporal punishment and religion.

Support for corporal punishment is strongest among Conservative Protestants, who use spiritual passages from the Bible to support their claim about the acceptability of corporal punishment. The biblical perspective of “spare the rod, spoil the child” not only
supports the use of corporal punishment but suggests that not using corporal punishment would actually be detrimental to the child’s development (Andero & Stewart, 2002).

Andrew and Stewart (2002) state:

Contemporary religious conservatives fear that children reared without proper discipline will be unable and unwilling to submit themselves to the will of God and, hence, will fail to enjoy the fruits of spiritual salvation. Therefore, influential Conservative Protestant pastors and authors cite numerous scriptural passages to support their claim that corporal punishment is the primarily biblically ordained response to overt challenges to parental authority. (p. 92). Therefore, Conservative Protestants are the most likely group of people to accept and utilize corporal punishment as a form of discipline (Petts & Kysar-Moon, 2012). In some child rearing Christian literature, corporal punishment is endorse and advocated. Cain (2008) discusses a Christian child rearing expert, Pearl, who supports the use of corporal punishment of children from the age of birth until seven years of age. He advocates using a switch twice on a seven month olds’ legs who cries when put down to sleep as a correct discipline strategy for that child (Cain, 2008).

Though corporal punishment is most common among Conservative Protestants, some studies have shown that religious context in which a child was raised could have a moderating effect on the aftermath of spanking. Ellison et al. (2011) found that children who were spanked by Conservative Protestant mothers experienced less negative behaviors after the spanking than other children, possibly due to the mother’s positive, nurturing relationship with the child. Petts and Kysar-Moon (2012) also studied the religious context in which a child was raised and his research supported some of the research of Ellison et al. 2011. They found that in Conservative Protestant homes where both parents were
Conservative Protestant and where the father spanked infrequently, those children displayed less externalization problem behaviors than children who were raised in homes where only one of the parents was Conservative Protestant. However, with spanking, these same children did have an increase in internalization problem behaviors. In other words, Conservative Protestant homogenous homes were not a moderating effect against an increase in internalization problem behaviors with spanking used as a discipline technique. The study also found children who were raised in heterogeneous households, with one parent being conservative protestant, did show increase internalization problem behaviors and externalization problem behaviors with spanking use.

Summary of Literature Review

In this chapter, teachers’ perception of the use of corporal punishment was discussed. It emerged from the review the meaning of corporal punishment, history of corporal punishment opposition to corporal punishment, policy framework on corporal punishment, support for corporal punishment, teachers’ perception on corporal punishment in school, behavior modification, classroom management and students’ classroom misbehavior, positive reinforcement, positive reinforcement versus negative reinforcement, corporal punishment and ethnicity, and corporal punishment and religion.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter dealt with the methods and techniques used in gathering data for the study. It discussed the research design, the population, sample and sampling technique, instrumentation, data collection procedure, methods of data analysis and problems encountered during data collection.

3.1 Research Design

The descriptive sample survey design was used for this study. According to Gay (2002), the descriptive design involves the collection of data in order to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. According to Osuala (2005), descriptive research gives a picture of situation or a population and it is basic for all types of research in assessing the situation as a prerequisite to inferences and generalisations.

Descriptive research is concerned with the present status of a phenomenon and it deals with what exist such as determine the nature of prevailing conditions, and practices. The researcher considers the descriptive sample survey the most appropriate because the simple surveys do little more than asking questions and reporting answers about status of something (phenomena) to studies but present explicit statement about relationships between variables (Amedahe, 2002).

According to Hackett (2002), the descriptive survey design can be used to gather data on client needs and attitudes, to aid programme decisions and the provision of counselling services. Awabil (2002) further stated that survey research makes possible the collection of data on large numbers of people.
Finally, survey research is relatively easy to conduct. The design is however associated with some weaknesses. Among them are the difficulties in obtaining a truly random sample of the population and the problem of low response rating that plague all surveys, Hackett (as cited by Awabil, 2002). Notwithstanding its shortcomings, the survey design was the most suitable, since it led the researcher to draw meaningful conclusions from the data obtained.

