

https://dspace.org/

Beyond corporal punishment : teachers' perceptions and suggested alternatives to the abolishment of corporal punishment in South African schools.

Molepo, Nono

2010-03-12T09:53:53Z
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/7660

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

CHAPTER ONE

1. Introduction

Corporal or physical punishment of children and the threat of it include hitting the child with the hand or with an object (such as cane, belt, whip, shoe, etc.); kicking, shaking, or throwing the child, pinching or pulling their hair, forcing a child to stay in uncomfortable or undignified positions, or to take excessive physical exercise, and burning or scaring the child amongst other things (Chisholm, Motala & Vally, 2003). As in so many other countries in the world, many children in South Africa suffer corporal punishment and other forms of humiliating and degrading punishment in the home, in the school and in different institutions (Payet & Franchi, 2008).

For the better part of the twentieth century, corporal punishment was an integral part of schooling for most of the teachers and learners in South African schools (Morrell, 2001). As Morrell (2001) indicates, this was a reflection of a tradition adopted by a huge part of South African society who had come to believe that corporal punishment was an effective child-rearing method. Such a tradition is in some cases, supported by citing the verse from the Bible which says that the man who fails to use the rod hates his son (Proverbs 13:24). As a result, for a long time, it was acceptable for educators to use "the cane" as a means of controlling learners at school (Department of Education 2000, p. 5). Beating up learners as a way of punishing them was taken as a strategy of choice.

There were, however, constant indications by research that corporal punishment might lead to a situation where it perpetuated violence from the wider society, reproducing it throughout South Africa (Chisholm et al., 2003). Consequently, within the education sector, the effectiveness of corporal punishment as a disciplinary means caused a serious debate in the 1980s. This debate went on well beyond the 1980s to the present times. Other human developmental professionals such as psychologists argued that corporal punishment can have serious emotional damage to the children whose behaviour it is meant to correct (Scarre, 2003). Particular concerns raised by psychologists include the fact that corporal punishment lowers the self-esteem of learners, which in turn impacts on academic performance owing to the sense of insecurity and self-hate occasioned by such disciplinary measures (Morrell, 2001).

The first Minister for Education in the first democratically elected South African government, Kader Asmal (2000, p.4), emphatically acknowledged the dilemma of educators regarding the banning of corporal punishment and at the same time pointed out the need for alternatives to corporal punishment when he remarked:

> The reality of the situation is that many educators face daily struggles in their school environment with issues of discipline. Many educators have found themselves in a position of not knowing what to do in the absence of corporal punishment. These educators are not alone in the struggle; even those educators who are committed to this change sometimes find themselves in a difficult situation.

Social commentators also point out that corporal punishment could be part of a wider web of violence that fuels antagonism and hatred among the youth who grow up as hardened and insensitive members of society (Vally, 2005). They argue that indeed corporal punishment has little value in enhancing educational potential; instead it creates a vicious cycle of violence. The social commentators argue that when teachers punish children physically they give them models for aggressive behaviour. For instance, a study conducted by Dodge and Bates (1992) found that those elementary schools with punitive teachers tended to manifest physical harm to peers and damage to property, than children with non-punitive teachers.

During the 1990s, opinions against the use of corporal punishment gained momentum in South Africa and this led to its abolishment in South African schools. The South African government's adoption of the abolition of corporal punishment in the country through the South African Schools Act of 1996 meant that a whole new approach to education in the country was in the process of being developed. This approach required political will on the part of the government and the commitment of principals, teachers and parents. All these stake holders had to work in close collaboration to establish a new morality and behaviour after a centuries-old system of education that had allowed the use of physical punishment had fallen away. The University of the Witwatersrand Education Policy Unit also suggested alternatives that could be practically implemented, based on the principle of behaviour

modification in which teachers should aim at discouraging bad behaviour before it has begun.

> It should be noted that the argument against corporal punishment seemed and still seems to feed off the notion that the act of caning is both violent and ineffective. There has always been mixed reactions as those in favour of corporal punishment in schools argue that many educators are struggling against indiscipline in schools since corporal punishment was outlawed. On the other hand, there are those like Vally (1998) who subtly link caning to apartheid South Africa. The current Department of Higher Education Minister, Dr. Bonginkosi Nzmande once commented at a conference that corporal punishment was not effective as it had to be used repeatedly on the same pupils for the same offence. He also argued that it is not the complete answer but one of the options among many (*East London Daily Dispatch*, 9 June 2004).

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In South Africa, the end of apartheid and the establishment of a culture of respect for human rights in 1994 laid the foundation for the end of corporal punishment in schools. The new constitution of South Africa held corporal punishment as an infringement of a learner's human rights because of the humiliation that such a learner underwent before his / her colleagues. Section 10 of the South African Schools Act (1996) specifically reflected the spirit of the constitution by banning corporal punishment in school as from 1996. Porteus, Vally & Ruth (2001, p. 6) note that "teachers who use corporal punishment are liable for criminal prosecution." Yet, from that period onwards, many educators found themselves in a dilemma because they experienced an upsurge in cases of ill discipline amongst their students, and at the same time they did not know what to do in the absence of corporal punishment (Department of Education, 2000). Abolition of corporal punishment has brought a lot of anxiety and confusion to educators in South African schools. Those for abolishment as well as those who still illegally administer corporal punishment do not quite understand how to handle the situations that demand that learners be disciplined. However, besides the existence of such confusion, the Department of Education has had to resort to drastic means in an attempt to enforce the law. An example is the East London Provincial Education Department where educators were warned for

continual use of corporal punishment, that they will face the wrath of the law (*East London Daily Dispatch* 9 June, 2004). The same paper just cited reported that the Education Department handled 10 cases relating to corporal punishment in 2003 alone. The Departmental spokesperson, Gay Khaile said that five teachers had received written warnings; three were suspended for a month without pay, the one was fined R2500 and given a final warning, while the tenth was acquitted.

Such an example reveals the worrying magnitude of the problem that seems to have brought so much anxiety and fear among educators, such as the fear of losing their jobs, as well as fear of litigation. Their fears are not unfounded given that as an example, the police and the Department of Education in Durban investigated complaints of corporal punishment against a Durban high school principal where a girl claimed that she had been hit with a stick for skipping class (*Sunday Times*, 16 May 2004). Teachers also worry about loss of classroom control, having to deal with an abrupt change of moving away from instilling corporal punishment to other alternative methods. They also face immense parental pressure to keep order in schools (Payet & Franchi, 2008).

Maintaining discipline in schools has become a problematic issue. There are reports in the Eastern Cape about difficulties in keeping discipline since the government abolished corporal punishment in 1996. A Principal is on record urging the Education Department to review legislation to assist them deal with the situation. This principal argues that educators need to be empowered in dealing with pupil misbehavior. One of the educators' unions supported this principal's opinion and suggested that schools need to develop an inclusive code of conduct that would address their challenges (*East London Daily Dispatch*, 27 February 2004).

There is an opinion that the abolition of corporal punishment has resulted in educators witnessing a diminishing of their status and authority in the eyes of their learners. Such a situation impinges on their teaching duties (Parker-Jenkins, 1999). Some of the educators concede that "corporal punishment may not be a good strategy for all children, but it is important as a last resort for children who do not respond to other disciplinary methods" (Porteus, 2001, p. 17). This suggests that some educators do not look at corporal punishment as a strategy whose effectiveness or want of it

works in isolation, nor as the first priority in a list of possible approaches to the correction of ill discipline. Clearly, such are genuine concerns from both categories: teachers who wish to assert their authority and stem the tide of indiscipline in schools on the one hand and on the other, social commentators and psychologists who argue that corporal punishment impacts negatively on the long term emotional and mental stability of the children who experience it (Payet & Franchi, 2008).

This move has led to the education sector having to seek alternative ways of enacting disciplinary approaches that would at the same time reassert the teacher's authority while remaining humane and respectful to the right of errant children to dignity among their peers and at the same time uphold their sense of self-esteem. In ensuring that teachers do not violate the injunction that prohibits corporal punishment, this way of disciplining children was criminalized, with educators facing charges of assault every time they transgressed. This situation has meant that schools and educators have the responsibility of trying to identify and implement alternative disciplinary practices and procedures. It is against this background that this study seeks to establish the perceptions that educators have towards the outlawing of corporal punishment in South African schools.

1.2 Rationale of the Study

Morrell (2001) notes that at the policy level, the South African government attempted to offer alternatives to corporal punishment in two ways: it introduced school-level codes of conduct and gave parents an unprecedented involvement in school affairs. This new approach involved a different philosophy towards punishment, one that stresses consensus, non-violence, negotiation and the development of school communities. This meant that teachers had to involve other stakeholders when dealing with issues concerning discipline in schools, a point that naturally impacted on their perceptions of the different approaches towards disciplinary issues. While policy and legislation must play their role, this is not enough to bring about a change in the practices and perceptions of teachers at grass roots level (Payet & Franchi, 2008).

Since 1996, newspapers in South Africa have routinely reported that corporal punishment continues to be used in schools, sometimes resulting in the hospitalization of learners. For instance, one of the most recently reported cases is that of a Grade 10

learner who died after allegedly being beaten by the school principal (Vally, 2005). This incident once again brought to the fore debates on the place, if any, of corporal punishment in correcting learner misbehaviour in South African schools. While human rights activists saw such acts of corporal punishment as a violation of human rights of the students who needed correction via other means, some people decried the diminishing authority of teachers to contain their students' misbehaviour.

The then Kwa Zulu Natal Minister of Education, Dr Vincent Zulu, also agreed that in many South African schools, structures of control were virtually non-existent, and the teachers, the erstwhile figures of authority, had become ineffectual in the wake of the learners' militancy. Dr Zulu admitted that disruption of learning continues to be considered a major problem by teachers and learners alike (*Daily News*, 18 April 1997). Furthermore, literature and research indicate that corporal punishment is still regarded as the disciplinary method of choice by some educators. For instance, a study by Morrell (2001) indicated that 51% of teachers in the Gauteng Province considered corporal punishment to be effective and only 1.8% mentioned self-discipline as an important educational goal.

Considering that literature indicates that corporal punishment is possibly still being used in South African schools, and in order to get a rounded sense of developments around the issues of discipline in South African schools, it is necessary to evaluate teachers' perceptions concerning the abolishment of corporal punishment in schools. This will also be useful in attempting to evaluate alternative disciplinary measures to corporal punishment employed in schools.

1.3 Aims and Objectives of the Study

Though the South African Schools Act (1996) is framed with the good intention of protecting learners and providing education to all South Africans, its implementation is problematic. As a result, this study aims at investigating teachers' perceptions of the abolishment of corporal punishment in South African schools. It also aims at exploring the alternative disciplinary measures used by educators in schools. Part of its aims is also to identify problems hindering the implementation of other alternatives to corporal punishment, and to make recommendations concerning this dilemma.

1.4 Research Questions

- What are the teachers' perceptions concerning the abolishment of corporal punishment in schools?
- What alternative disciplinary measures do teachers in schools use?
- What are the teachers' understandings of the contents of the code of conduct in schools?

1.5 Definition of Terms

This section gives working definitions of the key terms and phrases which were used in this research.

Many people use the terms "discipline" and "punishment" interchangeably to mean the processes or acts of correcting what is deemed to be unacceptable behaviour. However, they are not the same. In order to better understand the difference between these words we need to take a closer look at the words and their associated meanings.

1.5.1 Discipline

When applied to schools, the word "discipline" is defined and used in terms of the expected levels of behaviour of the learners and the way it conforms to the school rules and regulations, which are in turn informed by the wider societal goals of modelling responsible citizens out of the learners (Rosen, 1997). In addition, Kumalo (2001, p.4) notes that "discipline" must also derive part of its relevance from enabling learners to achieve the goals of "inner control or self-discipline". This scholar stresses the dimension of intrinsic motivation and individual aspirations in the attainment of acceptable levels of discipline.

Hurrisunker (1998) also looks at the question of discipline as used within the school context. Noting the problems associated with the word "discipline," and while acknowledging the lack of a universal definition of the term, Hurrisunker (1998, p.68) in reading Wilson (1971), looks at the word "discipline" as "[referring] always to the kind of order involved in trying to reach appropriate standards or follow appropriate rules for engaging in a valued activity." In all the common definitions of discipline there seems to be reference to conformity towards expected levels of behaviour.

This study is largely guided by these definitions of discipline because ultimately, what the learners acquire in schools' official and hidden curricula must find relevance in the social responsibilities that the learners are expected to assume at a later stage in their lives.

1.5.2 Punishment

Punishment is based on the belief that if children are made to suffer for doing wrong, they will not repeat their inappropriate behaviour (Department of Education, 2000). Related to this is corporal punishment, which is viewed as any deliberate act against a child that inflicts pain or physical discomfort to punish or contain him/her. According to the Department Of Education (2000), corporal punishment "involves numerous forms of abuse that include spanking, slapping, pinching, or hitting a child with a hand or with an object; denying or restricting a child's use of the toilet, denying meals, drinks, heat/warmth and shelter; punishing or pulling a child with force and forcing the child to do exercise" (6). However, corporal punishment is more than this because it encompasses the threat to use any or all of the above. The underlying assumption is that such threats increase the children's sense of insecurity, and are also forms of violence in themselves.

1.5.3 Behaviour Modification

This approach is very much a practical approach to teaching which is concerned with treating the behaviour of learners rather than speculating about untreatable causes (Harrop, 1983, p.4). It does not allow the teacher to opt out of responsibility. Behaviour modification is a technique of altering an individual's behaviours and reactions to stimuli through positive and negative reinforcement of adaptive behaviour and/or the extinction of maladaptive behaviour through positive and negative punishment (Dembo, 1994). It involves some of the most basic methods to alter human behaviour, through operant reward and punishment.

