Corporal Punishment in the First Cycle Primary Schools of the Central Zone of Tigray Region in Ethiopia

R. Sreevalsa Kumar[1] and Fiseha Teklu[2]

Received: 18 February 2013; Accepted: 10 August 2017

Abstract: Cognizant of the negative after-effects of corporal punishment (CP) in children, there have been focused global initiatives to do away with CP from schools. However, CP is rampantly used as a disciplinary procedure in schools across the globe. This study was conducted to obtain descriptive information regarding CP in the first cycle primary schools of the Central Zone of Tigray Region in Ethiopia and also to examine the teacher variables associated with the use of CP. Data were collected through an individually administered instrument pack with three sections including a CP scale from a sample of 199 first cycle government primary school teachers of the same Region, drawn using multi-stage cluster sampling procedure. Results indicated that the great majority of teachers were using a wide range of CP methods to manage various problems related to behaviours of students. The majority of teachers, though using CP, they did not endorse its use in schools. Teacher variables, such as their gender and training in special needs education did not influence their use of CP. Teachers' perceived knowledge about problem behaviour and its school-based management and their level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without applying CP influence the use of CP; though a definite trend does not emerge. The implications of the findings are discussed against teacher training and policy implementation in the context of Ethiopia.

Keywords: corporal punishment; primary schools; Ethiopia; perceived knowledge about problem behaviour; problem behavior management; teachers.

[1] Associate Professor, Department of Special Needs Education, Addis Ababa University. P.O. Box: 150267, Ethiopia. *Email: vals8975@yahoo.co.in*
[2] Lecturer, Department of Special Needs Education, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia.

Introduction

Corporal punishment (CP) abounds even in today's schools amid the plethora of disciplinary measures initiated by school actors, especially by teachers. CP in its various intensities and forms swells among the most preferred problem behaviour management strategies for teachers (Feinstein & Mwahombela, 2010). CP in schools is not restricted to third world and developing countries alone. In line with this, Human Rights Watch (2009) observed that CP is routine in many parts of the US. Various omissions and commissions of students result in CP from teachers: not answering questions correctly, tardiness, talking to a friend during class, etc. (Anbarasan, 1999); poor performance in academics (Agbenyega, 2006) are some of the situations attracting CP in schools.

Teacher factors like the teachers' beliefs, such as "it is the easiest way of disciplining students" (Kuleana, 1999), "it is essential for maintaining discipline in schools" (Kuhn in McKendrick & Hoffman, 1990) and absence of in-depth training on alternative methods of problem behaviour management (Vally & Ruth, 2006) are among the variables predicting the use of CP. Teachers' perceived knowledge about problem behaviour management and their level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without applying CP can be assumed to be also determining the use of CP.

CP is effected through a variety of methods; many of them are inhuman. Hitting, pinching, kicking, shaking, shoving, chocking, inflict pain using wooden paddles, belts, sticks, or others, painful body positions, kneeling down, standing in bright sun, use of electric shocks, use of excessive exercise drills, or prevention of urine or stool elimination, pulling hair, etc. (Save the Children, 2003; Society of Adolescent Medicine, 2003) are found in the array of CP methods used in schools.

Africa, being home for traditional values and practices, is fertile for the use of CP in its schools. A study conducted in South Africa by the National Youth Victimization Study by the Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention in 2006 found that 51.4% of students experienced CP in schools (Newell, 2006). Zimbabwean schools were no exceptions. Angellar, Stephen and Ottilia (2011) reported that 49 percent of teachers used CP in the schools there to control students' misbehaviors. Teachers in Kenyan schools, according to Anbarasan (1999) regularly caned students even for minor classroom misbehaviors. And a survey by Populations Communication Africa reported 60% of children have experienced CP in the schools of Kenya (Johnson, 2004). According to Agbenyega (2006), a whopping 94-98 percent of teachers use CP to enforce school discipline in the schools of Ghana. Studies coming from Swaziland (e.g., Clacherty, Donald & Clacherty, 2005) too are indicative of the widespread use of CP in that Country.

Although CP is prohibited in Ethiopia, children are still corporally punished in its schools (Save the Children Sweden and Africa Child Policy Forum, 2005). Though comprehensive studies on CP in Ethiopian schools are too scanty, the available ones (e.g., Ayalew, 1996; Kumar & Seleshi, 2013; Seleshi, 2001) vividly depict the pervasive use of CP in Ethiopian schools. CP here takes different forms such as hitting with stick, slapping, pinching the ear, punching, kneeling down, hitting on the head, belting, and whipping. However, kneeling down is rated as the most frequently used techniques of CP by both teachers and students. While hitting with a stick was rated as the second most used method by teachers, hitting on the head is reported as the second most frequently used method by the students in Ethiopian schools (Save the Children Sweden & Africa Child Policy Forum, 2005).

Aftermath of CP

How does CP impact those who receive it? There have been debates, and obviously there are proponents and opponents of CP. They are parents, public and students themselves. "*Spare the rod, spoil the child*", "*nothing else gives a faster result*" etc. are in the typical belief systems held by the proponents of CP (Dobson, 2007). Whereas, opponents of CP are vocal and loud enough in their argument that CP not only harms children physically but also results in short and long term psychological liabilities (Alvy, 2007). Researchers further pondered into the aftermath of CP and the revelations were striking: Straus (1994) came out with the findings that more delinquency, aggression, academic problems, lower IQ, inappropriate sexual behaviour and abuse of others and even an increased suicidal rate among those children who were corporally punished are high. Straus further reported elevated rates of anxiety disorders, alcohol abuse and feelings of a lack of control among the adults who had been slapped or spanked by their parents during their childhood.