3.2 Population

Saunders et al. (2003) refer to target population as the entire group of specific respondents or elements relevant to the research. In a different perspective, Fraenkel and Wallen (2001) posit that population is the group that the researcher is interested in for the purpose of generalisation. This is the target group about which the researcher is interested in gaining information and drawing conclusions. The target population of this study includes headmasters and teachers of the senior high schools in Asokore – Mampong municipality in Kumasi namely Kumasi Academy Senior High School, Paakoso senior high school and Sakafia senior high school. There are over 300 teachers in all the three public SHS in the Asokore – Mampong Municipality in Kumasi. In all, 141 teachers and 9 headmasters and their assistants from the three schools constituted the population for the study.
3.3 Sample and sampling procedure

The sample frame for the study is all headmasters and teachers in the three selected SHS in the Asokore – Mampong municipality in Kumasi. Out of the target population of 300 teachers in the three (3) selected public senior high schools in the Asokore – Mampong Municipality in Kumasi, a representative sample of 150 was selected for the study, using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination formula (see Table 1). The researcher adopted simple random sampling technique to select the schools for the study. This was to ensure that all the schools in the Asokore – Mampong Municipality were given equal chance of being selected. The schools were selected, using balloting. This was done by writing Yes” and “No” on papers. The papers were placed in a container and mixed thoroughly. To ensure fairness, the supervisor was asked to pick the cards from the container. Those schools which was picked “yes” were selected for the study.

Table 3.1: Population and sample of teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Teachers Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumasi Academy senior high school</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakafia senior high school</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paakoso senior high school</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork (2020)

The researcher, employing the purpose sampling technique to picked three (3) schools. The 150 headmaster and teachers were determined and computed using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination formula. The teachers were selected through
the simple random sampling technique. The teachers, was selected using balloting paper. This was done by writing “Yes” and “No” on papers and teachers were asked to pick the cards. Those who picked “yes” were selected for the study. The technique was used to ensure that each teacher had an equal chance of being selected.

3.4 Instrumentation

Questionnaires with closed ended items were used to collect data for the study. The questions for the questionnaires were developed based on the literature review and the research questions of the study. The questionnaire was designed and constructed by the researcher with guidance from his project supervisor. The questionnaire was a self-administered, designed by the researcher in a 5-point Likert scale of 4= Strongly Agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, 1= Strongly Disagree in which higher score indicate more perceived positive responses. Section ‘A’ gathers data on the demographic characteristics of respondents, Section B, on perceptions of teachers on the abolition of corporal punishment, Section C on factors influence the use of corporal punishment and Section D, on methods used by teachers to modify students behavior.

The close-ended questionnaire was intended to enable respondents to provide uniformity of response and to enable more information to be gathered. They also provide easier and accurate analysis of the data to obtain precise interpretation of the responses. Questionnaires are cost effective and less time consuming as compared to other instruments.
3.5 Validity and Reliability

Alhassan (2000) defines validity as the degree to which a test actually measures what it claims to measure. Face validity is the ability of each test item to establish a logical link with an objective (Kumar, 1999). Content validity is the extent to which statements or questions represent the issue they are supposed to measure (Kumar, 1999).

Reliability is the ability of an instrument to consistently measure what it is supposed to measure (Alhassan, 2000). To establish the reliability of the instrument in this study, the instrument was shown to my Supervisors in the Department of Educational Leadership for their expert advice. In this respect, the Cronbach’s alpha, a measure of internal consistency was used. The value for the alpha was determined, using the SPSS (version 24) programme. The reliability for the heads’ instrument was 0.75, that of the teachers’ instrument was 0.69 and that of the students’ instrument was 0.88 (See Appendix A). This supports (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000) view that an alpha level of 0.60 and above is satisfactory for a set of items in a questionnaire. The outcome of the reliability was therefore ideal for the research instrument to be sent out for the main data collection. Even after this, the instrument was pre-tested in KNUST Senior High School.

3.6 Pre-testing of the instrument

In order to check for the appropriateness of the data collection instrument and data procedures, a preliminary study was conducted before the main study. The instrument was pre-tested because the questionnaire was newly constructed. Added to this, the researcher wanted to ensure that the instrument was reliable. The pre-testing was done in KNUST senior high school which had similar characteristics of that of the main study, and is within
the adjoining Oforikrom Municipality. The idea supports the view of Borg and Gall (1989) that there is the need to subject a new research instrument to field testing with a population similar to that from which the subject for the study would be taken.

Questionnaire was administered and collected within one week for appraisal. Questions which were found to be ambiguous and those not suitable to the local conditions were reconstructed. Other items which were found to elicit similar responses were either eliminated or restructured. The relevant corrections were made before the final administration.

The research instrument was pre-tested in two schools within the Oforikrom Municipality. The selected schools had comparable characteristics as the target population. Twenty-five teachers who teach at the SHS level, and five heads, from each of the schools responded to the items in the questionnaire.