1.5.4 The Authoritarian Approach

This approach assumes that most learners are going to misbehave as often as they can. Therefore, educators need to prepare for the worst in order to control their classes; they need to be tough and act tough. They must demand respect through their position

as educators. With regard to this, Sihlangu (1992) for example, argues that in following this approach, pupils need to be kept at arm's length because friendliness, warmth and openness bring disrespect to the educator. Techniques often used to supplement the authoritarian approach include the use of corporal punishment, ridiculing, embarrassing the pupil and questioning of his/ her integrity.

1.6 Outline of Chapters

The next chapter in this study discusses the concept and practice of corporal punishment in schools. International and South African literature will be discussed, looking at the normative principles and ethical values that according to international and national levels should inform alternative disciplinary measurers as opposed to corporal punishment. This will be followed by Chapter 3 – Methodology. This section discusses the techniques of data collection, the problems faced during this stage of research and how these problems were resolved. The subsequent chapter, Chapter 4, deals with results and analysis of the data. Chapter 5 identifies, discusses and interprets the attitude of educators towards the abolition of corporal punishment as well as methods to keep discipline in schools. Chapter 6 presents and summarises implications, limitations, conclusions and recommendations from the findings.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1 What is Corporal Punishment?

In its more general sense, the term corporal punishment refers to deliberate infliction of pain on the human body with the intention of disciplining or reforming the wrongdoer (Scarre, 2003). Robinson, Funk, Beth & Bush (2005) give us a critical lead in pointing out that in the past, corporal punishment was not limited to children. It applied to adults as well. In societies with a long history of writing such as England and Greece, there are records that stretch as far back as the Middle Ages and even much earlier, of how corporal punishment was used in the judicial system (Middleton, 2008). Flogging, for example, Middleton (2008) points out, was last used in Britain in 1962.

Vally (2005) makes a useful observation that corporal punishment is also linked to historic periods characterised by violence such as slavery, colonialism and apartheid, through the use of the whip. One could add other heinous forms of corporal punishment such as branding and mutilation during and post slavery. Thus, if it was not being used as a "corrective" measure, corporal punishment was being used on both adults and children as a tool of subjugation. One notices that less than four decades ago, corporal punishment was officially being meted out by the law or had become entrenched in societies characterised by conflict (Dapper & Dingus, 2008).

2.2 Corporal Punishment in Schools

With the establishment of formal schooling, corporal punishment was used as a panacea for all kinds of ills and was legitimated largely on religious grounds, amongst which were Judeo-Christian beliefs (Scarre, 2003). With regard to its use in schools, corporal punishment "includes a variety of methods such as hitting, spanking, punching, shaking, paddling, shoving, and use of various objects, painful body postures, excessive exercise drills, and electric shock" (Dapper & Dingus, 2008, p.243) amongst many examples.

On the pervasiveness and general acceptance of corporal punishment in English public schools, Middleton (2008, p.263) makes an instructive comment that "Whilst the idea of corporal punishment as a benign activity may seem strange from a modern viewpoint, it was a normal means of disciplining a child both at home and in the school, for much of the 19th and 20th centuries." In other words, corporal punishment was understood as part of school life, and the cane or birch was the rule and not the exception. It was assumed that corporal punishment was a "fair and reasonable way of chastising a child" (Middleton, 2008, p.253). To assume that this view was heterogeneous is to miss the contestation that corporal punishment has always faced. As Middleton (2008) observes, there were voices of discontent from parents, pupils and some thinkers even as early as the Victorian times. This was occasioned by the arbitrary or unjust use of corporal punishment which tended to be downright cruel in some instances. Thus, some educators used corporal punishment habitually, some carrying instruments of punishment all the time such that those instruments became an extension of themselves. Middleton's (2008) observation can be extended to any school context in the last twenty or so years, perhaps even less than that figure in some instances.

The pain from corporal punishment together with physical injuries was the prime index of the debilitating effects of corporal punishment. Dapper and Dingus (2008, p.243) observe that "Injuries from corporal punishment may include (but are not limited to) welts, blood blisters, severe bruising, skin discolorations, hematomas, blood clots and broken veins." In instances where corporal punishment proved to be too frequent and severe, Robinson, Funk, Beth and Bush (2005) opine, there was opposition from both the learners and parents. This opposition stemmed from the fact that corporal punishment was accepted by both learners and parents as long as it was deemed just and moderate. The intensity of the punishment was expected to match the offence committed by the learner. Middleton's (2008, pp. 264-265) comment in this regard is instructive:

> Corporal punishment was, it should be noted, intended as a punishment of last resort; educationists cautioned that it should be used infrequently and with discrimination. For instance, teachers were advised that they should only punish a pupil when the child had acted in a way that it knew to be wrong. It would be considered a mistake to punish a child for producing poor quality work.

> However, such advice was open to interpretation…. The problem, it seems, was that although it was broadly agreed [in the 19th and 20th centuries] that it was reasonable to use corporal punishment when necessary, there was no universal idea of what constituted necessity.

On top of the wanton use of corporal punishment was the severity of meting this punishment.

The corollary to the above situation was that views on corporal punishment changed, occasioned largely by lobby groups, child development studies in America and Europe as well as Freudian psychology in the 1920s and 1930s (Dapper and Dingus, 2005). In this way, the deleterious psychological effects of corporal punishment were brought to the fore. There was a conclusion that, as Dapper and Dingus (2005, p. 245) write,

> The use of corporal punishment in schools has been shown to be associated with damaging physical and psychological outcomes that can affect some children for the remainder of their lives. For example, the excessive use of corporal punishment has been shown to be associated with conduct disorder in children and is comorbid with PST [Post Traumatic Stress Disorder]. The humiliation that accompanies the experience of corporal punishment in schools may reduce the child's ability to problem solve rationally; make a child more aggressive, defiant and oppositional; and further inhibit a child's ability to solve problems effectively.
>
> ….
>
> These deficits further subject children to feelings of inadequacy and resentment and may eventually lead to anger, hostility, violence, and aggression against school property, peers, and authorities.

Robinson, Funk, Beth & Bush (2005) add to this list of debilitating effects of corporal punishment, that correctional research has linked corporal punishement to substance abuse.

Much as there are the above arguments that corporal punishment can degrade educator and learner – that its long term effects are not negligible, attitudes towards corporal punishment have been and continue to be ambiguous. The centrality of corporal punishment in disparate educational systems seems to be an on-going

concern. While some countries have expressly banned it from their schools, others uphold corporal punishment as a possible way to "teach a lesson, to improve or correct a child's behaviour" (Parker-Jenkins, 1999, p.16).

According to a study done by Tafa (2002), corporal punishment was legal in Botswana despite widespread uncertainty about its administering. Justified as African culture by teachers in the Tafa study cited above, this attitude harps back to the discussion above. The debates on corporal punishment have been so enduring that some countries such as Tanzania, Sudan, Somalia and Kenya have not banned it, and defend its use by citing it as a tool to cope with big classes. Other countries, Botswana for example, resist outlawing it despite heated pressure from various activist groups. Turner (2002, p. 89) further notes that "the Supreme Court of Canada recently upheld a century-old law that allows parents, teachers and caregivers to spank children." Ball (1989, p. 23) also notes that "corporal punishment was used a great deal as a method of discipline in the early 1700s up to the 1900s in United States schools." In the same research, Ball asserts, "even though 70 to 80 percent of teachers surveyed favoured corporal punishment, an even larger number wanted to be trained in more effective discipline methods other than corporal punishment." This suggests some ambivalence towards corporal punishment by teachers who acknowledge the fact that corporal punishment is by no means the most effective method of instilling and maintaining good behaviour among young learners. Indeed these findings were made within the American context, but they have clear links with South African schools where pupil indiscipline is a major problem.

According to Season (2005), the South African government has taken a number of measures to implement the prohibition of corporal punishment in schools. The National Policy Act (1996) read with the South African Schools Act (1996), stipulates that no educator shall administer corporal punishment or subject a student to psychological or physical abuse at any educational institution. Personnel have been appointed at the national and provincial Department of Education to ensure adherence to the prohibition within the educational system. The Department of Education has also published a manual for teachers on alternatives to corporal punishment, which has been distributed widely together with a guide for personnel who were meant to facilitate training. However, knowledge about legislation does not always result in

behaviour change among teachers. Season (2005) maintains that corporal punishment and other forms of humiliating and degrading punishments are still widely used in South African schools. It seems that the main reasons for the persistence of this practice in schools are linked to a lack of understanding among educators of the human rights framework protecting children, the harmful effects of corporal punishment on children, and the lack of skills to manage discipline in big classes through positive, non-violent measures.

In line with international and regional rights treaties such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, there is now an international move towards abolishing all forms of corporal punishment and humiliating punishment of children in areas such as care institutions, juvenile justice systems, formal schools or within the family (Season (2005). In South Africa, Season (2005, p.29) adds, 'interpersonal violence is widespread and conflicts are in many instances resolved by violent means." The use of corporal punishment on children contributes to a perception from an early age that violence is an appropriate response to conflict and unwanted behaviour. It teaches that it is acceptable for powerful persons to be violent towards the weak and to solve conflicts through violence.

According to Porteus (2001), the Association for Childhood Education International has actively supported the United Nations Convention on the Right of the Child since its adoption in November 1989. Article 19 of the convention specifies that state parties must take appropriate measures to protect children from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse. In schools, administrators are expected to take into account the child's human dignity and not use disciplinary measures that may cause physical or mental harm. Thus, education as well as legislative and legal reforms are crucial to ending corporal punishment at a global level.

In 1979, Sweden became the first country in the world to ban all corporal punishment of children. By abolishing corporal punishment, Sweden set a good example for other nations. Furthermore, Sweden bolstered the law by providing a fund for massive educational campaigns. While the Swedish government primarily relies upon the efficacy of training educators to shun corporal punishment, offenders are subject to

criminal prosecutions (Porteus, 2001). Porteus (2007) adds that accumulated research supports the theory that corporal punishment is an ineffective discipline strategy with all children of all ages and furthermore, that it is often dangerous. Corporal punishment most often produces in its victims anger, resentment and low-self-esteem. Porteus (2001) is in tandem with scholars cited earlier in this study in saying that corporal punishment teaches violence and revenge as a solution to problems and perpetuates itself, as children imitate what they see adults doing. Children who get spanked regularly, according to Porteus (2001), are more likely over time to cheat or lie, be disobedient at school, bully others and show less remorse for doing wrong Corporal punishment adversely affects children's cognitive development. Children who are spanked perform poorly on school tasks, compared to those who are not. (Chisholm et al., 2003).

Children need discipline and particularly to learn self-discipline. In addition to infringing on children's rights, their human dignity and physical integrity, Season (2005), argues that corporal punishment and other forms of humiliating and degrading punishment are ineffective forms of instilling and maintaining discipline. Season further adds that smacking, spanking, beating and humiliation are poor substitutes for positive forms of discipline. Educators, it is suggested, should teach learners to think about others and about the consequences of their actions.

While positive school rules are needed for schools to be effective, it is also necessary to have punishment (corrective discipline) for those who break the rules and disrupt school activities. However, the type of disciplinary measures that schools may take must be determined and regulated by law. As Squelch (2000) observes, good discipline is one of the key characteristics of an effective school. Without discipline, effective teaching and learning cannot take place. Squelch (2000) further posits that society expects schools to be orderly and to produce well-educated and well-behaved people and as such, it is important to keep in mind that discipline is an ongoing process. There are no quick fixes to develop children into responsible human beings with self-discipline and respect for others. However, as Season (2005) notes, legislation alone will not end the use of corporal punishment. To eliminate the use of corporal punishment, legal reform has to go hand-in-hand with awareness raising and

public education to change attitudes and to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline.

According to Squelch (2000), when a learner is punished, it is necessary for the educator to explain what school rule was broken, explain the consequences of breaking the rule, explain the punishment and record the punishment, especially for serious incidents. In doing so, the educator should consider that punishment must be fair and reasonable, in proportion to the offence, lawfully and consistently applied.

As indicated earlier in this research, the old South African Education Department viewed corporal punishment as the only tool to control learners who were disruptive in their behaviour (Vally, 2005). With time however, South African Society has undergone major social, economic and political changes in seeking to establish a democratic and humane nation. Among the changes in the education sector has been the banning of corporal punishment in all schools under the South African Schools Act of 1996. This prohibition was challenged in the Constitutional Court in 2000 but the appeal was dismissed (Department of Education, 2000, p.1) partly because the banning of corporal punishment is supported by a number of conventions that complement each other in the protection of young children against various forms of violence. Some of these include the Convention on the Rights of the Child, the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, the South African Schools Act, and the South African National Policy Act – all of which protect children against physical and psychological forms of violence. Therefore, corporal punishment, in its widest definition, no longer has a place in South African schools. Failure to comply with this prohibition can result in educators facing charges of assault. This leaves schools with the responsibility of identifying and implementing alternative disciplinary practices and procedures. The ban has been met with mixed responses from both educators and parents. Whatever their views, the questions being asked by most people are: a) what do we do now? ; and b) what are our alternatives?

The dilemma of finding alternative means of maintaining discipline in schools is not just for teachers, but everybody concerned with child growth and development. The problem so far is that practically all the existing literature on the place of corporal punishment in South African schools remains limited to the question of right or

wrong; whether corporal punishment should be reintroduced or not. In many cases, debate around this issue is fanned by professionals in the legal and psychosocial paradigms of knowledge, all of whom presume to know how best teachers can maintain discipline in schools without necessarily resorting to corporal punishment (Payet & Franchi, 2008). The insinuation in most of these debates that most teachers use corporal punishment with malicious intent, or that they are a bit too enthusiastic when addressing disciplinary matters using the cane, is one way of postponing the moment of engagement with the crucial question of how the teachers perceive corporal punishment and its abolition in schools. It is with this in mind that the proposed study seeks to investigate views on corporal punishment and suggested alternatives.

