

Extent to Which Teachers Adhere to Corporal Punishment Regulation in Curbing Students' Misbehaviour in Public Secondary Schools in Rombo District, Tanzania

Laurent Cyprian Mushi ¹, Dr. Timothy Mandila ², Prof. Herme J. Mosha ³

Faculty of Education, Mwenge Catholic University, Moshi - Tanzania

Citation: Laurent Cyprian Mushi , Timothy Mandila, Herme J. Mosha (2022) Extent to Which Teachers Adhere to Corporal Punishment Regulation in Curbing Students' Misbehaviour in Public Secondary Schools in Rombo District, Tanzania, *British Journal of Education*, Vol.10, Issue 11, pp.68-83

ABSTRACT: *This study assessed the extent to which teachers follow corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools in Rombo District, Tanzania. The study was guided by the path-goal theory. The study used cross-sectional survey design under quantitative approach. Target population comprised heads of schools and teachers. Probability sampling techniques were used to sample 7 heads of schools and 84 teachers making a total of 91 respondents. Questionnaire and interview schedule were used for data collection. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse data. The study found out teachers to a very small extent considered gender of students before administering punishment. Heads of schools to a very small extent were responsible for punishing misbehaving students. Heads of schools to a very small extent assigned male teachers in writing to administer punishment when female teachers were not available in schools. Heads of schools kept punishment records to a small extent. The researcher concluded that, to a very small extent teachers follow corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools. The study recommends that government should form a committee to reconsider corporal punishment regulation. Teachers should consider gender of students before punishment. Also, heads of schools should enhance steadfast to corporal punishment regulation. Heads of schools should be responsible to punish all misbehaving students. Heads of schools should assign male teachers in writing to administer corporal punishment if female teachers are not present. Furthermore, heads of schools should record all corporal punishment in the book for future reference.*

KEYWORDS: assessment, corporal punishment regulation, students' misbehaviour

INTRODUCTION

Corporal punishment is physical punishment that uses physical force intended to cause bodily pain for the purpose of correcting or punishing a student for his/her misbehaviour (Gershoff, 2008). Corporal punishment is "any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light" (CRC, 2006). It includes hitting, slapping, spanking, punching, kicking, pinching, shaking, and using various objects such as

wooden paddles, belts, sticks, and pins (Northington, 2007). In June 2006, the Committee on the Rights of the Child adopted General Comment No. 8 on the right of the child to protection from corporal punishment. Other regional human rights mechanisms have condemned all corporal punishment. In October 2006, the report of the UN Secretary General's Study on Violence against Children was submitted to the General Assembly. It recommended universal prohibition of all corporal punishment as a matter of priority (GIEACPC, 2020).

Corporal punishment is however, lawful in schools in Mainland Tanzania under the National Corporal Punishment Regulation (1979) pursuant to article 60 of the National Education Act (1978). Corporal punishment as per this regulation means punishment by striking a pupil on his hand or on his normally clothed buttocks with a light, flexible stick but excludes striking a child with any other instrument or on any other part of the body. The number of strokes was reduced from six as per the Corporal Punishment Regulation of 1979 to four as per the Corporal Punishment Regulation of 2002, which gives authority to heads of schools to punish or assign teachers to strike students; a female pupil may only receive corporal punishment from a female teacher. Where there is no female teacher in a school the head of school may himself administer corporal punishment or authorise, in writing, a male teacher to administer corporal punishment. The teacher is supposed to consider the gravity of the offense, the sex, age and health of the student before administering corporal punishment. The records of this punishment must be kept in a book for future reference (GIEACPC, 2011).

Ngussa and Mdalingwa (2017) conducted a study on Students' Perceptions on Corporal Punishment and its Effect on Learning: A Case of Secondary Schools in Babati Rural District, Tanzania. The study findings revealed that students were of the view that corporal punishment may cause them escape classrooms, may lead to dropouts and can instil fear to learn and therefore contributing to poor performance. The Human Rights Watch Report (2017) indicates routine, widespread, and sometimes brutal use of corporal punishment in Tanzanian schools. Nearly all students interviewed had been subjected to corporal punishment at some point in their school experience. Teachers reported caning students. Secondary school students and teachers said that in their schools, children are routinely beaten with sticks, which are often visible in class.