Though there are pleas for continued use of CP, arguments against it are stronger, sharper and focused. Highlighting the serious physical implications of CP, Save the Children (2003) and UNICEF's Asian Report (2001) observe that CP can also injure the child to the level that calls for medical attention, leaves permanent damage and even causes their death. It was just a few of years ago that a ten-year-old 4th grade boy in India was brutally beaten up by two of his teachers to the extent of causing serious back bone and neck injuries leading to his death on the fourth day into the incident (School boy dies, 2012, December 5). A flood of stories narrating the tragic conditions of hapless children in the hands of their *in loco parentis* in schools, leaving them with permanent disabilities as the aftermath of CP is a true cause of concern, globally.

CP increases the likelihood that students develop a negative attitude toward school and teachers which often lead to behavioral problems, anti-social acts, and various mental health problems, ultimately leading

to dropping out of school (Human Rights Watch, 2008). According to Save the Children (2003), the other most dangerous consequence of CP is that it sends a message to the minds of a child that violence is acceptable behavior that it is all right for a stronger person to use force to coerce a weaker one.

A meta-analysis by Elizabeth Thompson Gershoff (2002) brought about great insights into the aftermath of CP. She found 11 behaviours and experiences associated with CP. Of which a whopping 10 had a negative impact on students while one impacted positively: the immediate compliance. Gershoff further found that students punished with CP had lower levels of self control, more problems with compliance and poorer relationship with their parents. Sleep disturbances, bed-wetting, tension, depression, anxiety and other mental health problems also accompanied CP.

The ear-raising revelations about the negative impact of CP propelled many organizations go public against it. The influential American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, British Medical Association, American Academy of Pediatrics were among those that advocated against CP (Feinstein & Mwahombela, 2010). The concerns of professional organizations soon captured the attention of law and law-makers which resulted in legal efforts to regulate and/or curb CP.

The most influential action was taken by the United Nations (1989) through the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The Convention protects children from all forms of physical violence (Article, 19) and from inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment (Article, 37). The Convention also stipulates that school discipline shall be consistent with the child's human dignity. The African Charter on the Right and Welfare of the Child, in its Article 16 states that children should be protected from all forms of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment and especially physical or mental injury or abuse, neglect, or maltreatment including sexual abuse while in the care of a parent, legal guardian, or

school authority or any other person who has the care of the child (Africa Child Policy Forum, 2008).

The Ethiopian legal scenario is, indeed, promising. Ethiopia ratified the Convention on the Right of the Child in 1991 and the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child in 2000 (Goel, 2009). Further, the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) Constitution guarantees every child the right to be free of CP or cruel and inhuman treatment in schools and other institutions responsible for his/her care (Article 35) (Federal Negarit Gazeta, 1995). The Child Welfare Policy of the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs (MOLSA) assures that all efforts shall be made to provide protection against child abuse and neglect (No. 5.1.10) (MOLSA, 1996). By not including CP in the list of the allowed disciplinary measures in its School Administration Regulation of 1998, the Ministry of Education implicitly prohibits CP in the schools of Ethiopia (Save the Children Sweden, 2005).

The Rationale and Objectives of the Study

Problem behaviour in its varying forms and intensities has been explicitly and implicitly documented in the schools of Ethiopia too. Similarly teachers' use of CP to manage problem behaviours is also reported. However, a comprehensive picture on the exact nature, magnitude and the types of behaviours meted with CP in Ethiopian context is missing. Also, how various teacher variables, such as gender, status of training in special needs education (SNE), knowledge about problem behaviour management and their confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without using CP associate with the use of CP is not known. This triggered this inquiry. A comprehensive understanding about the use of CP would aid further the legal initiation of Ethiopia to curb corporal punishment in its schools. In addition, such an insight would help identify additional training needs of teachers of Ethiopia. This was the backdrop against which this investigation was conceived.

This investigation, thus, is conducted to acquire descriptive information regarding the magnitude of the use of CP, teachers' acceptance of CP, the behaviours or situations that are corporally punished and types of CP used in the primary schools of the Central Zone of Tigray Region in Ethiopia. Further, we aimed to examine the association between the teacher variables, such as their gender, training in SNE, perceived knowledge about problem behaviour and its school based management, level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without using CP with their use of CP.

Method

This study is correlational research that aimed to explore and describe the magnitude and nature of teachers' use of CP in their effort to manage students' problem behaviour in the primary schools of the Central Zone of Tigray Region in Ethiopia. It also aimed at analyzing as to how various teacher variables associate with their use of CP.

Sample

Teachers who were working in exclusive government first cycle primary schools (only from grade one to four) in the Central Zone of Tigray Region of Ethiopia comprise the population of the study. Multi-stage cluster sampling method was employed to draw the sample. The Central Zone of Tigray Region is divided into 12 *Woredas* (districts). There were 200 exclusive first cycle primary schools in this region and they were almost equally distributed across the 12 *Woredas*. Of the 857 teachers working in the 12 *Woredas*, 545 (63.59%) were males and the rest 312 (36.41%) were females (Tigray Region State Education Bureau, 2009). Being the first stage of the sampling procedure, four *Woredas* (33% representation) were randomly selected. Four schools from each selected *Woreda* were randomly selected in the second stage. All the 243 teachers (approximately 28% of the total population) working in the selected 16 schools were targeted to be drawn into the sample. Excluding the teachers who were

absent from school for various reasons and those who provided incomplete responses, the effective sample comprised of 199 teachers, that is, 23% of the population with a mean age of 44 years (SD = 9.79).