3.7 Data Collection Procedure

The researcher sought permission from the Asokore Mampong Municipal Director of Education to carry out the study. After the Municipal Director of Education had given permission, the researcher paid a visit to the sampled schools. The questionnaires were thereafter administered to the respondents. The respondents were given two weeks to complete the questionnaire before they were collected from their various schools. The researcher was able to retrieve all the 150 questionnaire administered and getting a 100% response rate.
3.8 Data Analysis Procedure

The data gathered from respondents were edited and coded, and statistically using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software. The research being a descriptive survey, descriptive statistics was used to analyse the data. Percentages and frequency distribution tables were used to support the analysis of the major responses. The responses of items on the various scales in the different sections of the questionnaire were assigned values and scored accordingly. Research questions one to four were analysed, using means and standard deviations. The responses for the items were measured on a four-point Likert scale. The values assigned to the responses ranged from 1.00 to 4.00.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The researcher explained the purpose of the study to the respondents. The respondents were not in any way forced to respond to the questionnaire, they did that on their own volition. Problems of plagiarism were addressed by acknowledging all sources of information appropriately. The confidentiality of the respondents was assured by making them know that the information collected through the questionnaire was used for academic purposes only. In a similar manner, the anonymity of the respondents was also assured as respondents’ names were excluded on the questionnaire and that they could withdraw from taking part in the study, if they so wished.
CHAPTER FOUR
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter dealt with the findings and discussions of the study and covered the demographic characteristics of the respondents. It also analysed and discussed the findings, based on the research questions.

4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics of the respondents that included their gender, age, qualifications and teaching experience were analysed and presented in Table 4.1-4.4.

Table 4.1 Gender of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data 2020*

Table 4.1 shows that, on the gender of respondents, 45 (30%) were females while 105(70%) were males. The result means that males who took part in the study were more than their female counterparts.
Table 4.2 Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data 2019*

Also, on respondents’ ages, 80 (53.3%) of them were in the age bracket of 21-30, 17(11.3%) were in the age bracket of 31-40, 13(8.7%) were in the age bracket of 41-50, while 40 (26.7%) were also in the age bracket of 51-60. The finding also gives an indication that all the sampled respondents were grown-ups and experienced enough to partake in a credible research endeavour such as this study.

Table 4.3 Qualification of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data, 2020*

Again, on respondents’ educational qualifications, 41 (27%) were holders of the Diploma in Education, 94(63%) were holders of the Bachelor’s Degree, and 15(10%) were holders of the Master’s Degree.
Table 4.4 Working Experience of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years and above</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Field Data, 2019*

Finally, on respondents’ teaching experiences, 35 (23%) had been teaching for between 1 and 5 years, 41 (27%) had been teaching for between 6 and 10 years, 46 (31%) had been teaching for between 11 and 15 years, while 28 (19%) had been teaching for 16 years and above.

4.2 Research Question One: What are the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High Schools in the Asokore – Mampong Municipality?

The research question 1 sought to find out the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High Schools. In table 4.1, the results are presented.
### Table 4.5 Perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should use corporal punishment to modify deviant behavior</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreases the self-respect of students</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates inferiority complex among students</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children prefer corporal punishment to other forms of punishment</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment makes children respect teachers</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It causes dropout of the students</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment makes children respect teachers</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It hurts me to give corporal punishment</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment makes learners dislike school</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers should be allowed to use corporal punishment with discretion</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment corrects the erring child to mold his/her life.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment amounts to child abuse</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Field Data, 2020**

The heads and teachers were asked to rate over a 5-point Likert scale the perceptions of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in senior high schools. From the results, a mean score of less than 3.0 suggests disagreement while a mean score of 3.0 and more suggests agreement. Thus, from Table 4.5, it is observed that the mean score of 3.01 and above in all cases indicate that, the respondents agreed that teachers in the Asokore–Mampong Municipality have a number of perceptions on the use of corporal punishment in senior high schools. One of the perceptions was that teachers should use corporal...
punishment to modify deviant behavior, though they have the perception that the use of corporal punishment decreases the self-respect of students, and creates inferiority complex among the students. Teachers also have the perception that children prefer corporal punishment to other forms of punishment, and that the use of corporal punishment causes dropout of the students. One other perception teachers had was that the use of corporal punishment makes children respect teachers though it hurts to give corporal punishment. Teachers had the perception that though corporal punishment makes learners dislike school, teachers should be allowed to use corporal punishment with discretion. This was based on the teachers’ perception that the use of corporal punishment corrects the erring child to mold his/her life even if the use of corporal punishment amounts to child abuse. Teachers should use corporal punishment to modify deviant behaviour (M= 4.40) comes out as the most held perception of teachers on the use of corporal punishment in Senior High Schools.