In South Africa, it has been observed that the role of education in the socialization of learners is often overlooked, because of the importance given to racial economic redress. As a result, the moral and personality development of children, particularly their beliefs, values and aspirations are largely ignored (Sihlangu, 1992). Disciplinary methods such as the use of corporal punishment, particularly in poor schools, are practised without review. As one of the key elements of education, classroom discipline is recognized as an absolute prerequisite for achieving instructional objectives and safeguarding students' psychological, social and physical well being. Unless pupils in a classroom are disciplined, no meaningful learning will take place (Capel, Leask & Turner, 1995). Related to corporal punishment are behaviour modification strategies, which the project now turns to.

According to Dembo (1994), behaviour modification assumes that observable and measurable behaviours are good targets for change. Dembo further posits that all behaviour follows a set of consistent rules. As such, methods can be developed for defining, observing, and measuring behaviours as well as designing effective interventions. The behaviour modification approach is an important alternative to corporal punishment. Behaviour modification is mainly interested in modifying the pupil's behaviour from undesirable to desirable. The goal is to reward the desirable behaviour and quell the undesirable one. A review of related literature by prominent researchers has shown that this approach motivates learners to learn and pay attention to details. It is said to improve memory retention, make learners confident and reduce

anxiety. Harrop (1983:4) states that behaviour modification is very much a practical approach to teaching, concerned with treating the behaviour of pupils rather than speculating about untreatable causes. It does not allow the teacher to opt out of responsibility; one cannot simply attribute pupils' problems to the pupils' home environment or to physiological abnormalities and wash ones hands of such behaviour.

Harrop (1983:140) also observes that an effective way of implementing behaviour modification in the classroom depends upon the teacher. That is, teaching involves following a curriculum, selecting appropriate materials, explaining, discussing, setting work, marking the work, and a host of allied functions. This means that the teacher performs these activities in order to promote the well being of his/her pupils in the broadest possible sense. When the teacher performs these duties he/she is modifying the behaviour of his/her pupils. In this context, it is thought that pupil behaviour will change as a result of the educator's behaviour; that pupils will learn in accordance with the quality of the educator's teaching. If an educator is perceived as a rewarding person, and gives his/her approval for work well done, it is assumed that pupils will learn (Dembo, 1994). In short, whether the educator is aware of it or not, he/she is using the practice of behaviour modification. When the educator systematically applies the principles of behaviour modification, he/she is fulfilling his/her duty. The educator has an obligation to promote the well being of the pupils in his class (Capel et al., 1995).

2.3 Approaches in Dealing with Disruptive Behaviour

Regarding approaches to dealing with disruptive behaviour, four schools of thought emerged, all suggesting strategies that can be employed by teachers in dealing with disruptive behaviour in the classroom. The first one is the non-interventionist approach. It maintains that the classroom manager should not intervene with the behaviour of pupils because it is assumed that children are innately good and trustworthy (Kasambira, 1993).This is a flawed approach because more often than not, children need guidance.

The second is the behaviourist approach which stresses that the external environment is responsible for pupil's behaviour. The teacher can manipulate the environment to

help the pupils shape behaviours appropriate to the classroom. This is done through conditioning, hence the need for rules and regulations (Dembo, 1994). This school however, does not incorporate the pupils' thoughts and feelings about certain behaviours demanded of them. There is always the possibility of conflict (Capel et al., 1995).

The third is the interactionist approach. This group of educationists believes in the process of mutual action. This refers to sharing authority and ideas so as to produce an effect on each other. The teacher in this process believes that pupils have a positive input and are capable of making informed decisions. In the end, it is the teacher together with the pupils who make classroom rules and regulations (Capel et al., 1995). These rules and regulations are likely to be followed because they are not the teacher's regulations but the class's. Once the rules are broken, pupils also know what the punishment is and that way, there is bound to be little resentment for the teacher, if any at all. This theory then appears to be better than the first two since it implies a negotiated settlement and sets clearer parameters of behaviour.

The fourth is called the teacher's authority approach (Dembo 1994) and is a fairly new approach. The chief proponent is M. Gilson, one of the reputable educationists in America. Gilson contends that the teacher is the one in charge of the classroom and as such should enforce his/her authority. The teacher under this approach makes rules and regulations which govern pupil behaviour in the classroom. These rules, together with their accompanying punishments, must be endorsed by the school and parents. Once the rules are broken, the teacher proceeds to punish the pupil accordingly. Gilson's main argument is that pupils should know that the teacher is the ultimate authority in the classroom and the pupils do not have any recourse on matters pertaining to classroom behaviour. The exercising of authority will differ from teacher to teacher depending on a particular teacher's demands or requirements.

2. 4 Strategies to Prevent Disruptive Behaviour

Most educators are of the opinion that the best way of having less incidents of a disciplinary nature and conflict in the classroom, is to prevent such situations from happening in the first place (Dembo, 1994; Capel et al., 1995; Vally, 2005). As such, it is imperative to consider some of the strategies that scholars give in this regard.

Educationists concur that disruptive behaviour cannot be prevented or eradicated completely. Even the best classroom manager does find him/herself confronted with disruptive behaviour now and then. This does not mean that preventive measures should not be taken. Capel et al., 1995, p.107) put it succinctly when they observe that "it is easier to prevent disruptive behaviour than to deal with it afterwards." A couple of strategies are offered by various educationists and these are discussed below.

The most important tip given to educators is to anticipate disruptive behaviour. Classroom managers who anticipate such behaviour cope better than those who expect complete obedience or compliance. In any case, as Dembo (1995) points out, dealing with say, more than thirty personalities means that the educator should expect disruption now and then. It sounds like common sense but the majority of teachers, even experienced ones, Wragg (2001) argues, are caught on the wrong foot by disruptive behaviour.

A lot of authorities on disruptive behaviour recommend that educators learn the names of all the pupils in their classes in order to minimise disruptive behaviour. They point out that once a pupil can be identified by name it means a personal relationship has been established (Wragg, 2001). The pupil ceases to be a nameless girl or boy. As a result, pupils who can be easily identified tend to care about what the teacher says and are likely to behave less disruptively than nameless pupils. At the same time, pupils make an effort to avoid behaving disruptively for they know that they can be easily identified to face the consequences of their misbehaviour.

The educator is also advised to construct simple classroom rules together with his/her class. Haigh (1990) says that this gives pupils a sense of responsibility. Rules created this way are not the teacher's rules but rules for everyone in the classroom. For that reason, they are not likely to be ignored or hated. The other reason for classroom-constructed rules is expediency. The rules become advantageous in the sense that there are no surprises or apprehension in the classroom because everyone knows what is expected of them. That way, punishment becomes easy to administer.

Regarding the meting out of punishment, any form of punishment promised to the pupil, Dembo (1995) asserts, should be carried out. He strongly advises against empty threats. Soon pupils learn that their teacher only threatens them. A teacher should not also threaten to do something that he/she is powerless to effect, such as beating pupils. Empty threats increase disruptive behaviour incidence with even those pupils who had been well behaved joining in. In administering punishment, Wagner (1989) advises that punishment should be proportionally administered to the offence. This is what Kasambira (1993) calls being firm and friendly.

Classroom managers are also advised to establish their authority if they want to minimize disruption. A tense or anxious teacher will not have much authority over his/her pupils (Kasambira, 1993). As a result, all sorts of misbehaviours are bound to occur, especially those that interfere with the teaching – learning process. Related to this point, Fontana (1985) advises teachers to be aware of what is happening in class all the time. This is called "withitness." Dembo (1995, p.296) further describes it as the teacher's ability to "communicate to students that she/he knows what is happening." Other authorities call it having eyes at the back of your head. This is done through good eye contact with the pupils and being vigilant in class, constantly monitoring the mood, atmosphere, attitude and behaviours of the class. Capel et al. (1995) also add that a teacher can for instance, circulate around the classroom even when reading. They further suggest that spending a few minutes in each part of the classroom ensures that pupils are aware of the teacher's presence quite close to them. That way, they are less likely to be disruptive. Thus, potential problems are taken care of before they occur. This takes us to another related concept, overlapping.

Overlapping according to Dembo (1994) refers to the teacher's ability to do two or more things at once and to make transitions between different kinds of activity without stopping or breaking the pace of the classroom activities. An example of overlapping might involve a teacher who notices that as he/she is addressing the class, a potentially disruptive or disruptive behaviour is taking place. The teacher can move towards the pupil who is misbehaving or about to and just stand by that pupil without breaking his /her address to the class. Usually this is enough to get the pupil to stop the undesirable behaviour without the need to break the teacher's flow or even to mention the undesirable disruptive behaviour. After all, pupils, Wagner and Wagner

(1987, p. 42) assert, “respect teachers who blend power and authority in a subtle way.”

Some educationists, for example Wagner (1989) suggest that a teacher should make profiles on his/her pupils. These profiles should reflect each pupil’s background, especially useful information such as family background, records of school misbehaviour and so on. This gives the teacher a head start in dealing with persistently disruptive pupils. Haigh (1990, p.48) says, “such pupils behave in a disruptive way, walking about the room, shouting out and getting into minor fights regularly.’’ Through pupil profiles a teacher adopts the best method of dealing with disruptive pupils since those causes outside the classroom come to light.

Much as the idea of making pupil profiles is a wise one, it is impractical or near impractical in a primary school. Usually classes have more than 40 pupils and a teacher may have other pressing things to do (Payet & Franchi, 2008).

Another suggested strategy to curtail disruptive behaviour is to count and chart learner behaviour. Under this strategy, an educator counts and charts behaviour such as how long the child plays during the day, how many minutes he/she pays attention, or how many puzzles the pupil puts together during a session. The educator must also count important teaching behaviours such as the number of times she/he rewards a target behaviour. The educator is also advised to keep notes on behaviours s/he is working on. For instance, write down how well the learner is doing or what problems s/he may be having (Capel et al., 1995).

The educator is also advised to use an effective reward system. He/She must give a lot of praise where it is due, loudly and clearly, to reward the child for finishing a task, for example. Praise him or her now and then to keep him or her working on hard behaviours (Dembo, 1994). Another example of a reward system is a points system. Under this system, points are either awarded for good behaviour or deducted for bad behaviour. For example, learners begin the school year on 500 points and thereafter points are deducted for misbehaviour. Alternatively, learners begin with zero points and then accumulate points for good behaviour (Squelch, 2000, p. 34)

Alongside using effective reward systems it is suggested that disruptive learners may be required to report to the principal or another senior educator on a daily basis for a specific period of time. This should make learners realize that they are being closely watched. Alternatively, a learner may be required to carry a report sheet to be completed by each of the learner's educators and then handed to the principal or deputy principal at the end of the day (Capel et al., 1995).

Lastly, cultivation and maintenance of enthusiasm by the educator is also thought to help minimise educator-learner conflict. A number of authors such as Dembo (1994) are in agreement that a lively teacher is likely to capture the attention of his/her pupils and minimal disruption is likely to occur. Such liveliness should be accompanied by well-planned, interesting and varied teaching methods.

2.4 Responding to Disruptive Behaviour (the Dos and Don'ts)

An educator's response to disruptive behaviour determines what sort of classroom practitioner s/he becomes as well as his/her temperament (Capel et al., 1995). That being the case, it is important for educators to know a couple of key dos and don'ts with regard to dealing with disruptive behaviour which because it interferes with meaningful learning, can be frustrating and irritating to the educator, forcing him/her to resort to one form of punishment or another, including corporal punishment. In any case, a teacher's response to disruptive behaviour determines whether that behaviour ceases, escalates or resurfaces.

One of the don'ts is that a teacher must not be angry in the face of disruptive behaviour (Blum, 2001). This is a very contentious point to make but with time, Blum (2001) argues, an educator learns not to get angry with every instance of disruptive behaviour. When a teacher is beside himself/herself with anger, it is much to the enjoyment of the pupils most of the time. As a result, they are likely to repeat it for fun. Thus, they become even more disruptive (Squelch, 2000).

Kasambira (1993) advises that educators must not rise to the bait when learners tease or test them. This usually happens to new teachers. Under such circumstances, the teacher is advised to respond calmly, coolly, firmly and fairly. On a related issue,

Dembo (1995) advises that confrontation should be avoided at all costs and that some reprimands are better done privately than publicly. Pupils can be overly sensitive to some public reprimands leading them to do or say something embarrassing to the teacher. Once a teacher's reputation has been tarnished, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to restore it to its former levels. Reprimands should also be specific. The teacher should try to avoid reprimanding the whole class because 'this may alienate those who were thus far sympathetic towards the teacher', say Capel, Leask and Turner (1995, p. 114).

Educators are also advised not to insult or criticize learners (Kasambira, 1993). It is the behaviour that warrants and deserves criticism and not the pupil personally. Once a pupil is criticized or insulted, he/she will take it personally either overtly or covertly. Either way, relations between the teacher and the pupil will be strained.

Amongst the list of dos, in dealing with disruptive behaviour, Capel et al. (1995) advise that the teacher should express concern and possibly disappointment. It is thought that this may cajole the pupil into responding appropriately. Disruptive pupils, Dembo (1995) opines, should be re-directed to their work. The educator should, in his/her discussion with the pupil, refer to the work to demonstrate beyond any doubt that the teacher is concerned with getting the work done. Thus, once the pupil is concentrating on the work, disruptions cease or subside.