Instruments

The instrument pack developed for this study contained three sections. The first section included seven items on teachers' demographic information. The second section had nine items measuring aspects like the behaviours resulting in CP, teachers' perceived level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without using corporal punishment, etc. There were one Likert scale type item, two 'yes or no' type items, two four point scale items, two open-ended items and a multiple choice item with 22 response choices plus a provision to add any other behaviour, which are corporally punished, in this section. Each of these items was designed to be individually scored and analyzed. The third section of the pack was a 14 item rating scale. These items included 13 CP procedures teachers generally use and one open-ended item which required the teachers to list any other CP that they have been using. The items were written as a five-point scale having response categories ranging from "always" to "never" with corresponding values from five to one. Scores were summed up to obtain a total score, with higher scores indicative of higher magnitude of the use of CP.

Operationally defining CP so as to guide the development of the instrument pack, especially the CP Scale was the starting point of instrument development. Though CP has been defined by various organizations and researchers, these definitions share more similarities than differences (cf., Donnelly & Straus, 2005; Save the Children Sweden, 2005; Society for Adolescent Medicine, 2003). Consolidating from the available definitions, CP, for this inquiry, has been operationally defined as an intentional application of physical pain and/or discomfort, however light, as a method of changing students' behaviour. Such applications can be either by directly applying physical

force (beating, pinching, etc.) or by indirect methods such as forcing the child to stay in uncomfortable positions or to engage in excessive physical exercises, etc.

All the individual items and the scale were developed following the rigors of test construction. The processes followed for item development and content validity establishment were the same for all the sections. But, for the individual items in section two, only test-retest reliability on a sample of 46 teachers over a period of two weeks was established as that was the most feasible reliability measure for these items. The reliability coefficients ranged from 0.7 to 0.9 for these items which indicate moderate to high test-retest reliabilities. A detailed description on the development of the third section, which is a full-fledged rating scale, is presented below.

Being the first step, an item pool of 15 items was developed chiefly based on an exhaustive review of literature and consultations with school teachers and experts in the areas of education, special needs education and psychology. In the second stage, each item, thus, generated was scrutinized for culture fairness, distinctiveness and clarity; leading to 12 items getting qualified for inclusion in the first draft. The draft version was then sent to one psychometrician, one general educationist and three special needs educationists to establish face validity and content validity. They were requested to comment chiefly on item sampling, each item's appropriateness to assess the construct, clarity, redundancy, and culture fairness. They were also asked to provide any other suggestions that might help in refining the items. Inputs from the experts by and large were in agreement with the adequacy and appropriateness of the rating scale to assess CP. Further, there were suggestions to restate some items and add some other items. Each comment from all the experts was carefully studied and incorporated into the final version of the instrument. As a result, two new items were added to the final version making the total number of items in the scale 14. Therefore, at the end of this exercise, the instrument can claim good face validity and content validity. The test

retest reliability in an interval of two week's time on a sample of 46 teachers yielded a coefficient of 0.90 indicative of high test-retest reliability. The internal consistency of the items which was estimated using Cronbach's alpha to be 0.74 which is generally acceptable for research purposes (see George & Mallery, 2003).

Procedure

Data were collected towards the beginning of the academic year 2012-13 and teachers were asked to respond to the instrument pack based on their use of CP in the current and previous academic years. Being the first step of data collection, the directors of the selected schools were contacted and briefed about the purpose and significance of the study, ethical guarantees like confidentiality, voluntary participation, right to withdraw from the study, etc. and requested for their cooperation in the process of data collection. All the 16 directors volunteered to support the data collection process by way of distributing the instrument packs to the teachers and collect back the filled-in ones from them. The required number of instrument packs was handed over to the director of each school: a total of 243 packs were handed over to the 16 directors. The teachers were given a week's time to respond to the instruments and return to the school directors. This was done deliberately to enhance the reliability and validity of the responses. Of the 243 instrument packs administered individually, 217 were returned (a return rate of 89.30 %), a fairly higher return rate. But 18 of the filled-in instruments were incomplete and hence discarded, making the effective size of the sample used for analysis 199.

Data Analysis

The data were then entered into the SPSS software in preparation for quantitative analysis. This data was then checked and edited. In brief, descriptive statistics, such as percentage mean and standard deviation, and inferential statistics like independent sample t-test, ANOVA, LSD post hoc pair wise comparison and Pearson r were

employed in analyzing the data. In testing the significance of the results, alpha was set at .05 level in advance.

Results and Discussion

Magnitude of the use of CP

The mean score of sample teachers (n = 199) on the rating scale of CP was found to be 19.88 (SD = 7.79). On a possible score range of 13 to 65, a mean score which is close to the highest possible score indicates higher magnitude of use of CP. The mean score of the teachers in this study is close to the lowest possible score indicating lower magnitude of the use of corporal punishment. This is an encouraging result. However, an aspect should not miss the attention of the reader: the actual score ranged from 13 to 52, indicating that there are teachers who still use lot more CP to discipline their students.