The finding of the research commensurate with the idea of Webber and Plotts (2008) that the behaviorist approach to identifying punishing consequences as a part of a larger behavior change plan can be effective in changing student behaviour. Unfortunately, there is much less data available to determine whether the retributive or restorative approaches to punishment results in changed student behaviour. There simply is little data available about retributive punishment in schools, and few studies have examined the impact of these forms of punishment on changing student behaviour. What do we know about using the behaviourist definition of punishment as a vehicle to change behaviour? Like reinforcement, punishment is a behavioural principle and a natural phenomenon that occurs in everyday life. This view of punishment is any consequence for a specific
behaviour that actually decreases the likelihood that the behaviour will reoccur. According to applied behaviour analysis, punishment is only effective if the behaviour of the receiver decreases as a result. If the punishment does not decrease the occurrence of that specific behavior, then by definition, punishment is not occurring (Webber & Plotts, 2008). For example if a teacher attempts to reduce the use of inappropriate language by requiring the student to stay after school for five minutes for each time that this inappropriate language occurred in the classroom, the teacher would only know if it was in fact a punishing consequence if, after implementing this procedure several times, that the use of inappropriate language by this student actually diminished. If not, some other consequence might be tried in an effort to identify an effective punishment for that student and behaviour. Even if this procedure was effective for the student, it might not be an effective punishment for another student for the same behaviour. Punishment, when used according to these principles, can be very effective in changing behaviour, and can change behaviour even more quickly than other methods such as reinforcement of alternative behaviours.

4.3 Research Question Two: What factors influence the use of corporal punishment in Asokore – Mampong Municipality?

Research question two sought to examine the factors that influence the use of corporal punishment. Strongly Agree and Agree were combined as Agree while Strongly Disagree and Disagree were combined as Disagree, The responses are presented in Table 4.6.
### Table 4.6 Factors that influence the use of corporal punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleeping in class</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnecessary noise making in class</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disobedience</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating in class</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying junior students</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper dressing</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: Field Data, 2020**

From Table 4.6, it is observed that for all the items relating to the factors that influence the use of corporal punishment, majority (67% - 81%) of the respondents agreed. Thus generally, the respondents agreed that the Sleeping in class, Fighting, Unnecessary noise making in class, Absenteeism, Disobedience, Stealing, Eating in class, bullying junior students, Improper dressing were factors that influence the use of corporal punishment.

Again, Table 4.6 shows that 105 (70%) of the respondents agreed that Sleeping in class was one of the major factors that influence the use of corporal punishment, 24(16%) were neutral and remaining agreed 21(14%) disagreed. Students sleep in class due to several factors that may originate from their classroom itself or from somewhere else. Sleeping in class is generally perceived as of a lack of interest in the subject or teacher. However, the truth may lie in other external factors that are usually overlooked. Whatever the case, poor sleeping patterns of students deprives them from getting good grades. It also leads to the loss of self-confidence on the part of students who feel left behind. Imagine
waking up from sleep to a question from the teacher you cannot provide an answer to. Before looking at the reasons, let's look at consequences of sleeping in class.

Table 4.6 revealed that 122 (81.4%) of the respondents agreed that Fighting was one of the major factors that influence the use of corporal punishment, 13(8.6%) were neutral and remaining agreed 15(10%) disagreed. The finding support the argument made by (Rogers & Mirra, 2014) that the real, extremely sad reason why schools can’t allow students to physically defend themselves in school is that a bully can attack another little kid and then make the excuse that the other kid started the fight. Note that students can’t use corporal punishment in Ghanaian public schools nowadays. It is also difficult to expel a disruptive student. Thus, even if the bully is caught in a lie, he knows he is going to be let off with a slap on the wrist.

Table 4.6 shows that 105 (70%) of the respondents agreed Unnecessary noise making in class was identified as one of the factors that influence the use of corporal punishment, 24(16%) were neutral and the remaining 21(14%) disagreed. Students make noise in a variety of ways. They tap their pencils, click their tongues, sing a song, or crack their knuckles. The noises can drive you and other students to distraction. Although you might be able to ignore some extraneous noises, others interfere with your lesson or with your ability to concentrate.

Again from Table 4.6, 108 (72%) of the respondents agreed Absenteeism was identified as one of the factors that influence the use of corporal punishment, 21(14%) were neutral and the remaining 21(14%) disagreed. Absenteeism in school is the habit of staying away from school without providing a genuine or any reason for not attending classes. Absenteeism is a truant behaviour that negatively affects the
performance among students. Absenteeism is a student behaviour grounded on physical, psychological and social reasons and affecting students' development negatively. Absenteeism can be not only a symptom of students' negative feelings about school but also sourced by many different reasons (Gökyer, 2012). Absenteeism is typically based on total days of school missed, including both excused and unexcused absences (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012). The State Board of Education (2013) adopted definitions for excused and unexcused absences for use by schools and districts in order to implement the statutory policies and procedures concerning truants, and the reporting of truancy offers the three forms students’ absenteeism.