The discussion of the literature in this section suggests that many educators are aware of the challenges of maintaining discipline in the classroom. Equally, these educators offer several ways of dealing with behaviour-related problems. Of importance in this study is to investigate whether the participating educators implement any of these suggested ways or if they had other effective methods of instilling discipline.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

3.1 Introduction

The focus of this chapter is the research methodology applied in this study and includes a description of the research design, research instruments, the pilot study, sample and sampling techniques used to carry out this study.

3.2 Research Design

Research design refers to a "research plan" as Chikoko & Moyo (1995, p.20) simplify it. Murimba & Moyo (1995, p.17) further clarify this term to mean "the underlying logic" for a particular plan of research. Research design is therefore more than mere technique. This chapter will declare and qualify the research approach undertaken in this study, identify research instruments and justify both the approach and choice of instruments.

3.3 Approach

This study is qualitative in approach. Trochim (2003) declares that qualitative research is one of the two major approaches to research methodology in the social sciences, the other being the quantitative method. Trochim (2003) goes on to add that the qualitative method involves understanding the reasons that govern human behaviour. As such, qualitative research is of special value for investigating attitudes towards sensitive issues:

> …for example, if you are interested in how people view topics like God and religion, human sexuality, the death penalty, gun control and so on, my guess is that you would be hard-pressed to develop a quantitative methodology that would do anything more than summarize a few key positions on these issues. While this does have its place (and it's done all the time), if you really want to try to achieve a deep understanding of how people think about these topics, some type of in-depth interviewing is probably called for. (Trochim, 2003, p.187)

The abolition of corporal punishment matches the criteria for such sensitive issues.

Given that this study aims to probe the point of view of educators on corporal punishment as well as possible solutions in place of corporal punishment, a qualitative approach was deemed to be an appropriate methodology to inform the study. Furthermore, this approach is appropriate because as Meriam (1989, p. 67) points out, qualitative researchers are concerned with "the meanings people have constructed, that is, how they make sense of their world and their experiences of it." Rubin and Rubin (2004) expand on the efficacy of the qualitative method by saying that, especially through the interview technique, there is an integration of multiple perspectives and bridging of inter-subjectivities. At the same time, the two scholars add that we get to learn of a problem from "inside."

3.4 Research Instruments

3.4.1 The Questionnaire

The short questionnaire (see Appendix 3) requested the participating educationists to provide demographic details through answering a short list of questions. The demographic details were important variables that would help in determining patterns about the administration of corporal punishment. In other words, it helped in determining who was likely to administer corporal punishment and why, taking into account details such as participants' sex, levels of education and age among others. This questionnaire was factual and did not ask for opinions concerning the abolition of corporal punishment. This was covered exhaustively by the interviews. The questionnaire proved to be a relatively quick way of information gathering in which the educators had to tick a box and fill in small pieces of information such as their level of education.

3.4.2 Semi-structured Interviews

Data was also collected using semi-structured interviews (see Appendix 6). According to Lofland & Lofland (1995), a semi-structured interview, is a dialogue between an interviewer and interviewee and its goal is to elicit rich, detailed material that can be used in analysis. A semi-structured interview is different from a structured one in that whereas the latter uses standardised and set questions, the latter has some latitude in terms of following up responses given by respondents. Semi-structured interviews are appropriate and widely used to supplement

and extend our knowledge about individuals' thoughts, feelings and behaviours, or how the participants *think* they feel and behave. Data yielded through semi-structured interviews is both quantitative and qualitative regarding participants' thoughts, feelings and behaviours (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Semi structured interviews are therefore suitable in sensitive and complex topics, such as corporal punishment in schools. Rubin & Rubin (2004) expand further by saying that semi-structured interviews are one of the most common qualitative methods and one reason for their popularity is that they are very effective in giving a human face to research problems. In addition, conducting and participating in interviews can be a rewarding experience for participants and interviewers alike because, semi-structured interviews, alongside other interviews, offer the participants the opportunity to express themselves in a way ordinary life rarely affords them. Many people find it flattering and even cathartic to discuss their opinions and life experiences and to have someone listen with interest.

Interviews are designed to elicit a vivid picture of the participant's perspective on a research topic and the researcher used this method because of the desire to learn everything the participants could share about the research topic (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). This method was also considered appropriate because it gives the researcher the opportunity to engage with participants by posing questions in a neutral manner, listening attentively to participants' responses and asking follow-up questions and probes based on those responses in order to elicit the most comprehensive data possible (Chikoko & Moyo, 1995). The researcher did not lead participants following any preconceived notions, nor did she encourage participants to provide particular answers by expressing approval or disapproval of what they said.

Prior to conducting the interviews, the researcher designed interview questions and thought of possible probes to these questions based on likely responses. The interview was conducted with varying degrees of flexibility consisting of six questions, which were followed by probes. The researcher took the following considerations when compiling questions. The first consideration is language. It should be simple in order to covey the meaning of the question clearly. Another consideration is that the questions should be easy to read and clearly relevant to the

subject under investigation. A good question should create a feeling of importance in the respondent and also a feeling that the research is relevant and that cooperation is important.

Youngman (1978) suggests that the questions should not be too long, too complex, or too confusing and must be varied in format. Interviews were conducted both in Sesotho and English to accommodate the code switching that was done by respondents between the two languages. This is so because most of the respondents were comfortable with their mother tongue, which is Southern Sotho although the interviewer's main aim was to conduct the interviews in English throughout. Rigidly sticking to English and insisting that the participants do the same would have curtailed spontaneous conversation and feedback, thereby producing impoverished data.

3.5 Context

The school under study is a primary school, south of Johannesburg in a township. The school runs from Grade R to Seven. It has fifteen classes at Foundation phase and another fifteen of senior phase. The school has a teacher complement of thirty-three, with approximately two-thirds being female. The teacher-pupil ratio is approximately one to fifty, meaning that the classes are very big.

Twelve educators from this school were randomly selected to participate in this study. The researcher focused on this particular primary school not only for its accessibility to the researcher but also because anecdotal information from the media indicated that it was one of the schools in Johannesburg with a high incidence of pupil misbehaviour in Gauteng schools.

3.6 Procedure

The researcher designed the study and drafted a questionnaire to be administered to the twelve participants in the study. The researcher telephonically set up an appointment with the principal of the school under study. The principal granted the researcher an audience at which was explained to the principal the nature and aim of the study. The principal granted the researcher permission to carry out the study. Another date was set for the researcher to introduce herself and the study to staff and ask for volunteers to participate in the study.

A total of 23 educators volunteered to take part in the study. The researcher met them in the school staffroom at break time. The researcher explained the study and that she needed 12 participants. Respondents were advised that participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw their participation at any time. It was made explicit that choosing not to participate held no negative consequences for the participants. The researcher also made it clear that only pseudonyms would be used for reasons of anonymity.

The twelve participants were randomly selected because, as Nueman (2003) indicates, it is a manageable number for a qualitative study. According to Nueman (2003), a large sample without random sampling or with a poor sampling frame is less representative than a smaller one with random sampling or an excellent sampling frame. The researcher used random sampling to choose the 12 educators. This sampling procedure assures that the different units in the population have equal probabilities of being chosen. The 23 names were written on same size small pieces of paper, folded, put in a box and drawn. One of the educators conducted the draw until the required number of twelve was reached. The participants were asked to sign consent forms and did so.

The interviewer conducted the interviews in the office of the Deputy Principal because participants felt that it was privately situated, with no outsiders to disturb and they felt that their confidentiality would be protected in that space. The participants had been invited before the interviews to suggest a location where they would feel comfortable (Kvale, 1996). The interviews started at 1130hrs after the school's second lunch break. The Principal helped in organizing the educators. Each educator had a time schedule which showed the starting and finishing time of his/her interview, following each educator's free time on the school time table.

The interviews were tape-recorded to facilitate natural speech and the researcher also took short notes. The length of the interviews varied according to each educator's responses. The longest was 45 minutes, which made the researcher adjust the time in order to accommodate other participants. The tape-recorded interviews were then transcribed and analysed.

Prior to the actual study, a pilot study was conducted. A pilot study is a trial run of the full study at a miniature scale. It helps by providing data needed to plan the larger study (Lancaster, Donald & Williams, 2004). It permits a preliminary testing of the hypothesis that leads to a more precise hypothesis in the research. It also greatly reduces the number of treatment errors, because unforeseen problems in the pilot study may be overcome in redesigning the main study (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). It is usually the case that a small sample can provide adequate, appropriate information about the power and sample size for the future full-scale study. Chikoko & Moyo (1995) further say that a pilot study should justify the number of subjects required.

The pilot study was conducted at another school, not at the school of study, to test the feasibility of the interview schedule. The researcher was also interested in finding out whether or not the questions in the interview guide could be moderated as well as to gain some insight into the spectrum of responses that could be anticipated from the study. Two of the questions were fine tuned.

3.7 Data Analysis

The qualitative responses from the interviews lent themselves to content thematic analysis. Braun and Clarke (2006, p.79) define thematic analysis as "a method for identifying, analysing and reporting patterns (themes) within data." These two scholars add, significantly, that thematic analysis "goes further than this, and interprets various aspects of the research topic" (p.79). There was a need in this study, to construct categories or themes as qualitative data were being compared or related. In other words, there was a need to create and apply "codes" to the data, in an effort to see how different and similar attitudes to corporal punishment and practices in maintaining discipline intersected variables such as sex, age, educational levels and teaching experience of participants. The coding was guided by the research aims.

Thematic analysis also helped to condense the data. As Neuman (2000) points out, coding allows one to retrieve parts of data by reducing raw data into manageable chunks. Relevant units of the raw data were organised into conceptual categories in accordance with Jensen's (2002, p. 251) observation that thematic analysis is "an attempt to identify, compare, and contrast meaning elements, as they emerge from and recur in several different contexts. What distinguishes thematic coding from much

quantitative content analysis is the emphasis on defining each of the elements in relation to their context." Conclusions were then drawn based on the relationships emerging from the data set.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Presentation

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and analyses the results of the study. It is divided into two sections. The first presents and discusses the demographic data of the participants whilst the second presents and examines the educators' perceptions about the abolishment of corporal punishment and what they perceived to be alternatives to corporal punishment.

A profile of each of the twelve educators is given. Each profile shows the concerned educators' sex, age, highest level of education or professional qualification attained, teaching experience, preferred method(s) of instilling discipline, attitude towards corporal punishment and the educator's application or non application of corporal punishment pre and post 1996. The year 1996 is used a benchmark given that corporal punishment was banned in South African schools in that year through the South African Schools Act.

The educators' attitudes regarding the maintenance of discipline in the classroom were derived from the interviews. The educators' preferred methods of instilling discipline are evaluated using views of authorities on corporal punishment some of whom are cited in the literature review plus others who are not. An overall evaluation of educator practices and attitudes is made, based on the intersection of educators' demographic details, attitudes towards and implementation or non implementation of corporal punishment pre and post 1996.

4.2 The Participants

Introduction to Participants

Twelve educators took part in this study. Pseudonyms were used for all educators and they were done in alphabetical for both female and male educators. The pseudonyms are non ambivalent in their marking of sex. For example, the first female educator is called Abigail and the first male educator is called Adam. Each educator was asked to indicate his/her age on the provided questionnaire. Age ranges were provided to allay

the possible discomfiture of stating one's exact age. The age ranges were as follows: 31-35, 36-40, 41-45 and lastly, 46 and above. The participants also had to indicate the duration of their teaching experience. The interviews yielded information on the educators' attitudes towards corporal punishment, alternative means of instilling discipline, whether they were aware of the illegality of using corporal punishment, whether or not they had used corporal punishment prior to 1996 and whether they were using it or not post 1996. Regarding corporal punishment, educators were asked to indicate their attitudes in a scale ranging from on the one end, "strongly agree" through "agree," "neutral,"" disagree" and at the other end, "strongly disagree." They were also asked to indicate whether they had used corporal punishment pre and post 1996, and to indicate the frequency of administering corporal punishment. The scale for both periods had options, "never," "sometimes" and frequently. The following are the educator profiles:

Participant One – Abigail

Abigail was aged between 41 and 45. She had obtained a Primary Teacher's Diploma and had 14 years of teaching experience.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Abigail strongly disagreed with the abolishment of corporal punishment. She commented, "Since the abolishing of corporal punishment, the level of discipline in our schools has gone down. Learners are no longer committed to their studies as it used to happen before 1996." Abigail further cited general laxity in the learner's behaviour such as coming to school late and home work undone. She said she was very aware of the fact that corporal punishment was banned in South African schools in 1996. Before 1996, Abigail said that she had administered corporal punishment "sometimes." She said she used to beat habitual offenders only, those in her words, "who did not want to listen." After 1996, Abigail said she stopped using corporal punishment after its banning because she did not want to "get into trouble."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Abigail pointed out that the disciplinary methods she used were dependent of the gravity of the learner's misbehaviour. Generally she makes pupils clean the classroom and she was of the opinion that learners "enjoy cleaning the classroom" but tend to feel that cleaning school premises outside the classroom is far from "enjoyable" as

"they are seen by everyone which makes them feel so bad about their behaviour and some do not repeat that behaviour [for which they are being punished]." Abigail also used detention, but rarely because according to her, "You as the teacher you also end up being punished by staying with the children."

Participant Two – Barbara

Barbara was aged between 41 and 45, and held a Bachelor of Arts degree as well as a Post Graduate Diploma in Education. She had been teaching for 15 years.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Barbara, like Abigail, strongly disagreed with the abolishment of corporal punishment. She said, "Children of today lack self-discipline as compared to previous ones" and she attributed this situation to the banning of corporal punishment in schools. Barbara added, "They [learners] are also not serious about their school work because they know that nothing will happen to them." Barbara was aware of the fact that legally, corporal punishment had been banned. In spite of this however, Barbara had meted out corporal punishment frequently, pre 1996 and continued to post 1996. Pre 1996, she said she had tended to use corporal punishment frequently but had changed to using it "sometimes" post 1996. She said she was currently using "slight corporal punishment" on the learners and as an example she said, "I use a belt on their palms because it is not so painful."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Apart from corporal punishment, Barbara also used detention. She was of the opinion that detention was not an effective deterrent of undesirable behaviour because "you see the same pupils being detained over and over."