A significantly higher number of teachers (42.2%) reported that they have been using CP. This, of course, is a matter of concern as the teachers reported as using CP form close to 50% of the sample. Further, it could be assumed that these teachers either may not be aware of the negative impacts of CP and the legal and policy prescriptions on the use of CP in Ethiopian schools or prefer not to believe and follow them. The need of additional orientations and training on aspects related to the use of CP is vividly indicted here. Nonetheless, it is encouraging to observe that the majority of the teachers, that is, 115 (57.8%) reported as not having used CP starting from the last academic year to the beginning of the current academic year. This can indeed be taken as a step forward towards dispensing with CP in the schools of Ethiopia.

To cross check if what teachers reported about their use of CP and their actual application of it match with each other, each item in the CP scale was individually scrutinized as for no items more than 42.2% of the teachers should be reporting as having used them, whatever be the

frequency of its use. Two discrepancies emerged here: 81.9% of teachers reported that they have made students stand on their knees and 53.3% reported as having pinched students as disciplinary procedures. Both the figures are significantly above the percentage of teachers who reported as having used CP. One possibility is that the teachers' response to this particular item would have been influenced by social desirability bias or teachers may not be aware that making a student stand on her knees is a CP method. But this assumption does not hold good for teachers' response to the CP method of pinching students. It can be strongly argued that social desirability bias would have influenced this response. However, since the teachers reported as having used the remaining 11 items in the scale are less than 42.2%, the genuineness of the result on this aspect cannot be totally brushed aside. Whatever be the cause of the discrepancies, it can be concluded that 81.9% of the teachers use CP in the government first cycle elementary schools of the study site and there is a great discrepancy between what teachers have reported and what have they actually practiced. And this would be the figure and insight used for subsequent discussions.

Teachers who had reported that they did not use CP were further asked to explain as to why they decided not to use CP through an open ended item. The reasons included their belief that advising students was a better method to correct their problem behaviour: a significant number of teachers expressed their belief in the power of advice. CP could lead students disliking their teachers; it is legally prohibited in Ethiopia; CP is the violation of human rights; CP can cause serious physical and psychological injuries to students; the parents of students did not like their children to be corporally punished were also the reasons reported by teachers.

It can be observed from the reasons attributed by teachers for their abstinence from using CP that most of their reasons are well founded. This is indeed rays of hope towards the ultimate elimination of CP from the schools of Ethiopia. The revelations of teachers prompt one to

assume that if adequate knowledge about CP, its legal standing and the aftermaths is provided, teachers may abstain from the use of CP. It is also to be noted that there are ill founded beliefs among teachers which prompted them not to use CP. Such beliefs are to be replaced with empirically validated knowledge-base so as to support teachers to be more realistic about CP.

Teachers' endorsement of CP

Only 41 (20.6%) teachers endorsed the use of CP in schools while the majority, 157 (78.9%), did not endorse it. There was only one teacher who did not take any of the positions. A thought provoking scenario emerges here: more than half of the teachers who reported to have been using CP and the great majority of teachers who have really been using it do not have an appreciation for it. Then, why do these teachers use CP? Is it because they lack skills to discipline students using more appropriate and scientifically validated procedures as observed by Vally and Ruth (2006)? Definite answers to these questions are beyond the scope of this inquiry. Further studies are signaled as they are of pivotal importance in the effort to curb CP in the schools of Ethiopia. Though 80% of teachers rejecting the application of CP is an encouraging result, close to 42% of teachers is found to be using it. This highlights that those teachers' rejection does not translate into actions. How can these teachers be helped? Their belief system about CP is to be known to decide upon the course of remedial measures to be initiated. An open-ended question inquired into this aspect. This question asked teachers to present their justifications for their endorsement and non-endorsement of CP in schools.

Teachers who endorsed and did not endorse CP paraded their arguments behind their stands. A sizeable number of teachers who endorsed CP believed that CP is the best way to correct a child. Further, some of the teachers were of the belief that children needed early correction and the most effective way to do this was to corporally punish them. "*I endorse CP because a child needs early correction; otherwise it is difficult to correct him/her once he/she gets older*'' is a typical stand adopted by a teacher. There were also teachers who believed that CP is necessary to maintain students' respect for teachers.

The arguments presented by teachers who did not endorse the use of CP included their belief that CP can lead to physical and mental injuries to students; can make students more aggressive; develop negative attitudes toward teachers, school and studies in students; lead to students' poor academic achievement and drop outs; and can develop fear of school and teachers leading to running away from schools. One of the assertions of a teacher is worth quoting: "*to correct bad things* (problem behaviour of students), *we should not do bad things* (CP)''; a quite appreciable insight.

Analysis of teachers' arguments for their endorsement and non-endorsement of CP in schools reveals one thing beyond dispute: teachers equally hold well founded and ill founded insights about CP and its after effects. Further studies on teachers' actual knowledge about CP and their attitudes towards CP are indicated.

Teachers' perceived knowledge about CP

It is assumed that teachers' perceived knowledge about problem behavior and its school based management can influence their use and endorsement of CP. Fifty (25.1%) teachers reported as having 'rich' knowledge. Ninety-seven (48.7%) teachers believed that they had the essential knowledge, whereas 52 (26.1%) teachers reported as having inadequate knowledge. Though the majority of teachers believed as

having rich or essential knowledge, where does their actual knowledge lie is an interesting and vital aspect of future studies. The revelation of 26% of teachers as not having adequate knowledge is something which has to attract the attention of teacher educators of Ethiopia. They have to find ways to enhance their knowledge through pre and in-service teacher trainings. It may also be noted that no teacher reported as having very little or no knowledge about problem behaviour and its management.