In fact, students need to attend school daily to succeed. However; Tauber (2007) says illness, financial difficulties, age, social rank, geographical region, attitudes of teachers, weak school management, high education cost and weather condition can cause absenteeism. Tsouloupas, Carson, and Matthews (2014) also reveal that; family health or financial concerns, poor school environment, drug and alcohol use, transportation problems, and differing community attitudes towards education are all conditions that can cause a child not to attend school.

Table 4.6 shows that 101 (67.3%) of the respondents agreed that disobedience was a factor that influence the use of corporal punishment, 28 (18.7%) were neutral and the remaining 21(14%) disagreed. According to Sun and Shek (2012), the disobedient student will distract others from learning, even if the student eventually complies with the teacher’s directions. Consider the way students feel when they see another person trying to take advantage of a situation in which the disobedience is intended to stall the progress of the event or to acquire something that others do not have. If students have been waiting in a
line and someone cuts the line in a mean-spirited way, it affects the way that everyone in the line feels about being there. Not many people want to be the enforcers of the rules (Sugai, Sprague, Horner, & Walker, 2000), but some may become vocal about it in the hope that they have a positive effect on the situation, but everyone is bothered to some degree.

A student who offers resistance to the teacher’s directions may cause those who were not excited about doing the work in the first place to feel as if they are getting a reprieve from it, but then again, it is harder for them to come back to focus on the work and that makes the task more daunting. Disobedient students may enjoy testing the teacher individually, but they also serve to reveal the teacher’s nature to the rest of the class. If students can show how to be an unreasonably bullies, they win some respect from the other students. If they show you to be someone who truly wants the best for the students, students may create a little bit of positive peer pressure to help resolve the problem (Sass, Lopes, Oliveira, & Martin, 2016).

From table 4.6, it is observed that 110 (73.3%) of the respondents agreed that Stealing was a factor that influence the use of corporal punishment, 28(18.7%) were neutral and the remaining 12(8%) disagreed. The findings was in line with (Riley, Lewis, Wang, 2012) that stealing is taking things that belong to others without their permission. The act is common in young children because they tend to be self-centered and feel that it is all right to take what they want from others. A child’s true understanding of the concept of stealing usually occurs between the ages of five and seven (Rogers, & Mirra, 2014). .By this time, children can understand the idea of ownership and realize that taking things that belong to others is wrong. Teachers need to explain that stealing means taking something
that belongs to someone else and that it is wrong, unacceptable and dishonest. Clarify that when an individual takes something without asking or paying for it, someone will be hurt. For example, if a child takes someone's pencil, he will be unable to do his work. If a student’s book or money is stolen, she might get into trouble at home.

From table 4.6, the study revealed that 122 (81.4%) of the respondents agreed Eating in class was a factor that influence the use of corporal punishment, 15 (10%) were neutral and the remaining 13 (8.6%) disagreed. First of all, food in class is distracting. Most snacks create a loud crunch or a smack (chips, for example) and undoubtedly are in some sort of noise-making package. Besides noise disturbing classmates, students may also be more focused on their food than their teacher. Many students have food allergies, and when others bring those foods to class, the effects can be detrimental. For example, peanuts are a common snack, but they are also a common allergy. In addition, eating in class is simply messy. Snacking often produces crumbs, spills, wrappers, etc (Bowd, 2015). This creates an unhygienic environment and more work for custodians. Eating in class does not prepare students for the work force. In many places of business, eating on the job is considered unprofessional. Lunch hours are provided for a reason and students must learn to fit eating their meal into a period of time. Last, eating in class can be unhealthy. Most snacks contain ingredients that can be harmful to health if over- consumed (sugar, sodium, fats, etc.). If students snack every day, addictive foods such as chips, cookies, or candy can create problems (Damien, 2012).

From table 4.6, it is observed that 115 (76.7%) of the respondents agreed that bullying junior students, was a factor that play a role in the use of corporal punishment, 15(10%) were neutral and the remaining 20(13.3%) disagreed. Student bullying is one of
the most frequently reported disciplinary problems at school: 21% of elementary schools, 43% of middle schools, and 22% of high schools reported problems with bullying in 2005-06. Bullying is the number one disciplinary problem in middle schools. These lessons, activities, and games will help you and your students understand this serious problem (Isernhagen & Harris, 2018). Teachers play a critical role creating a supportive environment by engaging students, establishing relationships, managing the classroom, serving as positive role models for prosocial behaviors, and enforcing school rules. Teachers set the overall tone of the classroom and others than the students themselves, teachers are a school’s key resource against bullying and victimization. When teachers are able to establish positive relationships with students who are difficult to teach and exhibit behavioural problems, those students tend to have reduced aggressive behaviors and greater school engagement (Doumen, Buyse, Colpin, & Verschueren, 2011).