Participant Three – Adam

Adam was within the age range 46 and over. He held a Primary Teacher's Certificate, a Further Education Diploma and Secondary Education Diploma. He had 23 years of teaching experience.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Adam was aware that corporal punishment had been banned in South African schools in 1996. However, he disagreed with that move saying, "Learners are now out of hand. Children now do wrong things because they have been told they have rights."

Adam said he had administered corporal punishment "frequently" pre 1996 and had stopped completely since its banning because, "These things of rights and all that can get you into trouble if you're not careful. Some teachers have been suspended and some fired."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Adam said he made offending pupils clean toilets and the classroom because according to him these seemed to be the only available or reasonable methods of maintaining discipline for he asked in a resigned manner, "What else can I do?"

Participant Four – Brian

Brian was aged between 36 and 40 and had obtained a BA Degree as well as a Higher Education Diploma. He had taught for two years.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Brian strongly disagreed with the abolishment of corporal punishment and said, as his reason, "When I look at these learners, they are not punished and they tend to do what they want." Brian was aware that the ban on corporal punishment which took place 6 years before he could start teaching. He was adamant that corporal punishment would have played a positive role in maintaining discipline and motivating learners because in his words, "I learnt under this system [corporal punishment] myself and we were well-behaved and wanted to do our best every time." Brian had not used corporal punishment from the time he joined teaching because he said it was a "crime, according to the department [of education] and the government."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Brian said that he sometimes called in parents in the event that a child continued with a certain undesirable behaviour even after punishments such as cleaning the school. Brian was of the opinion that calling in the parents tends to avail a "common solution" to the learner's behaviour and that input from home was more effective than that from school because at home some of the parents "spanked the children and that works." Apart from involving parents, Brian also made offending pupils clean toilets. On top of these two strategies Brian said, "I also shout at them." He said shouting made the pupils "wake up and focus and think twice about doing a wrong thing."

Participant Five – Cecilia

Cecilia was aged between 41 and 45 and held of a Bachelor of Arts (Education) and a Bachelor of Education Honours Degree. She had 9 years of teaching experience.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Cecilia was aware of the ban on corporal punishment and strongly agreed with the move. As her strongest reason she said, "Today we have people who are not learned because they ran away from school because of the fear of corporal punishment." Cecilia said she had had bad experiences herself as a pupil to a point where she had started thinking of quitting school because of a teacher who would hit her "for nothing or a very small thing like making a mistake while writing and then cancelling it." Cecilia qualified her statement and said, "Although in some instances corporal punishment was used to discipline children, in others it was used to ill-treat them." In spite of her strong views against corporal punishment, Cecilia said that in the one year she taught before the ban, she sometimes used corporal punishment and after 1996 she "sometimes" used this disciplinary measure. When asked to clarify this contradiction she said, "There are times when it is necessary. You do it once or twice on rude children for example, and you may not need to beat up any child in that class for the rest of the year." Asked if she did not fear litigation, she said, "Of course I do, but like I said I spank those children that know they are very wrong and they are not likely to tell anyone and I don't hit them often."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Cecilia said her disciplinary methods depended very much on the nature of the misbehaviour by the pupil. She said for example, "If homework is not done, I sacrifice my time and help them with their homework." She also cited those who play truant and said, "I give them [a position of] responsibility to make it difficult for the leaner to play truant." Cecilia also said that sometimes she talks to students in an attempt to understand the root cause of their untoward behaviour.

Participant Six – Dora

Dora fell within the 46 and over age group. She held a Primary School Teacher's Diploma and a Bachelor of Education Honours Degree. She had taught for 24 years.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Dora was aware of the banning of corporal punishment and disagreed with it. She cited poor discipline and academic results since the banning of corporal punishment and said, "Discipline in our schools had deteriorated and our results are not so good because of the banning of corporal punishment." Dora said she had used corporal punishment "frequently" before its ban and had not used it since its banning. Asked why she had stopped, she said she did not want to be "dragged to the courts and all that nonsense, especially as I'm thinking of retiring soon."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Dora said she used detention and cleaning of school premises, activities that she supervises. She also said that she uses a reward system for good behaviour and academic excellence because "those who are lazy or naughty will know that they will not get anything."

Participant Seven – Eunice

Eunice was aged between 41 and 45. She held a Primary School Teacher's Certificate and had 18 years of teaching experience.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Eunice was aware of the ban on corporal punishment and strongly agreed with it saying, "Some teachers used to always beat up children and the children were always afraid in the classroom." Before 1996, Eunice said she employed corporal punishment frequently. Post 1996, she said she sometimes used it. Asked why she agreed with the ban but continued to use corporal punishment, Eunice said, "Some of us know how to use it responsibly. Some people just enjoy beating children." Asked if se did not fear litigation, Eunice shrugged her shoulders and said, "I suppose if it came to that I can defend myself because I don't just hit children for nothing."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Eunice said she sometimes detained offending learners but did not like doing it because "it is a waste of everybody's time."

Participant Eight – Faith

Faith was in the 41-45 age group. She held a Primary Teacher's Diploma, with 11 years' experience as an educator.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Faith was aware of the ban on corporal punishment and was neutral on the issue. She gave two sides to the issue and said on the one hand, "Children [before the banning of corporal punishment] were able to learn effectively because they knew that if they homework, they should do it or else they will be beaten. But now they don't care about their work. They only want to please their parents and not the teacher." On the other hand, Faith thought that corporal punishment did stunt the psychological growth of some learners. She said, 'You find that those who had been beaten too much would never concentrate in class and so they lost the chance to understand their lessons and that sort of thing carried on and on." Faith sometimes used corporal punishment before 1996 but stopped completely after the ban although she feels that "if you're lenient [don't use corporal punishment] some children take advantage."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Faith said she had no means of disciplining offending learners except ignoring or just talking to them about their behaviour. She lamented, "What else can we do? The Department [of Education] has abandoned us [teachers]"

Participant Nine – Caleb

Caleb was aged 31-35. He had obtained a Senior Primary Teacher's Diploma and had taught for 3 years.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Caleb was aware of the ban on corporal punishment and strongly agreed with the move. Caleb said, "According to the Bill of Rights, we must not abuse these children." He added, "And the person [educator] applying corporal punishment ends up being emotional and may seriously hurt the child." Caleb joined the teaching profession in 2001, 5 years after the banning of corporal punishment and said he had never used it since joining teaching. He cited his reason for non use of corporal punishment, the availability alternative and effective means.

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Caleb said his methods of maintaining discipline in the classroom included talking to the learner, detention, giving the offending learner a lot of work, involving parents and momentarily keeping the learner out of the classroom.

Participant Ten – Daniel

Daniel was aged between 36 to 40 years. He had obtained a Senior Primary Teacher's Diploma, a Further Education Diploma as well as a Bachelor of Education Honours Degree. He had been an educator for one year.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Daniel was aware of the ban on corporal punishment and strongly agreed with the move. He emphasised his stand point by saying, "According to the constitution of South Africa, corporal punishment is abolished. Anyone who administers it on the learner is guilty of an offence. The dignity of the learner must be protected." Daniel joined teaching in 2003, seven years after the official ban of corporal punishment and said he had never used corporal punishment because according to him, "A self-respecting teacher will respect his learners and be respected by them. So there's no need to beat up these children."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

One of Daniel's disciplinary methods was to "make the learner write the same word many times and ask the parents to sign." Asked to quantify "many times," Daniel said, "Sometimes four, sometimes five pages of the same word on each line, five or six words each line." Daniel also used detention and was quick to qualify, "Parents must know a day before that the child will be detained." He also resorted to making offending learners clean the chalkboard for a stipulated number of days. Asked if he had at some point thought of corporal punishment as an alternative, Daniel's response was, "Punishment must not cause any damage to the child, whether emotional, spiritual or bodily harm; and that's what corporal punishment does and so I don't use it."

Participant Eleven – Gladys

Gladys was within the 41-45 age range. She held a Primary School Teacher's Diploma and a B.A. Degree. She had 17 years' experience as an educator.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Gladys was aware of the ban on corporal punishment but strongly disagreed with this piece of legislation. "Without corporal punishment," she said, "there is no order, children don't listen." Gladys had used corporal punishment frequently before 1996 and had continued to use it "sometimes" post 1996. Asked why she used this method of disciplining learners, knowing that legally it was an offence, Gladys said, "It is easy to say ban corporal punishment if you're not the teacher. But when you deal with these kids daily, you realise that if you don't spank them now and again, you're in trouble."

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Amongst her repertoire of disciplinary methods Gladys mentioned detention, keeping a learner out of the classroom for a while and making the learner at fault stand on one leg in front of class with both hands raised above the head.

Participant Twelve – Helen

Helen was aged between 41 and 45. She held a Bachelor of Arts Honours Degree and a Higher Diploma in Education. She had been an educator for 10 years.

Views and Practice Regarding Corporal Punishment

Helen disagreed with the abolishment of corporal punishment and said she became aware of the ban at the time it was announced in 1996. As her reason for disagreeing with this piece of legislation, she said, "Children's behaviour has become worse. They are difficult to control and they no longer value education. Corporal punishment was at least the only measure to at least calm them down." Before 1996, Helen said she had sometimes used corporal punishment and stopped using it completely from 1996 to the day of the interview in 2004.

Alternative Methods of Disciplining Pupils

Helen said she employed detention and isolation. Regarding isolation, she clarified that the learner would be made to sit away from the rest of the class, not take part in

discussions but produce whatever written work the other pupils will be doing. As Helen pointed out, this was her version of “time out.”

4.3 Analysis of Data

The analysis of data starts by presenting a table showing the educators’ demographic details, their attitudes towards corporal punishment as well as whether they employed corporal punishment before and after the ban in 1996. Also shown are alternative disciplinary measures to corporal punishment and those perceived to be the most effective. This information is shown below:

Name	*Age*	*Qualification*	*Exp*	*Ban on CP*	*Used CP pre 1996?*	*Used CP post 1996?*	*Alternatives to Corporal Punishment*	*most effective disciplinary method*
Abigail	41-45	Primary Tr's Diploma	14 yrs	SD	Yes	No	-cleaning classroom and school premises -detention	-cleaning School premises
Barbara	41-45	B.A., Post Grad Dip in Ed.	15 yrs	SD	Yes Freq.	Yes Som.	-detention -clean classroom	-detention
Adam	46 and over	Primary Tr's Cert, Further Ed Dip and Sec Ed. Dip.	23 yrs	D	Yes Freq.	No	-cleaning toilets and classroom	-cleaning toilets
Brian	36-40	BA, Higher Ed Dip.	2 yrs	SD	-	No	-involve parents -cleaning toilets -shouting at learners	-cleaning toilets
Cecilia	41-45	BA, B Ed. Hons	9 yrs	SD	Yes Som.	Yes Som.	-detention -talk to learner	-corporal punishment
Dora	46 and over	Primary Tr's Dip, B Ed. Honours	24 yrs	D	Yes Freq.	No	-detention -rewards -cleaning	-detention
Eunice	41-45	Primary Tr's Cert.	18 yrs	SA	Yes Freq.	Yes Som.	-detention	-corporal punishment
Faith	41-45	Primary Tr's Dip.	11 yrs	N	Yes Som.	No	-ignoring learner -talk to learner	-ignoring learner
Caleb	31-35	Senior Primary Tr's Dip.	3 yrs	SA	-	No	-detention -talk to learner -involving parents -bar from class	-involving parents
Daniel	36-40	Snr Pr Tr's Cert, Further Ed. Dip., B Ed.	1 yr	SA	-	No	-writing words repeatedly -clean board	-writing words repeatedly
Gladys	41-45	Primary Tr's Dip, B.A.	17 yrs	SD	Yes Freq.	Yes Som.	-physical workouts -exclude learner -detention	-corporal punishment
Helen	41-45	BA Honours, Higher Dip Ed.	10 years	D	Yes Som.	No	-detention -isolation	-detention

Table 4a: Educators' demographic details, attitudes towards corporal punishment and disciplinary methods used.

Key for Table 4a:
Tr's = Teacher's
Som. = sometimes
Freq. =Frequently
A = Agree
SA = Strongly Agree
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

4.3.1 Sex and Age

From the information above, 8 of the educators were female and 4 male. This reflected the general sex distribution in the school in which female educators account for more than two-thirds of the total number of educators. The ages of the educators ranged from 31 to 46 years and over. In the 31-35 age category, there was only 1 educator, Caleb. In the 36-40 age group there were 2 educators, Brian and Daniel. With the exception of the one male participant in the 46 and over category, it can be said that the male teachers were generally younger than their female counterparts. The 41-45 age group had the most educators, 5 out of 12 and they were all female. The last group, the 46 and over category, had 4 educators, one male and three females. Thus with regard to sex and age, the sample was varied.

4.3.2 Education Levels and Professional Qualifications

With regard to levels of education, all the educators had satisfied the demands of the South African Schools Act of 1996 which stipulates that the minimum level of high school education before tertiary training is Grade 12. All of the 12 educators had obtained professional qualifications. In other words, all of them held professional qualifications as educators. Four of the twelve educators, or a third, had obtained either a Primary Teacher's Diploma or Certificate without further training. Three of them were females, all in the 41-45 age group. The sole male in this category was aged between 31 and 35. The remaining 8 educators had furthered their education, obtaining a higher diploma in education and or a degree in education. Regarding levels of education and professional qualifications, it can be said that this was a highly qualified and impressive sample of qualified teachers with diverse first and further education qualifications.