Teachers' level of confidence

The level of confidence of teachers in managing problem behaviour with and without applying CP was assumed to influence their use of it. Their confidence level is presented in table 1 below:

Table 1: Teachers' level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without using CP

	Fully confident	Partially confident	Not confident	Do not know
With applying CP	34 (17.1%)	61 (30.7%)	104 (52.3%)	0
Without applying CP	99 (49.7%)	66 (33.2%)	34 (17.1%)	0

It may be read from the above table that while 49.7% of the teachers reported as fully confident in managing the problem behaviour of students without applying CP, 17.1% were confident with applying CP. Another 30.7% of teachers are partially confident in managing problem behaviour with applying CP while 33.2% of teachers reported as partially confident without applying CP. Encouragingly enough, 52.3% did not believe that they can manage the problem behaviour by using CP. But 17.1% of teachers did not have confidence in managing problem behaviour in the absence of CP.

It is important to note that a significant number of teachers are not confident in dealing with the problem behaviour of students if CP is not used. The same portion of teachers (17.1%), however, is confident if CP is in place. So it can be reasonably concluded that teachers who lack confidence in managing problem behaviour of students without applying CP are confident if CP is used. It is matter of concern that half of the teachers are either not confident or only partially confident to manage problem behaviour without using CP. But, close to half of the teachers reported they are either fully confident or partially confident in managing problem behaviour using CP.

Students' behaviours resulting in CP

What are the problem behaviours which result in CP from teachers? An item with 22 options (behaviour which can result in CP) and one open-ended option was responded by the 84 teachers who reported as having used CP. Table 2 below presents the percentage of teachers who punished corporally different problem behaviours. Since teachers selected many options, the aggregate percentage would not be 100.

Table 2: Percentage of teachers who corporally punished various problem behaviors in descending order

Problem behavior	Percent
Talking to a friend during class	80.95
Quarrelling with other students	63.09
Failure to follow direction	58.33
Frailer to do homework	50.00
Destructing of property	48.81
Physically fighting with other students	46.43
Stealing of property	46.43
Not bringing materials such as text book, pencil, etc. to class	45.24
Showing disrespect to teachers	36.90
Approaching other students sexually	34.52
Possession of weapons such as knife, sharpened materials,etc.	30.95
Talking out of tern	29.76
Sexually attacking other students	28.57
Assaulting other students	26.19
Skipping classes	22.62
Not answering questions correctly	21.43
Running away from school	19.05
Coming to class without clipping nails	16.66
Failing in examination	14.28
Tardiness	11.90
Wearing dirty clothes/uniform	07.14
Use of illegal drugs	05.95

It is to be noted that all the 22 behaviours listed in the instrument have been punished corporally by teachers, though by differing portions. Talking to a friend during class hours is the behaviour which is punished by the great majority of teachers. Quarrelling with other students, failure to follow directions, failure to do homework and destructing property, in that order, are the other four behaviours among the top five problem behaviours meted out with CP. These revelations go well with the earlier findings reported elsewhere (see Anbarasan, 1999; Agbenyega, 2006). It is also important to examine the problem behaviours which were punished by the least number of teachers. The

least punished five behaviours in that order include use of illegal drugs, wearing dirty clothes, tardiness, failing in examinations and coming to class without clipping nails. The percentages of teachers who punished these behaviours ranged from 5.95 to 16.66. Either the behaviours which are punished the least may be low frequency problem behaviours or teachers may be more tolerant of these behaviours. It is of pivotal importance to note also that the behaviours which are punished corporally by teachers are the ones which can be managed by effective classroom management and simple behaviour modification techniques (see Kumar, 2011).

Prevalent CP Methods

The 13 closed-ended and one open ended items in the CP scale were individually tabulated to find the most to least prevalent CP methods used by teachers. The responses were dichotomized either as used, disregarding how frequently they were used, or never used. This was done since the intention here was to know the percentage of teachers using each CP method so as to derive the most and least preferred CP by the teachers. Table 3 below presents the CP methods and the percentage of teachers who have used them:

Table 3: Percentage of teachers using various CP methods

CP methods	Percentage
Make the student stand on knees	81.9
Pinch on the student's body parts such as ear	53.3
Hit with knuckle on the head	41.2
Beat (hit repeatedly) with an object like cane, ruler, etc.	40.7
Make the student do strenuous work (for example, garbage cleaning, gardening, toilet cleaning, etc.)	40.2
Hit (once) with hand	34.7
Make the student stand in hot sun	26.6
Make the student do strenuous physical exercise	23.6
Hit (once) with an object like stick, ruler, etc.	22.6
Make another student physically punish the student	22.1
Whip the student	20.6
Pull the hair or ear	20.1
Bang the head against the wall or desk	18.1

Of the 13 CP methods listed in the scale, making the student stand on knees was the method used by the maximum number of teachers (81.9%). Pinching on students' body part was the second most CP method used, 53.3% of teachers reported as having used them. Hitting with knuckle on the head, beating with an object and making students engage in strenuous exercises were among the top five CP methods used by teachers. The percentages of teachers who used them ranged from 40.2 to 81.9.

Banging the head of the student against the wall or desk is the CP method least used by teachers. However, it is not a solace as 18.1% of teachers used them. This is a method which can even lead the death of the student. Head banging can cause brain damage too. Pulling hair or ear and whipping, ranked second and third least used CP methods. Though used by the less number of teachers (20.1% and 20.6% respectively), it needs serious attention of the stake holders. These methods are inhuman and in violation of all the human and child rights. Making another student physically punish a student's behaviour in question and hitting with an object were the fourth and fifth least used CP. To the open ended question which asked teachers to list any other

CP method that they had used, no additional method was reported. Generally these findings go well with the literature on the CP methods used in other places too (cf., Save the Children, 2003; Society for Adolescent Medicine, 2003).