Table 4.6 shows that 117 (78.3%) of the respondents agreed that Improper dressing was a factor that influences the use of corporal punishment; 18 (11.7%) were neutral and the remaining 15 (10%) disagreed. According to Olori (2003), this form of dressing is provocative, improper and morally unacceptable. These dress patterns are morally offensive and reveal the high rate of moral decadence in the society of our time. With all these explanations, one is now clear about the type of dressing that is considered indecent in the Ghanaian context. Not a day passes without some complaint or the other by colleague students, visitors, lecturers, non-teaching staff or some other persons about the provocative dressing of students, most especially the girls. They wear skimpy skirts, only about one inch longer than their pants to lectures and other social gatherings in and outside campus (Hoy & Spero, 2015).
4.3 Research Question Three: What other methods are used by teachers to modify student behavior in Asokore-Mampong Municipality?

Research question three sought to find out methods used by teachers to modify student behavior in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality. The responses are presented in table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Methods used by teachers to modify student behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of clear rules for students</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>6(4)</td>
<td>10(15)</td>
<td>43(29)</td>
<td>81(54)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>5(3)</td>
<td>15(10)</td>
<td>46(31)</td>
<td>79(53)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding the unruly behaviour of the students</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>15(10)</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>42(25)</td>
<td>76(51)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reinforcement</td>
<td>6(4)</td>
<td>9(6)</td>
<td>28(19)</td>
<td>32(21)</td>
<td>75(50)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative reinforcement</td>
<td>6(4)</td>
<td>9(6)</td>
<td>20(13.3)</td>
<td>38(25.3)</td>
<td>77(51.4)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Data, 2020

Table 4.7 shows that 81 (54%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Establishment of clear rules for students was one of the methods used by teachers to modify students’ behavior; 43 (29%) agreed, 10 (15%) were neutral while 6 (4%) disagreed and a significant number of 5 (3%) strongly disagreed.
Table 4.7 shows that 79 (53%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Punishment was one of the methods used by teachers to modify students’ behaviour, 46 (31%) agreed, 10 (15%) were neutral while 5(3%) disagreed and 5 (3%) strongly disagreed. Teachers in schools and parents in homes use punishment as one of the most important tools for controlling students’ behaviour and discipline. From the psychological point of view, punishment is defined as anything that decreases the occurrence of a behaviour; physical pain, withdrawal of attention, loss of tangibles or activities, a reprimand or even something others would find rewarding, but the particular individual does not like (Lopes, & Santos, 2013). One of the main goals of punishment is to invoke fear in the student, so that the behaviour does not occur again. In the school, teachers punish students for being late to school, for not following the school rules, for not doing classroom assignment and for failure to perform better in tests and examinations and the like (Dârjan, 2012). The kind of punishment given in response to these behaviors includes, caning the child, giving them physical labour such as watering school gardens, farming, kneeling on concrete stones, walking on knees, doing push-ups in the sun and carrying several buckets of sand (Gore & Parkes 2007). School is not the only place where children get punished. At home, they are also beaten by their parents when they do not go to school, stealing and the like. Children at home are punished by their parents through food denial, burning hands with fire for stealing and being chased away from home to go to sleep in the bush (Hayes, 2013).

Table 4.7 shows that 76 (51%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Avoiding the unruly behaviour of the students was one of methods used by teachers to modify students’ behaviour., 42 (25%) agreed, 10 (15%) were neutral while 3 (2%) disagreed and 15 (10%) strongly disagreed. Disruptive behaviour is experienced by 47% of teachers on,
at least, a weekly basis (Department for Education). Even more concerning, is the fact that four in 10 teachers have been ‘attacked by students’ (Espelage & Lopes 2013). What’s more, the impact of low-level disruption is woefully overlooked and underappreciated. Failing to manage classroom disruption is responsible for the loss of an hour of learning per day, per child (Khani & Mirzaee, 2015). Occasionally, a teacher may come across unforeseen, problematic behaviours when you’re teaching. How you react and deal with the situation is important. Teachers are constantly watching students and they pick up on teachers’ reactions and apply them to situations that occur when they are babysitting. But how do you manage students? There is a phrase that you teach your students that also pertains to you: “Stay in control of yourself. Stay in control of the children.” You must always remain level-headed, no matter what happens.