4.3.3 Period of Service

The twelve educators had an average teaching experience of just over twelve years. However, the average masks the wide discrepancies in the educators' teaching experience. The educator with the most experience had taught for 24 years whereas the one with the least experience had taught for only a year. A further breakdown reveals that 4 of the educators had less than 10 years' experience whilst half of the sample (6) had been teaching for between 10 and 20 years. Two had taught for twenty years and above. One expects to see a diverse range regarding the understanding of corporal punishment across generations and teaching experience.

Generally, one would expect the long serving members to be more familiar with disciplinary issues in the classroom although it does not follow that they will consequently exhibit progressive notions and practices regarding corporal punishment. Similarly, it would not be correct to expect the youngest educators, by virtue of their more recent training to be thoroughly conversant with issues relating to corporal punishment. This point is underscored by Wragg (2001) who further adds that in any investigation involving individuals, personal traits may override training. It is therefore, to the educators' attitudes towards corporal punishment as well as their disciplinary practices that this project now turns.

4.3.4 Educators' Attitudes towards Corporal Punishment: Intersection(s) of Age, Gender and Teaching Experience

Of the twelve educators in the study, 8 or three quarters of the sample did not approve of the abolishment of corporal punishment. Five strongly disagreed whilst three disagreed. This attitude was spread across three age ranges; 36-40, 41-45 and 46 and over. The excepted age range was 31-35. In this group of educators who disagreed with the banning of corporal punishment, 1 was in the 36-40 age group, 5 in the 41-45 and 2 in the 46 and over. This sentiment was spread across sex as well given that six were female and two were male educators. The educators in this category also had varied teaching experience between 2 and 24 years. Similarly, educators' levels of education were varied in this group. In this respect it is difficult to draw a conclusion on this sentiment based on age, sex, level of education or teaching experience.

Nonetheless, one can tentatively draw a conclusion based on the one participant, Caleb, in the 31-35 category who did not approve of corporal punishment. Being the youngest, one can suggest that Caleb's strong agreement with the abolishment of corporal punishment suggests that a younger generation of teachers understands and appreciates this piece of legislation. Further proof for this claim, albeit still a tentative one, is that Caleb cites the Bill of Human Rights as his reason for not using corporal punishment

Of the 4 remaining educators, 3 strongly agreed with the abolishment of corporal punishment whilst 1 was neutral. Of those who strongly agreed, 2 were male and 1 was female. In a sense this debunks the myth that male educators are prone to use corporal punishment compared to female educators. Capel, Leask & Turner (1995) comment that there is a general belief that male teachers are more likely to mete out corporal punishment than their female counterparts.

What was striking though amongst these three teachers is the difference in their teaching experience. Eunice had taught for 18 years, Caleb 3 and Daniel just over a year. The teachers in this category were spread across three of the four age groups used in the study. They were evenly distributed across both sexes, with 2 males and two females. Teaching experience was also varied in this group but not so the educational qualifications. It was instructive to note that although Eunice strongly agreed with the ban on corporal punishment, she continued to use it. This could mean that this disciplinary practice had become habitual. As Rogers (2007) points out, it is not easy for all undesirable practices to die out in any profession. Eunice insisted that although corporal punishment was prone to abuse, she and a few other "level-headed" educators could use it "appropriately." Caleb and Daniel on the other hand, found it relatively easy not to use corporal punishment because they had just joined the service and as Caleb emphasised, "During our training, we were constantly told that it t was wrong to use corporal punishment and that we will get into trouble if we use it." Thus, it would appear that there is a generation of educators who trained post 1996 who have internalized the fact that they cannot use corporal punishment whereas on the other hand, there is/are generations that trained pre 1996 that still struggle to drop corporal punishment altogether because they practised it for a long time and during their training there was no emphasis on the no desirability of corporal punishment.

Generally though, there are no indisputably clear links between an educators' attitude towards corporal punishment and factors such as age, sex, level of education or teaching experience.

4.3.5 Educators' Disciplinary Practices

Educators' disciplinary practices are divided into two broad categories – disciplinary measures that do not involve physical force or corporal punishment and those that do. Each one of these broad categories is further sub-divided into themes that reflect preferred actual means of disciplining pupils.

a). Discipline Without Using Physical Force/ Corporal Punishment

Form of Punishment One: Cleaning

Abigail, Adam, Brian, Dora and Daniel made offending learners clean certain areas of the school. Abigail made the learners clean the classroom and school premises because she felt "it was for the general good of the school" because this led to a "clean environment." Adam made the learners clean the classroom and sometimes toilets because he could not think of any other effective method to use. He said he reserved the cleaning of toilets for relatively serious offences like bullying or swearing or for habitual offenders. Brian made the learners clean the toilets for any kind of offence so they "they won't do it again." He said that the cleaning of toilets was a dreaded punishment because it carried a stigma and none of the pupils wanted to be laughed at as a toilet cleaner. Dora said she made the learners clean the classroom and that helps in keeping the classroom "always smart." Daniel made the learners clean the chalk board because, in his words, "It is not a nice thing to do, if you think of the dust."

The preference for this kind of discipline cannot be attributed to sex seeing that is was chosen by both male and female educators. It is also used by those with longer teaching experience, for example, 23 years in Adam's case and 24 in Dora's as well as those little experience in comparison, Brian with two years' experience and Daniel with one. The teachers who used this method had diverse educational qualifications as well. One cannot draw a clear conclusion on the preference or use of this disciplinary method based on sex, age, teaching experience and educational qualifications.

Form of Punishment Two: Detention

Eight out of the 12 educators, or three quarters, used detention as a disciplinary measure. These were Abigail, Barbara, Cecilia, Dora, Eunice, Caleb, Gladys and Helen. What also emerged from this theme is that it is a form of discipline preferred by female teachers, in this case 7 out of 8 teachers. The 41-45 age group dominated, making up 6 of the 8 educators in this category, suggesting a generational influence. It was interesting to note that Cecilia was the only educator who detained errant pupils and helped them with their home work. It is a peculiar form of discipline in that wrong-doing is countered by something that is positive, begging he question whether the help the pupil receives will be regarded by the pupil as punishment or not.

Form of Punishment Three: Ignoring misbehaving Pupil

Faith was the only educator who said she ignored pupils who were misbehaving either as a way of discouraging that behaviour or resignation to uncontrollable learners. Asked if misbehaviour did not escalate as a result of ignoring both errant behaviour and learner, Faith responded, "It may but it calms down eventually." Faith was adamant that most of the time, this approach worked and if it didn't, she asked, somewhat resignedly, "Well, what can you do?" Faith had been an educator for eleven years and she was the only participant who was neutral on the banning of corporal punishment. "Either way," she said, "you have problems." One tends to feel that Faith needs to be more proactive than reactive.

Form of Punishment Four: Involving Parents

Brian and Caleb are the only educators who sometimes sought a mutual parent-teacher solution in the case of a pupil who was proving to be a serial offender. Brian and Caleb had taught for 2 and 3 years and aged between 36 and 40 and 31 and 35 respectively. Whereas Brian had a first teaching qualification and a degree, Caleb only had a first teaching qualification. It is interesting to note that these two teachers were amongst the least experienced and both were male. Both teachers regarded parental involvement as an effective disciplinary solution. It is difficult to say whether this was in recognition of the pivotal role that parents play in a child's discipline or a case of inexperience with regard to dealing successfully with pupil ill-discipline. At

the same time, this situation dispels some myths that male educators do not prefer dialogue when it comes to disciplinary issues.

Form of Punishment Five: Verbal Reprimand

Brian said that he sometimes "shouted" at the pupils to maintain order. As indicated above, Brian had little teaching experience, suggesting that he might learn to employ other subtle methods as time went by

Form of Punishment Six: **Barring Learners from entering the classroom or sending them out of the classroom**

Caleb and Gladys are the only two educators who said that they sent offending learners out of the classroom or barred them from entering the classroom. Caleb had taught for 3 years and Gladys for 17. It would appear that this is a form of discipline practised by educators irrespective of sex, age and teaching experience.

Form of Punishment Seven: Isolation:

Helen was the only educator who isolated misbehaving pupils by making them sit on their own at the back of the classroom and telling them not to participate in class discussions but to do whatever written work was required. Thus isolation was not a common means of maintaining discipline.

Disciplinary Measure 8: Counselling/Talking to the learner:

Cecilia and Caleb employed this method. Apart from the obvious difference in sex, Cecilia had taught for six years longer than Caleb and was roughly ten years older, yet they both employed the intervention of talking to pupils in an attempt to understand undesirable behaviour. The other difference is that Cecilia did use corporal punishment whereas Caleb did not. This situation warns against a schematic approach in analysing disciplinary measures employed by teachers. The temptation might be to think that teachers who use corporal punishment are the least likely to engage their learners on a one-to-one chat to find out the root causes of the pupil's errant behaviour. Cecilia, in spite of her use of corporal punishment comes across as a sensitive educator especially when we consider that her detention involves supervising homework that was not done as and that she also gives positions of responsibility to learners prone to truancy in a bid to stop that practice. On top of this, the fact that the two educators who employ this method are of different sexes shows

that male educators are sensitive to the possibility that sometimes the best way of eliminating undesirable behaviour is through sensitive dialogue with the pupil concerned.

b). Discipline Using Physical Force/ Corporal Punishment.

One: Physical Assault

Barbara, Cecilia, Eunice and Gladys indicated that they still used corporal punishment in spite of their knowledge that it had been banned in 1996. Barbara said that she belted the pupils on their palms, Cecilia's form of punishment was giving "one or two lashes on their bottoms"; Eunice said she made the learners hold the fingers of one hand together and struck the bunched fingers with the edge of a ruler once, and Gladys said she gave offending learners "a few lashes with a stick on their backsides." These educators used corporal punishment in the classical sense of that word which refers to "any punishment inflicted on the body meant to cause physical pain" (Scarre, 2003, p.297). The common anatomical target was the buttocks, which has been common with educators for hundreds of years (Porteus, 2001).

What is apparent here is that all these are female educators and all of them in the 41-45 age range. With the exception of Cecilia, the other three educators had taught for more than ten years. Cecilia was one year short of ten years. This suggests that female teachers, especially those in the age group 41-45 at the school of study, were more prone to use corporal punishment than their male counterparts. Perhaps female teachers feel that if they do not demonstrate sternness, they will have a lot of disciplinary problems. Asked why she still practised corporal punishment, one of Gladys's answers was, "You have to sometimes show the children that you're not their aunty or grandmother because they tend to be more mischievous if they are taught by a woman than when they have a man." Perhaps sex is not the main factor here. It could be habit and personal belief on the efficacy of corporal punishment. One notices, for example, that the MEC for education in Kwazulu-Natal, Eileen kaNkosi Shandu, who had been an educator for 28 years, caused concern with her "outspoken support for corporal punishment" in when 1999 (http://www.teacher.co.za/9903/cane.html). Corporal punishment has been on the decline and most scholars of education argue that it is preferred because it is an

instant corrective measure (Porter, 2004). As Middleton (2008, p.253) observes, over the years, "Corporal punishment was a quick and effective, and thus desirable, form of motivation. As one school board inspector cynically remarked, teachers found it 'the simplest way out of their difficulties.'"

There has been a change in the discourse on corporal punishment. Educational psychologists argue that it has pernicious effects such as lowering the learner's self-esteem and that it inculcates a culture of violence (Rogers, 2007). The United Nations has described it as "counterproductive and relatively ineffective" (Ravet, 2007, p.9). However, educators' practices seem to take a bit longer to change. In fact, one cannot guarantee that the 8 educators who said they had not used corporal punishment post 1996 were telling the truth.

Two: Deliberately Denying Learners Food at Lunch or Break Time as part of Detention

Although the most accepted and used sense of corporal punishment refers to direct assault, there are also situations which "involve the imposition of painful or uncomfortable conditions rather than direct assaults" and these include , "depriving the subject of sleep, food or shelter, or making him or her carry heavy loads" (Scarre, 2003, p.295). These conditions are examples of the broader definition of corporal punishment which is, "any punishment inflicted on the body meant to cause physical pain, discomfort or injury" (Scarre, 2003 p.297).

With regard to this study, 8 educators – Abigail, Barbara, Cecilia, Dora, Eunice, Caleb, Gladys and Helen indicated that they use break time and lunch detention. There was only one male in this group, suggesting that detention is preferred by female teachers. Asked why they chose those times, all eight were unanimous that there was no other time available. Further questioning revealed that only Cecilia and Caleb allowed the detained learners to eat during detention. Gladys said she "sometimes" let the learners eat. Asked why they did not let the learners eat during detention, there seemed to be a general consensus amongst those in this group that letting the learner eat would not constitute "punishment" enough.

Porter (2004) is of the opinion that detention should be well planned and supervised, and should not involve denying the detained learners food or use of ablution facilities should they need them. The same scholar also advises that the parents of pupils to be detained should know in advance so that they make the necessary arrangements with regard to travel, amongst a host of other issues. Roger (2007, p.44) writes that detention should "not evoke ancient prisons" but should be an "amenable space for work." Caleb, it would appear was more knowledgeable about lunch detention than other educators for he indicated that he took the trouble to inform the parents of learners o be detained prior to the detention. Canter (2001) suggests that learners be detained on weekends. Given the poor remuneration of teachers in most South African schools, this suggestion does not seem feasible.

Three: Physical Workouts

Gladys was the only educator who gave pupils physical workouts. She mostly made offending learners stand in front of the class on one leg with raised hands until the learners got tired. Gladys said the pain "teaches them a lesson." Whilst some scholars are of the opinion that physical workouts should be administered, others think that this form of implementing discipline, just like caning, is open to abuse and demeans the learner (Rogers 2007). From this sample, it was not a popular method.