Considering the nature and percentage of teachers who used each CP method, these revelations are indeed true causes of concern. All the CP methods are used by a significant portion of teachers, while some of them are used by an alarmingly higher number of teachers. Going by the available knowledge on the after- effects of CP, it is genuine to be skeptical as to if these teachers are sawing seeds for a problematic future for our students. The scenario is crystal clear that teachers are to be helped to help students who engage in problem behaviour with scientific rigor and flavor. While we have an encouraging policy environment in Ethiopia in terms of CP in schools, capitalizing on that, we should look out for effective strategies to implement them. Teacher training at pre and in service level are the preliminary bets.

Influence of Teacher Variables on the Use of CP

The teachers were categorised based on different teacher variables such as gender, age, status of training and/or courses taken on SNE, perceived knowledge about problem behaviour and their school based management, and level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without applying CP. Independent sample t-tests, one way ANOVA and LSD post hoc pair wise comparisons (wherever signalled) were used to compare the means.

Gender, Age and SNE Training and use of CP

Table 4: Data and result of independent sample t-test on magnitude of CP between male and female teachers

Sex	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Male	103	20.56	8.05	1.28	197	.201
Female	96	19.14	7.48			

Not significant at 0.05 level, 2-tailed

As indicated in Table 4, the mean difference between Male (M=20.56, SD=8.05) and female (M=19.14, SD=7.48) teachers did not differ significantly on the magnitude of CP used (t (197) = 1.28). As a patriarchy society, one might expect males in Ethiopia to be more intolerant than females in child handling which in turn can lead to greater use of CP by males. But the findings of this study do not support such an assumption and that is an encouraging revelation.

Table 5: Data and result of independent sample t-test on magnitude of CP between teachers who took course on SNE and who did not take any course

Status of course taken	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig.
Taken	80	20.96	9.29	161	197	.108
Not taken	119	19.15	6.54			

Not significant at 0.05 level, 2-tailed

As Table 5 shows, no significant difference could be observed between teachers who took course on SNE and/or training (M=20.96, SD=9.29) and those who did not take any course or training (M=19.15, SD=6.54) on the magnitude of CP they used (t (197) = 1.6). This is, indeed, an unexpected result as SNE training is expected to contain more

theoretical and practical inputs on classroom management and behavioural interventions which in turn would aid teachers to manage students' problem behaviours using positive and proactive methods. The same has not been observed in the case of the teachers of this inquiry. Putting SNE teacher education in Ethiopia in shade, similar findings of non-contribution of SNE teacher training on teachers' expectation on the academic achievement and social skills of students with emotional behavioural disorders (Fiseha & Kumar, 2013) and their perceptions about the magnitude of problem behaviour and the techniques they employ to manage them (Kumar & Seleshi, 2013) have already been reported. This is indeed a cause of concern. This particular finding, read with the similar findings of the earlier studies, categorically signal a thorough and comprehensive evaluation and revision of SNE teacher training in Ethiopia.

The correlation between teachers' age and the magnitude of the use of CP was computed using Pearson's correlation and a significant but weak positive correlation ($r = .187$, $p < .01$) could be established. Though weak, this is a result which requires further scrutiny. Why do older teachers use more CP than their younger counterparts? Older teachers being the members of older societies with staunch beliefs in traditional methods of child discipline coupled with older teacher training with fewer inputs on modern problem behaviour management could be predicting their higher dependence on CP. For younger teachers, more exposure to media and modern teacher training might be contributing to their comparatively lesser use of CP.

Teachers' perceived knowledge and use of CP

The teachers were divided into three groups based on their perceived level of knowledge (with rich knowledge, with essential knowledge and with inadequate knowledge) of problem behaviours and their school based management. One way ANOVA followed by LSD post hoc pair wise comparisons were computed to examine if teachers in various sub-groups differed significantly on their use of CP. The descriptive

statistics of the teachers in the three groups are presented in table 3 below:

Table 6: Descriptive statistics of teachers in different groups based on knowledge level

Level of knowledge	Rich	Essential	Inadequate
n	50	97	52
Mean scores on CP scale	24.16	18.36	18.59
SD	11.03	5.82	5.56

The result of ANOVA [*F (2,196) = 11.119, p*<.01] indicated a significant mean difference among the groups compared and signalled post-hoc pair wise comparison. LSD post-hoc comparison yielded significant mean difference between teachers with rich and essential knowledge and also between teachers with rich and inadequate knowledge ($p < .05$ in each case). But no significant mean difference could be observed between teachers reported to have essential and inadequate knowledge.

Though the results above are in expected lines, the direction of it is quite puzzling. That is, teachers with rich knowledge on problem behaviour and its management are expected to be more positive and proactive in their problem behaviour management. But, here teachers with rich perceived knowledge use significantly more CP than teachers who perceived to have essential and inadequate knowledge. CP is a reactive problem behaviour management procedure and teachers with actual scientific knowledge about problem behaviour are not expected to resort to it. Here emerges an important insight: what is the actual knowledge that teacher, especially those who believed to have rich knowledge and to be understood. Is it the knowledge that is empirically backed or is it the belief on the power of CP? Further studies on these aspects are indicated as a need to replace scientific knowledge on problem behaviour management becomes evident.