Table 4.7 shows that 75 (50%) of the respondents strongly agreed that Positive reinforcement was one of methods used by teachers to modify students’ behaviour, 32 (21%) agreed, 28 (19%) were neutral while 9 (6%) disagreed and 6 (4%) strongly disagreed. Reinforcement refers to “a stimulus which follows and is contingent upon a behaviour and increases the probability of a behaviour being repeated” (Smith, 2017).

The simplest way of conceptualizing positive reinforcement is that something pleasant is ‘added’ when a specific action is performed (Cherry, 2018). Positive reinforcement is an aspect of the construct of Operant Conditioning that was developed by B. F. Skinner (Cherry, 2018). Skinner studied rats, and he found that if the rats consistently pressed a bar which then administered food to the rat, the rat would press the bar more and more in order to get the food reward. Like those rats, if people find a particular behaviour rewarding, it is more likely that they will repeat this behaviour. When thinking about
positive reinforcement in teaching and education, the overarching purpose is to provide an incentive for students to repeat desired behaviours (Revermann, n.d.). In other words, by providing students with a positive outcome when they accomplish achievements or display certain behaviours, students are encouraged to do so again.

The timing and delivery of positive reinforcement is the key to effectively promote certain behaviours (Revermann, n.d.). In order for positive reinforcement to be effective, the reinforcement must be appropriate for a student’s age, it should be genuine, and it should be awarded straight after the target behaviour (Hoy & Spero, 2015).

Table 4.7 shows that 77 (51.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed that negative reinforcement was one of methods used by teachers to modify students’ behaviour, 38 (25.3%) agreed, 20 (13.3%) were neutral while 9 (6%) disagreed and a significant 6 (4%) strongly disagreed. Negative reinforcement is a method that can be used to help teach specific behaviours. With negative reinforcement, something uncomfortable or otherwise unpleasant is taken away in response to a stimulus.

Over time, the target behaviour should increase with the expectation that the unpleasant thing will be taken away. Negative reinforcement occurs when something already present is removed (taken away) as a result of a person's behaviour, creating a favourable outcome for that person. Basically, when a person's behaviour leads to the removal of something that was unpleasant to that person then negative reinforcement is occurring.
The term "stimulus" would be used within Applied Behaviour Analysis to describe the "something" that is taken away or removed. The stimulus could be anything, for example, a person, a noise, a feeling, an emotion or an object. Technically, for negative reinforcement to occur, the person must engage in the behaviour that created the favourable outcome more frequently in the future (Lopes & Oliveira, 2015).
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

The purpose of the study was to assess the teacher attitude towards the abolition of corporal punishment in some selected Senior High Schools in Asokore – Mampong Municipality. The final chapter summarizes the findings of the study, discusses the implications of the findings and suggests relevant recommendations for authorities to assess the teacher attitude towards the abolition of corporal punishment, especially, those in the Asokore – Mampong Municipality.

5.1 Summary

Overview of the Study

The study assessed the teacher attitude towards corporal punishment in some selected Senior High Schools in Asokore – Mampong Municipality educational directorate. Specifically, the study sought to find out the perceptions of teachers on corporal punishment in Senior High Schools in Asokore-Mampong Municipality, methods used by teachers to modify student behaviour in Asokore-Mampong Municipality and factors that play a role in the use of corporal punishment in Asokore – Mampong Municipality. Data were collected from one hundred and fifty (150) respondents, using random sampling. The data collected were coded, fed into the computer and processed, using the SPSS computer application software and Microsoft Excel. Descriptive statistics were used for the data analysis. Frequencies and percentages, simple tables and figures were employed to analyse
the teacher attitude towards the abolition of corporal punishment in some selected senior high schools

5.2 Summary of the Findings

From a careful analysis of the variables, as presented in the previous chapter, the study revealed the following major findings:

The research question one sought to find out the perceptions of teachers on corporal punishment in Senior High Schools in Asokore – Mampong Municipality. The study revealed that teachers should use corporal punishment to modify deviant behaviour (M= 4.40) come out as the most perceptions of teachers on corporal punishment in Senior High Schools.

Research question three sought to find out factors influence the use of corporal punishment in Asokore – Mampong Municipality. The findings of the study revealed that items relating to the factors that play a role in the use of corporal punishment, majority (67% - 81%) of the respondents agreed. Thus generally, the respondents agreed that the sleeping in class, fighting, Unnecessary noise making in class, absenteeism, disobedience, stealing, eating in class, bullying junior students, improper dressing were factors that influence the use of corporal punishment.