4.3.6 Educators' Choices of Different Methods of Discipline for Specific Misbehaviour

The following information table matches methods of discipline against offences committed by pupils and also shows which educators prefer what disciplinary action for what offence.

Educator	*Lateness*	*Disruptive Classroom Behaviour*	*Homework not Done*	*Bullying*	*Using Foul Language*
Abigail	-pick up litter	-detention	-clean classroom	-clean toilets	-detention
Barbara	-pick up litter	-clean classroom	-detention	-Corporal punishment	Corporal punishment
Adam	-clean classroom	-clean classroom	-clean toilets	-clean toilets	-clean toilets
Brian	-clean classroom	-clean toilet -shout at learners	-involve parents	-clean toilets -involve parents	-clean toilets
Cecilia	-talk to learner	-verbal reprimand	-detention -talk to learner -corporal punishment	- detention	-detention -talk to learner -corporal punishment
Dora	-pick up litter	-pick up litter	-detention	-detention	-detention
Eunice	-detention	-detention	-corporal punishment	-corporal punishment	-corporal punishment
Faith	-encourage pupil to be early	-ignore	-talk to learner	-talk to learner	-talk to learner
Caleb	-talk to learner	-detention	-involve parents -detention	-involve parents	-bar learner from class -involve parents
Daniel	-clean chalkboard	-clean chalkboard	-write words/lines repeatedly	-write words/lines repeatedly	-write words/lines repeatedly
Gladys	-exclude learner briefly	-detention	-detention -physical workout -corporal punishment	-physical workout	-corporal punishment
Helen	-detention	-isolation	-detention	-detention	-detention

Table 4b: Educators' Choices of Different Methods of Discipline for Specific Misbehaviour

Table 4b above shows disciplinary methods used by educators for common learner offences which are lateness, disruptive classroom behaviour, unwritten homework, bullying and using foul language or swearing. At a glance, the table reveals the disparity amongst the educators with regard to the methods of discipline employed for the same offence. For example, for lateness, the methods stretch from talking to the learner through cleaning the classroom or the chalkboard to detention. Similarly, some educators mete out different punishments for the same offence. For example, for homework that has not been done, Gladys uses, amongst her disciplinary methods, physical workouts, detention and sometimes corporal punishment. Asked about this

situation, Gladys said each case had its extenuating circumstances and added, “There are some kids who do the same thing over and over until you get to a point where you need to spank them.” Some educators on the other hand, Faith and Helen for example, tend to rely on the same disciplinary method for a variety of offences.

Some of the methods that teachers used, such as sending learners out of the classroom or barring them from entering the classroom when they are late are very wrong, according to scholars of education. Ravet (2007) for example, underscores that there should never be any moment that an educator, for any reason whatsoever, excludes the learner from the classroom. Rogers (2007, p.62) makes a similar and comments, “In any case, the whole point of attending school is to learn, and how will pupils learn if they are not in the classroom?”

The information above raises the following questions:
Does the punishment method or method of discipline match the offence? Is the meting out of punishment always logical? Is there a guide for meting out punishment/discipline? What do experts say about corporal punishment/discipline?

From the data above, it appears there is no order in implementing discipline in the school under study. It would appear that educators seem not to give a lot of thought to the way they instil discipline. It would also appear that they do not have a uniform way of instilling discipline. Bullying was regarded by educators as more serious than late coming but learners who committed these two different offences were in some instances given the same punishment – detention. Similarly there is no logic in a situation where a learner charged with bullying can in one extreme case, get a beating and on the other extreme, be talked to

4.3.7 Disciplinary Measures Considered to be Effective

Detention and corporal punishment emerged as the two disciplinary measures that educators felt were the most effective in terms of maintaining discipline. Four educators singled out detention and they were Abigail, Barbara, Dora and Helen. Three educators were of the opinion that no disciplinary measure was better than corporal punishment. They were Cecilia, Eunice and Gladys. Behind corporal punishment was the cleaning of toilets. Adam and Brian were of the opinion that this

was an effective disciplinary method. Involving parents, writing lines and ignoring learners were cited by Caleb, Daniel and Faith respectively, as the most effective disciplinary measures. It is difficult here to make a generalization based on age, sex, and educational qualifications.

4.3.8 Educators' Need for Training in the Maintenance of Discipline in Schools

The 12 educators from an urban public school were interviewed regarding the need for training in order to effectively maintain discipline at school. Out of 12 educators, 10 agreed that there was a need for educators to be trained in this area. One educator said there is no need for training whereas the remaining educator was neutral. She did not think either way would help solve disciplinary problems in schools.

The educators' detailed responses were as follows:

Abigail

She indicated the need for further training regarding the maintenance of discipline in the classroom. She cited the need for a uniform and effective strategy instead of individual approaches which may confuse children. Abigail also lamented what she felt was a lack of response from the government saying that the government did not equip teachers with ways and means of maintaining discipline and yet expected pupils to get good results in a learning environment characterised by pupil indiscipline.

Barbara

She also said she needed training in maintaining discipline because "each day you meet new challenges."

Adam

He also cited the need for training or a refresher course since so much had changed in social life, resulting in changed behaviours and expectations from children as well. He also felt that training would make it possible to give fair disciplinary measures that suit offences committed by pupils.

Brian

He was also of the opinion that there was a need to train in the implementation of classroom discipline. He said corporal punishment was abolished but teachers were

not given alternatives to keep order in schools. He further said that educators were working on assumptions and personal perceptions regarding disciplinary issues in schools and this sometimes caused a lot of frustration.

Cecilia

She was of the opinion that she did not need training in order to effectively maintain discipline. Cecilia was of the opinion that methods of maintaining discipline were as varied as the characters of teachers and as such, each educator should work out what worked for him/her.

Dora

She indicated a need for training. Eunice also cited an urgent need for the Department of Education to come up with clear and predictable punishment methods because, according to her, pupils were getting more and more out of hand. She also suggested that parents may also need some training regarding the behaviour of their children.

Eunice

She said further training in the area of classroom discipline was needed. She was of the opinion that since the abolishment of corporal punishment a lot of educators felt very frustrated since they were not so sure about which disciplinary measures to apply. She said that detention and making learners clean the school premises were not effective methods of discipline. She recommended that the Department of Education should conduct workshops to educate the educators on other possible measures of maintaining discipline effectively.

Faith

She cited a need for training. She was in the 41-45 age She said there was a need for training because teachers were confused about which disciplinary measures to use for what offence.

Caleb

He said teachers need training because most find it difficult to abandon corporal punishment and hence tend not to be keen on exploring other or new methods of

discipline. New or other methods of disciplining pupils, he added, are normally regarded as impractical.

Daniel

Daniel was undecided. He said teachers needed to consult the SACE booklet which stipulates what educators can and cannot do in the name of discipline. He also felt that educators should also carefully read the South African School's Act. According to him, the most important issue was to develop a love/working relationship with learners. He was also of the opinion that if an educator is disciplined in his/her practice, his/her class will be a disciplined one.

Gladys

She said she needed training on maintaining discipline. Gladys reiterated the necessity to put in place other disciplinary measures since the government had abolished corporal punishment.

Helen

She said there was a need for training especially because most of the children's bad behaviour had become quite extreme and most of it was rooted in the children's background such as abusive or insecure family lives. She felt that educators needed to be trained on how to handle such circumstances.

Given that the overwhelming majority of educators who cited a need for training in the implementation of discipline had taught for long periods such as 23 years, this could indicate that their classroom practice has been overtaken by societal and policy developments. In fact, this tends to happen a lot and has been happening faster since the new millennium (Ravet, 2007). What is positive is that most of the educators admit that their disciplinary practices need revisiting. Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) make the crucial point that teacher training is a continuous exercise if teachers are to be relevant and effective. These scholars cite, in the case of financial and time constraints, in-service training, which involves training a few educators per school who will in turn return to train others on any issue, discipline involved. One tends to identify with the frustration that most teachers talk about. It could be that some of the teachers have a point in stating that the Department of Education abandoned teachers when the Department banned corporal punishment but did not

follow up this move with relevant workshops or courses for those who trained and started practicing before the abolishment of corporal punishment.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to identify, discuss and interpret the attitude of educators who took part in the study, towards the abolition of corporal punishment as well as methods they used to maintain discipline in schools.

The research sample comprised 8 female and 4 female educators. The participants had varied ages, with an age difference of at most, 25 years. Teaching experience was also varied with the maximum difference of 23 years. Educators' qualifications were also diverse with all having obtained at least a teaching diploma. Four had teaching diplomas while the remaining 8 had university degrees at various levels.

5.2 Findings

Of the 12 educators who took part in the study, 8 or three quarters of the sample disapproved of the ban on corporal punishment, 5 of them strongly. This group was spread across sex, educational levels and teaching experience to a point where it was difficult, if not impossible to draw a conclusion on the characteristics of educators who disapproved of corporal punishment. The educators cited, as their reasons for lamenting the suspension of corporal punishment, declining standards of academic achievement as well as discipline. The linking of these two problems to the banning of corporal punishment suggested that the teachers regarded corporal punishment as an effective disciplinary measure as well as motivational tool. The educators who preferred the use of corporal punishment or its retention were of the opinion that learners would neither show them respect nor develop the discipline to work hard unless they were beaten or threatened with being beaten. They pointed out that corporal punishment is a method that is quick and not time consuming or costly to administer. This is in contrast to the opinion of the literature in Chapter Two which points at the fact that education as well as legislative and legal reforms outlaw and are keen to end corporal punishment world wide.

It also became clear that those educators who had used corporal punishment prior 1996 were likely to want to continue using it. About two-thirds of them disputed that corporal punishment encourages aggression in the learners. This is in contrast with the literature which held the opinion that corporal punishment can result in learners perceiving violence as desirable and reproduce it in other contexts.

Whereas some thought about it, some continued to mete out corporal punishment, thereby violating the Schools Act of 1996. However, two of the educators who disapproved of the ban on corporal punishment cited how in the hands of some irresponsible teachers, corporal punishment can be abused. One educator was neutral on this issue.

The three who agreed with the ban were also spread with regard to sex, teaching experience and educational level making it impossible to generalise on the kind of teacher who supported the ban on corporal punishment. They believed that the use of corporal punishment causes a lot of tension and fear and learners do not participate freely in the classroom. They also felt that through administration of corporal punishment, educators were not modeling good behavior. Some called it a violation of human rights. Two were male and one was female, challenging the myth that more male than female educators are likely to use corporal punishment. Significantly as well, the youngest participant was in this group, suggesting that a new crop of educators who themselves might have attended school after the ban on corporal punishment have fresh views about corporal punishment. It could very well be that an educator's schooling and training period are key variables. Those who went to school when corporal punishment was regarded as necessary and used it after their training might be set in their ways. The difficulty would be how to change their perception first, and second, their practice given that change of ay kind is threatening and can destabilize an individual.

This research revealed that corporal punishment is still practiced at the school under study. Four of the educators admitted to continued use of corporal punishment after its ban in 1996 and qualified their use as significantly less than pre 1996. What was interesting is that the four were all female and all aged 41-45. There is a possibility

that this is a manifestation of generational behaviour. It is difficult though to generalise and conclude that female teachers are more prone than their male counterparts to use corporal punishment given that females made up two-thirds of the sample. Of the four educators who still used corporal punishment post 1996, three had taught for at least 15 years each. The one educator had taught for nine years. A conclusion can be drawn that those who had taught for long periods of time and used corporal punishment frequently pre 1996 were prone to continue using it although to a lesser degree. Some of the educators who had served for periods longer than 15 years in the teaching field and did not use corporal punishment, cited as their reason, impending retirement and their desire not to face litigation just before they retire.

Alternative means of maintaining discipline apart from corporal punishment included making the pupils clean the classroom and/or toilets, as well as detention, isolation, ignoring the offending learners, barring the learner from class, making the learner write lines repeatedly, making the learner clean the chalkboard, shouting at the learners, giving the learners physical workouts, involving parents and talking to the offending learner. The most common and preferred alternative means of maintaining discipline was detention. The educators indicated that learners found it “painful” and so the educators were prepared to administer it even though it did inconvenience them as well through the time they spent supervising the learners during detention.

What clearly emerged from the administering of punishment methods is that this was done in a haphazard manner. There were huge disparities of the methods employed by different educators on the same offence, suggesting that there was no code that was followed. This could be confusing to learners. The same offence could have five different methods of punishment, with varying degrees of time and effort. It was interesting to note that only two educators cited good and preventative classroom management skills as important in curbing disruptive classroom behaviour. This points to a need to focus on this area in educator training or possible refresher courses.

Generally, educators felt frustrated, demotivated, disillusioned and powerless in the face of deteriorating standards of pupil behaviour. According to more that three-quarters of them, the government scraped corporal punishment, which the educators regarded as effective in motivating and disciplining learners, but did not replace

corporal punishment with another effective measure. Hence ten of the twelve participants cited a need for further training or refresher courses in maintaining discipline. This reinforced the teacher's feelings of abandonment by the Ministry of education. This is clear indication that there is a critical need for equipping or training of educators on alternative methods of discipline.

CHAPTER SIX

6.1 Introduction

This section presents and summarises implications, limitations, conclusions and recommendations from the findings.

6.2 Delimitation and Limitations of Study

Locke, Spirduso & Silverman (1987, p.1) write that delimitation "literally means to define the limits inherent in the use of a particular construct or population." This study limited itself to 12 educators in one primary school. Limitations were noted in that the educators come from one school in Gauteng, a government school too. The opinions given by the 12 educators might not be representative of the views and situations obtaining at other government schools in other provinces as well as in private schools.