To exactly establish the association between teachers' knowledge about problem behaviour and its management and their use of CP, teachers' actual knowledge is also to be investigated as the results emerging here do not illustrate any definite trend. That is, while teachers with rich perceived knowledge use more CP, teachers believed to have essential knowledge and inadequate knowledge did not differ significantly on their use of CP. This is where accurate information about their actual knowledge becomes all the more important.

Teachers' level of confidence and use of CP

Three groups got formed based on the level of confidence (fully confident, partially confident and not confident) of teachers in managing problem behaviours with and without the application of CP and their mean scores on CP scale were compared.

Table 7: Descriptive statistics of teachers in different groups based on level of confidence in managing problem behaviours using CP

Level of confidence	Fully confident	Partially confident	Not confident
no	34	61	104
Mean scores on CP scale	23.15	23.74	16.55
SD	12.19	7.35	3.75

The result of ANOVA [$F\ (2,196) = 24.753,\ p<.01$] indicated a significant mean difference among the groups compared and subsequent post-hoc pair wise comparisons yielded significant mean difference between teachers with full confidence and teachers who were not confident in managing problem behaviour by using CP and also between teachers who were partially confident and not confident ($p < .05$ in both cases). No significant mean difference emerged between teachers who were fully and partially confident.

The results above clearly establish associations between teachers' level of confidence in managing the problem behaviour of students with the application of CP and their actual use of it. Teachers who are confident (either fully or partially) use more CP than teachers who are not confident. If confidence makes a difference in the use of CP in schools, it is a well founded argument that measures may be initiated to help teachers to build confidence to manage students' problem behaviour without applying CP. This can be actualized through teacher education and training. It can further be assumed that an increment in the confidence in managing problem behaviour using well established behavioural management techniques would simultaneously lead to a decrement in the confidence of managing problem behaviour using CP.

Table 8: **Descriptive statistics of teachers in different groups based on level of confidence in managing problem behaviours without using CP**

Level of confidence	Fully confident	Partially confident	Not confident
no	99	66	34
Mean scores on CP scale	19.06	22.41	17.35
SD	8.46	7.69	3.77

The result of ANOVA [$F\ (2,196) = 6.12,\ p<.01$] indicated a significant mean difference among the groups. Subsequent LSD post-hoc pair wise comparisons showed significant mean difference between the groups of teachers who are fully confident and partially confident and also between teachers who are partially confident and not confident ($p < .05$ in both cases).

A closer analysis of this result reveals that teachers who are not confident in managing problem behaviours without applying CP use less of CP than teachers who are fully and partially confident; though the mean difference is significant only between the groups of teachers with partial and no confidence. But teachers who are partially confident

use significantly higher magnitude of CP. A clear trend on the association between teachers' level of confidence in managing behaviour problems without using CP and their actual use of it does not emerge here. The established associations are divided; in one situation a positive association is established whereas in the other case a negative association gets emerged. Further studies with stronger methods and larger sample sizes can develop better insight into it.

Conclusions and Implications

CP is used in the schools by the great majority of teachers, though only about half of the teachers who actually use it accept as having used them. However, the actual magnitude of the use of CP is encouragingly low. The great majority of teachers do not endorse CP in schools as a disciplinary measure. But, a significant portion of teachers who do not endorse CP actually use it. While the majority of teachers believe that they have required level of knowledge about problem behaviour and its school based management, a significant portion of teachers believes that they do not have the needed knowledge. Close to half of the teachers are confident that they can manage students' problem behaviour with CP and the remaining half is not confident of dealing with students' problem behaviour by applying CP. But, the great majority is confident to manage students' problem behaviours without applying CP. Various student behaviours are punished corporally by teachers using different CP methods; some of them are inhumane and in violation of human dignity and child rights.

Teacher variables such as gender and training in SNE do not influence their use of CP, whereas, age influences; older teachers use more CP than younger ones. Teachers' perceived knowledge about problem behaviour and its school based management, level of confidence in managing problem behaviour with and without applying CP influence their actual use of CP. But, a definite trend does not emerge.

The implications of the study are conceptualized in terms of teacher education and training and policy implementation in Ethiopian context. The findings of the study clearly highlight the need of further training to teachers not only on aspects related to CP but on themes of positive and proactive school based problem behaviour management too. There can be no denying the fact that cutting edge training of sufficient intensity and duration to teachers of today with components of respect for the rights and individuality of a child is a nonnegotiable must. This has to be achieved by a meticulously planned and systematically implemented teacher training programme at pre and in-service level on a nonstop basis. Such training would transform teachers into agents of change and stop continuing to remain the stooges of a system based on sheer inequality and violence.

To protect the students from violations of their rights and inhumane CP from the hands of their *in loco parentis* in schools, a strict policy environment is required which is actually in place in Ethiopia. But there is a lacuna in its implementation. CP in schools, chiefly, goes unrecognized and the perpetrators remain scot free. This needs to be addressed. There should be strong monitoring system; a system in which students too are part as actors, in each school is appearing as a feasible step forward. Parallel efforts to alter the traditional mindsets of teachers in our schools would further reinforce the existence of our children in our schools being more dignified and meaningful.

References

Africa Child Policy Forum (2008). *Ending corporal and other forms of humiliating punishment of children*. Retrieved from http://www.endcorporalpunishment.org/pages/pdfs/.../FaithHandbook.pdf

Agbenyega, J. S. (2006). Corporal punishment in the schools of Ghana: Does inclusive education suffer? *The Australian Educational Researcher, 33,* 107- 122.