Research question three sought to assess methods used by teachers to modify students’ behaviour in Asokore – Mampong Municipal. The findings of the research revealed that significant majority of the respondents (75% - 81%) strongly agreed that establishment of clear rules for student, unishment, avoiding the unruly behaviour of the
students, positive reinforcement and negative reinforcement were some of the methods used by teachers to modify students’ behaviour.

5.3 Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, it is concluded that teachers perception on corporal punishment is that it serves as child abuse and make students dislike school.

Again, on the factors influencing the use of corporal punishment, the study concluded that sleeping in class, fighting, unnecessary noise making in class, absenteeism, disobedience, stealing, eating in class, bullying junior students, improper dressing were factors that influence the use of corporal punishment.

Finally, the study concluded that methods teachers use to modify students behaviour was to establish a clear rules for students, avoid the unruly behaviour of students among others to ensure that students behave accordingly.

5.4 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher recommends that:

1. Stakeholders of education in the Asokore-Mampong Municipality should sensitize the public through the use of various forms of media on the negative effects of corporal punishment. This is because if the public opinion is against its use, it will help reduce its use in secondary schools.

2. The Education Directorate of the Asokore-Mampong Municipality should take the lead in harnessing the positive aspects of Ghanaian culture which considers the child a gift to society and discipline as an opportunity for learning to provide a
protective environment for children in communities within the Municipality to prevent future occurrences of violence through corporal punishment.

3. The Ghana Education Service should intensify teaching of life skills in schools to equip learners with skills necessary in handling life challenges.

4. School authorities should involve students more in formulation and revision of school rules and regulations. This would make the school rules and regulations more meaningful to the students. As a result, the students are likely to adhere to them.

5.5 Suggestions and Areas for Further Research

Because of the stipulated period for the study, the research was limited to specific areas and suggests that, further research be done to cover more districts to present the true picture of the use of corporal punishment in senior high schools. Comparable studies could be carried out in the other basic schools in the Kumasi Metropolis to overcome this problem.
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Dear Respondent,

TEACHER ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE ABOLITION OF CORPORAL
PUNISHMENT IN SOME SELECTED SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN ASOKORE
– MAMPONG MUNICIPALITY

I am ALICE JACINTA ADDO-DIABENE, a graduate student of the University of Education, Winneba- Kumasi Campus, undertaking a study titled “teacher attitude towards the abolition of corporal punishment in some selected senior high schools in Asokore – Mampong Municipality”.

This study is in partial fulfilment for the award of Master of Arts Educational Leadership. It would be appreciated very much if you could kindly respond to the questionnaire attached as you have been selected to participate in the study. Your name and your school’s name would not be needed in the questionnaire unless you wish to provide them. The information you will provide will be anonymous and will be used for academic research purposes only.

I count on your co-operation in this regard.

Thank you.

A. Bio Data

1. Please Tick [✓] to indicate your gender

   a) Male [    ]   b) Female [   ]
2. Please Tick [√] to indicate your age range.
   a) Below 20 years [ ]  c) 31-40 [ ]
   b) 21-30 [ ]  d) 41-50 [ ]

3. Tick [√] to indicate your educational level
   a) Diploma [ ]  c) Masters [ ]
      Degree [ ]

4. Tick [√] to indicate the number of years of working at the school
   a) 0-5 years [ ]  c) 12-16 years [ ]
   b) 6-11 years [ ]  d) 17 years and above [ ]
SECTION B

THE PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

Please tick (✓) in the appropriate boxes to indicate the perceptions of teachers on corporal punishment in Senior High schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers should use corporal punishment to modify deviant behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Decreases the self-respect of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Creates inferiority complex among students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Children prefer corporal punishment to other forms of punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Corporal punishment makes children respect teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It causes dropout of the students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>It hurts me to give corporal punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Corporal punishment makes learners dislike school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Teachers should be allowed to use corporal punishment with discretion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Corporal punishment corrects the erring child to mould his/her life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Corporal punishment amount to child abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECTION C

### THE FACTORS THAT PLAY A ROLE IN THE USE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Please tick (✓) in the appropriate boxes to indicate factors that play a role in the use of corporal punishment in Senior High schools

1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree, 3 = Uncertain; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sleeping in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unnecessary noise making in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Disobedience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stealing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Eating in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bullying junior students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Improper dressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION D

METHODS USED BY TEACHERS TO MODIFY STUDENT BEHAVIOR

Please tick (✓) in the appropriate boxes to indicate the methods used by teachers to modify student behaviour in Senior High schools

1= Strongly disagree; 2= Disagree, 3= Uncertain; 4= Agree; 5= Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Establishment of clear rules for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Avoiding the unruly behaviour of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Positive reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Negative reinforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>