6.3 Recommendations

In light of the fact that 10 out of the 12 educators in this study indicated that the would like to receive some training in implementing other forms of maintaining discipline other than corporal punishment, there is a need for schools to revisit their codes of conduct. This should be accompanied by wide-ranging discussions on alternative methods of instilling discipline. This can be coupled with in-house courses on maintaining discipline. Such a platform will ensure uniformity and fairness in the punishment of pupils. It is also likely to help teachers avoid litigation and pupils will not be exposed to character and academic damaging punishment.

6.4 Conclusion

The importance of effective alternative methods to corporal punishment, as seen through this research, cannot be overemphasized in education. In implementing

methods of discipline, the accessibility of resources (training) and facilities in schools must be kept in mind. The Department of education and administrators have the responsibility to help educators benefit from the services of the available resources and to interpret and clarify the type and methods that are available for use.

Educators who do not have competence to meet all the needs of the learners must be constantly sent for training opportunities to other institutions to achieve skills in alternative methods of discipline. Alternative methods of discipline in schools must be looked at in order to have a composite picture of a good discipline system. The Department of education, community leaders and school governing bodies should take a leadership role in working with educators to make schools environmentally friendly to learners' needs without using corporal punishment. In doing this, the potential of training to improve discipline in South African schools will be nearer fulfillment.

References

Asmal, K. (2000). *Response to the Discipline Dilemma*. Report presented to members of parliament, South Africa. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Ball, G. (1989). *Talking and Learning: Primary Maths for the National Curriculum.* Hemel Hempsted, Herts: Heinemann.

Blum, P. (2001*). A Teacher's Guide to Anger Management*. London; New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *1* (3), 77-101.

Brown, A. R., and Avery, C. (1974) *Modifying Children's Behavior* (1st Ed) London: Sage.

Capel, S., Leask, M., & Turner, T. (1995). *Learning to Teach in the Secondary School.* London: Routledge.

Canter, L. (2001). *Assertive Discipline: Positive Behaviour Management for Today's Classroom.* Los Angeles, CA: Canter and Associates.

Cohen, S. (1996). Teachers' and Pupils' attitudes and practices regarding the abolishment of corporal punishment in schools in the Gauteng area. Unpublished Masters thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Chikoko, B., and Mhloyi, K. (1995) *Introduction to Educational Research Methods.* Harare: Centre for Distance Education.

Chisholm, L., Motala, S., & Vally, S. (Eds). (2003). Introduction. In Chisholm, L., Motala, S., & Vally, S. (Eds.). *South African Education Policy Review*, 1993-2000 (pp 1-8). Sandown: Heinemann.

Chuene, S. Premier Wants the Cane Back, *Daily Sun*, 22 March 2004.

Dapper, D.R. & Dingus, A.E.M. (2008). Corporal Punishment in US Public Schools: A Continuing Challenge for School Social Workers. *Children and Schools*, *30* (4), 243-258.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World: What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Dembo, M.H. (1994). *Applying Educational Psychology* (5th edition). New York: Longman.

Department of Education. (2000) *Alternatives to Corporal Punishment* (1st Edition). Pretoria: Government Printers.

Dodge, K.A., and Bates, J.E. (1999). Reactive and Proactive Aggression in School Children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *106*, (1), 37-51.

Engelbrecht, O. (2004.). Minister Throws Cane Out of Window. *East London Daily Dispatch*, 9 June 2004.

Greenstein, R., Roberts, B., & Sitas, A. (2003). *Research Methods Manual*. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press.

Haigh, G. (1990). *Managing Classroom Problems in the Primary School*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing Ltd.

Harrisunker, N. (1998) The Perceptions of Teachers, Pupils, and Parents regarding Discipline in Newly-Integrated Lenasia Schools. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Harrop, A. (1983) *Behaviour Modification in the Classroom* (1st Ed.). British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data.

Jensen, K. B. (Ed.). (2002) The qualitative research process. In Jensen, K. B. *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies* (pp248-262). London: Routledge.

Kasambira, K. P. (1993). *Lesson Planning and Class Management*. Harlow: Longman Group.

Kumalo, M. (2001). Discipline in Soweto High Schools: Survey of Educators, Managers, Parents and Learners' Attitudes Towards Discipline. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Kozloff, M.A. (1974). *Educating Children with Learning and Behavior Problems*. New York: Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication

Lancaster, Y. (ed.) (2003). *Listening to Young Children*. California: Open University Press.

Locke, F.L., Spirduso, W.W., & Silverman, S.J. (1987). *Proposals that Work. A Guide for Planning Dissertations and Grant Proposals*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lofland, J., & Lofland, L.H. (1995). *Analysing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: Sage.

Makhulumo, A. (1997). Punishment Gone Too Far, *Daily News*, 18 April 1997.

Mathanda, A. (2007). "Are Schools Safe for Children?", *Sowetan*, Monday March 12, 2007.

Mather, N., & Goldstein, S. (2001). *Learning Disabilities and Challenging Behaviours: A Guide to Intervention and Classroom Management.* Baltimore Md: P.H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Maxwell, J.A. (1998). Designing a qualitative study. In L. Bickman & D.J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 69-1000). California: Sage Publications.

Merriam, B.S. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis.* New York: Jossey-Bass.

Middleton, J. (2008). The Experience of Corporal Punishment in Schools, 1890-1940. *History of Education*, *37*, (2), 253-275.

Mishler, E.G. (1986). *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morrell, R. (2001). Corporal punishment in South African schools: a neglected explanation for its persistence. *South African Journal of Education*, *21,* (4), 292 – 299.

Monyooe, A. (1986) A Study of Corporal Punishment and its Effects on Learning at Secondary and High Schools in Lesotho. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Murimba, S., & Moyo, G. (1995). *Guidelines to Research*. Gweru: Mambo Press.

Mutshushu, E. (2000) Discipline as an Aspect of Learner Development: Implication for Whole School Development. Unpublished master's thesis, Rand Afrikaans University.

Neuman, W.L. (2000). (4th ed.). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Newell, C. A. (1978). *Human Behaviour in Educational Administration*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Parker-Jenkins, M. (1992). *Sparing the Rod: Schools, Discipline and Children's Rights.* London: Trentham Books.

Payet, J.P. & Franchi, V. (2008). The Rights of the Child and 'the Good of the Learners': A Comparative ethnological Survey on the Abolition of Corporal Punishment in South African Schools. *Childhood*, *15*, 157-176

Peters, M. (1998). Teacher Faces GBH Charge, *Eastern Province Herald*, 1 April 1998.

Porter, L. (2004). *Behaviour in Schools: Theory and Practice for Teachers.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Porteus, K., Vally, S. & Ruth, T. (2001). *Alternatives to Corporal Punishment: Growing Discipline and Respect in our Classrooms*. Sandown: Heinemann.

Ravet, J. (2007). *Are We Listening? : Making Sense of Classroom Behaviour with Pupils and Parents*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.

Robinson, D. H., Funk, D. C., Beth, A. & Bush, A.M. (2005). Changing Beliefs about Corporal Punishment: Increasing Knowledge about Ineffectiveness to Build More Consistent Moral and Informational Beliefs. *Journal of Behavioural Education, 14*, (2), 117-139

Rogers, B. (2007). *Behaviour Management: A Whole-School Approach*. Harlow: Longman.

Rosen, R. (1997) *School Discipline Best Practices for Administrators*. London: Corwin.

Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2004) (2nd Ed). *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data.* London: Sage.

Scarre, G. (2003). Corporal Punishment. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, *6* (3), 295-316.

Season, (2005) *Ending Corporal Punishment of Children in South Africa*. (1st Edition) Pretoria: Butterworth.

Sihlangu M, M. (1992) A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Towards Corporal Punishment In Black Rural Primary Schools. Unpublished master's thesis, University of the Witwatersrand.

Squelch, J.M. (2000) *Eight Keys to Effective School Management in South Africa* (2nd ed.). Halfway House: Southern Book Publishers.

Tafa, E.M. (2002). Corporal Punishment: The Brutal Face of Botswana's Authoritarian School.) *Educational Review*, 54, (1), 234-255

Trochim, M. (1984). *Research Design for Program Evaluation: The Regression-discontinuity Approach.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Vally, S. (2005). *Corporal Punishment and Bullying*: *The Rights of Learners.* Johannesburg: ERP.

Wagner, R. B. (1989). *Accountability in Education: A Philosophical Enquiry*. New York: Routledge.

Watkins, C., &Wagner P. (2000). *Improving School Behaviour*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Wragg, E. C. (2001). *Class Management in the Primary School*. London: Routledge/Falmer.

Vally, S. (1998). Education Policy and Implementation Developments. In *Wits EPU Quarterly Review of Education and Training in South Africa*, *5*, (3), 56-72.

Appendix 1: Letter from Gauteng District Office



UMnyango WezeMfundo
Department of Education

Lefapha la Thuto
Departement van Onderwys

Enquiries: Cynthia Mabasa (011-983-2000)

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

SUBJECT: Permission to allow ms. N. Molepo to conduct research at Motheo Foundation Primary School for her degree of Master of Arts (Education).

Dear Supervisor

This is to certify that Nono Molepo has been granted permission to conduct research at the above-mentioned school in district 11.

Her topic for the research is " Beyond Corporal Punishment: Teachers' Perceptions and Suggested Alternatives to the Abolishment of Corporal Punishment in South African Schools.

We wish her well in her studies and hope that she will give us feedback on her research findings.

Yours faithfully

Miranda Zwane(Mrs.)
IDSO

Appendix 2: Letter to Headmaster of Participating School.

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Nono Molepo and I am carrying out a study on teacher's perceptions regarding the abolition of corporal punishment at schools and what strategies they employ in place of corporal punishment. The study is part of my course work towards a Masters Degree in Education at the University of the Witwatersrand. To this end, I would be most grateful if you could please grant me permission to select and interview 12 educators at your school to take part in the study.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Yours faithfully,

Nono Molepo (Mrs).

Appendix 3: QUESTIONNAIRE: DEMOGRAPHIC DETAILS

Dear respondent

I would like to request you to answer the following questions as part of the present study. These questions require demographic details, which will be of use in analyzing the results of the study. Please bear the following in mind as you answer the questions:

- Do not write your name anywhere on the answering sheet of paper.
- There are no correct or incorrect answers to questions A. We merely require your opinion in order to obtain reliable data.
- Your first spontaneous reaction is probably the most valid. So work quickly and accurately. Do not ponder too long over any particular question or item.
- Please answer as many questions as you possibly can, by circling / crossing the relevant items, or by writing in the spaces provided. If you would like to change your response to a question do so by clearly crossing out the earlier response and marking out the new one.
- We presume that this questionnaire will take just about 10 minutes of your time to complete.

Thank you for your participation.

Researcher: _____ Supervisor: _____

PERSONAL DETAILS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate your gender:	M	F

Please circle or otherwise mark off the relevant age group

AGE IN YEARS		
	25	30
	31	35
	36	40
	41	45
	46	OVER

B. EDUCATIONAL/ PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND

High School Education

Name of School(s)	Highest Qualification	No. of Years in teaching

Professional Training:

Name of Institution	Highest Qualification	Years

Appendix 4: A LETTER ASKING FOR PARTICIPANTS' CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY.

My name is Nono Molepo and I am conducting research for the purpose of obtaining a Masters degree at the University of the Witwatersrand. My area of focus is corporal punishment in schools. It has been a number of years since corporal punishment was abolished in South African schools. However many educators were trained and socialized in a way that recognized corporal punishment as an effective way of changing and influencing children's behaviour. As a result, many educators in our schools could still be battling to find an effective and convenient alternative form of discipline, which is different to corporal punishment. I would like to explore educators' perceptions regarding the abolishment of corporal punishment, and I would like to explore the alternative forms of punishment currently used by educators in primary schools. I would like to invite you to participate in this study.

Participation in this research will entail answering a few interview questions at a time and place that is convenient for you. Answering the written questions will take approximately 10 minutes and the interview will last for approximately 30 minutes. With your permission, interviews will be recorded in order to ensure accuracy. Participation is voluntary, and no person will be advantaged or disadvantaged in any way for choosing to participate or not participate in the study. Your responses will not be seen by any person in this school or in the district at any time, and will only be processed by myself. Your responses will only be looked at in relation to all other responses. This means that feedback that will be given to the school and the district office will be in the form of group responses and not individual perceptions.

If you choose to participate in the study please fill in your details on the form below. If you fill in this form, this will be considered consent to participate in the study. You may, however, refuse to answer any questions you would prefer not to, and you may choose to withdraw from the study at any point.

Your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated.

Kind regards

.....

Mrs N. Molepo
Tel: (011) 4338736
Cell: 0721162725

Appendix 5: CONSENT FORM

I _____ consent to participate in this study conducted by Nono Molepo on educators' perception towards the abolishment of corporal punishment in school as well as exploration of alternative discipline measures used by educators. I understand that:
Participation in this study is voluntary.
That I may refuse to answer any questions I would prefer not to.
I may withdraw from the study at any time.
No information that may identify me will be included in the research report, and my responses will remain confidential.

I also consent to being tape-recorded. I understand that:
The tapes and transcripts will not be seen or heard by any person in this organization at any time, and will only be processed by the researcher.
All tape recordings will be destroyed after the research is complete.
No identifying information will be used in the transcripts or the research report.

Signed:…….
Date:……

Appendix 6: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Corporal punishment was abolished in South African Schools in 1996. Do you think this was a right move? Please elaborate.

If you have to, how do you discipline your learners?

What forms of disciplinary measures, other than corporal punishment do you and your colleagues use?

Do you use different measures of punishment for different forms misbehaviours? Please explain by giving examples.

What forms of disciplinary measures do you consider to be the most effective and why?

Do you and your colleagues feel the need for further training in area of classroom discipline? Please elaborate.