Alvy, K. T. (2007). *The positive parent publication*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Anbarasan, E. (1999). *Spare the rod, save the child*, Paris: UNESCO. Retrieved from http://www.unesco.org.courier.

Angellar, M., Stephen D, W., & Ottilia, C. (2011). The crisis of student misbehavior in Zimbabwean public schools: Teachers' perceptions on impact of macro socioeconomic challenges. *International Journal of Education Administration and Policy Studies*, *2* (4), 40-44. Retrieved from http://www.academicjournals.org/ JEAPS

Ayalew Shibeshi (1996). School discipline and corporal punishment in Ethiopian schools. In H. Wondimu (Ed.). *Research papers on the situation of children and adolescents in Ethiopia* (pp.199-216). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Printing Press.

Clacherty, G., Donald, D., & Clacherty, A. (2005). *Children's views and experiences of corporal punishment.* Retrieved from http://www.rb.se/eng/Programme/ Exploitationandabuse/Corporalpunishment/1415+Publications.htm.

Dobson, J. C. (2007). *The new strong willed child*. Carol Stream. IL: Tyndale House Publishers.

Donnelly, M. & Straus, M.A. (2005). *Corporal punishment of children in theoretical perspective*. London: Yale University Press.

FDRE Constitution issued in Federal Negarit Gazeta, Aug. 1995, Addis Ababa.

Feinstein, S. & Mwahombela, L. (2010). Corporal punishment in Tanzania's schools. *Int Rev Educ*, *56*, 399-410.

Fiseha Teklu & Kumar, R. S. (2013). Teachers' expectations on academic achievement and social skills and behavior of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review*. *XXIX* (2), 79-95.

George, D. & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gershoff, E. T. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviours and experiences: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 128*, 539-579.

Goel, V. (2009). Children's human rights in underdeveloped country: A study in Ethiopian perspective. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations: 3* (4), pp. 142-155. Retrieved fromhttp://www.academicjournals.org/AJPSIR.

Human Rights Watch (2009). *Impairing Education*: *Corporal punishment of students with disabilities in US public schools*. Retrieved from http://www.hrw.org

Human Rights Watch (2008). *A violent education: Corporal punishment of children in US public schools*. Retrieved from http://www.hrw.org

Johnson, T. (2004). The nature and extent of corporal punishment prevalence and attitudinal research. *East and southern Africa summary* prepared by the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children. Retieved from http://www.endcorporal punishment.org.

Kuleana Study. (1999). *The state of education in Tanzania*. Mwanza: Kuleana Centre for Children's Rights.

Kumar, R. S. (2011). Emotional and behavioral disorders of youngsters in schools: A juxtaposition of school factors as their cause and cure. *Indian Journal of Social Development, 11,* 113-134.

Kumar, R. S. & Seleshi Zeleke (2013). Teachers' perceptions about behavioural problems, their attitudes towards students with behavioural problems and techniques they employ in managing behavioural problems: the case of primary schools in Addis Ababa. *The Ethiopian Journal of Education, XXXIII(* 1), 1-24*.*

McKendric, B., & Hoffman, W. (Eds.). (1990). *People and violence in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

MOLSA (1996). *Developmental society welfare policy of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia*. Addis Ababa: Author.

Newell, P. (2006). *South Africa briefing* for the human rights council universal periodic review. National Youth Victimization Study by the Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention. Retrieved fromhttp://lib.ohchr.org/HRbodies/UPR/Documents/ Sessional/ZA/GIEACPC_ZAF_UPR_SI_2008_GlobalInitiativeto EndAllCorporal PunishmentofChildren.

Save the Children Sweden, & Alebel Derib (2005). *Ending physical and humiliating punishment against children: Summary*. Retrieved from http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/.../ending-physical-and-humiliating...

Save the Children (2003). *Position on corporal punishment*. Retrieved from http://www.savethechildren.net/alliance/resources/corporal_punish

Save the Children Sweden & Africa Child Policy Forum (2005). *Ending physical and humiliating punishment against children: Ethiopia*. Retrieved from http://resourcecentre.savethechildren.se/.../ending-physical-and-humiliating...

School boy dies after being beaten up by teachers (2012, December 5). *The Hindu*. Retrieved from www.thehindu.com

Seleshi Zeleke (2001). Child rights advocacy in some schools of Addis Ababa: Could it help in reducing the incidence of corporal punishment? *The Ethiopian Journal of Education*, XXI, 1-24.

Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003). Corporal punishment in schools (position paper). *Journal of Adolescent Health. 32*, 385-395. DOI:10.1016/S1054-139X (03)00042-9.

Straus, M. A. (1994). *Beating the devil out of them: Corporal punishment in American families*. Kentucky, USA: Elsevier.

Tigray Regional State Education Bureau (2009). *Education statistic abstract 2009/2010: Planning and resource mobilization process*. Mekelle, Ethiopia: Desta printing press.

UNICEF (2001). *Corporal punishment in schools in South Asia*. Retrieved from www.crin.org/docs/resources/treaties/crc.../UNICEF-SAsia-Subm.pdf

United Nations (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child*. Retrieved from http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm.

Vally, S., & Ruth, T. (2006). *Alternatives to corporal punishment: Growing discipline and respect in our classrooms*. Sandown, South Africa: Heinemann.