Aslam et al (2021) conducted a study in Pakistan on Short and Long-Term Impact of Corporal Punishment: A Phenomenological Analysis of How Students Cope and Survive. The study findings revealed that the initial impact of corporal punishment included: decline in creative ability, low self-confidence, fear of teachers and schools, and anxiety/stress. The long-term impact included: low self-esteem/self-image, change in attitude toward teachers and educational system, and fearful/aggressive feelings. A report on corporal punishment in U.S. public schools by Gershoff and Sarah (2016) shows that as a result of school corporal punishment, children suffer from a range of serious injuries that often require medical treatment, including bruises, hematomas, nerve and muscle damage, cuts, and broken bones. Previous reports have indicated a widespread use of corporal punishment by teachers irrespective of the fact that Tanzania has ratified international, regional and Continental Conventions, abolishing the practice and enacted laws giving guidance on the practice. Despite the regulation of corporal punishment in secondary schools, parents complain about their children being injured. Therefore, in this study the researcher set to assess the extent to which

the corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour had effectively been implemented in public secondary schools in Rombo District, Tanzania.

Statement of the Problem

Corporal punishment for misbehaving students is viewed as a way to encourage desired conduct in students, but it has been abused to the extent that parents complain about their children being injured as a result of being battered. Students also complain about receiving severe pain and injuries or damage because of corporal punishment. According to Gershoff (2017), corporal punishment is also consistently linked with harm, detriment of children's learning, physical harm, and affecting mental health. Various researchers such as Puranen & Roitto (2018), Ukpabio et al (2019), Stein et al (2019); Nampoto (2018); found that teachers do not follow the corporal punishment regulation issued by the Government in 2002.

The reports on occurrence of injuries among secondary school students show that there is a problem with the implementation of the corporal punishment regulation. This study is important because previous studies did not adequately assess the implementation of corporal punishment regulation provided by the Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MOEST). Similarly, none of the afore cited studies has established the extent to which teachers follow or do not follow the corporal punishment regulation to curb students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools in order to bridge the knowledge gap. Until this situation is seriously considered, students will continue to be victims of corporal punishment. The prevailing situation has to change; a factor that has prompted the need for this study. Therefore, in filling this gap, the current study assessed the extent to which teachers adhere to corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools in Rombo District, Tanzania.

Research Question

To what extent do teachers follow corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools in Rombo District?

Significance of the Study

The study was important since its results would trigger reform of the policy on corporal punishment in public secondary schools. The study findings would influence administrators to take further steps to enhance the regulation for corporal punishment in secondary schools. The study would be instrumental in informing teachers, whether the corporal punishment regulation was successful or not in eliciting discipline behaviour among students in public secondary schools. The study would help students to no longer be victims of corporal punishment and create to them a safe school learning environment. The study would be used by other researchers as a basis when investigating other attributes on corporal punishment. Finally, the results would be useful to parents by creating trust of government efforts in correcting misbehaviour in public secondary schools.

Theoretical Framework

The guiding theory of this study was the path-goal theory as propounded by House and Mitchell (1975). According to this theory, leaders are effective because of their impact on subordinates' motivation and ability to perform effectively. The theory is called path-goal theory because its major concern is how the leaders influence the subordinates' perceptions of their work and personal goals through a path to their attainment. The theory suggests that a leader's behaviour is motivating or satisfying to the degree that the behaviour increases followers' efforts towards goal attainment and clarifies the paths towards attainment of these goals. Path-goal theory was designed to explain how leaders can guide followers along the path to realise their work and personal goals by regulating specific behaviours that are suited to followers' needs and to the context in which followers work. Path-goal theory suggests that it is important for leaders to provide guidance and direction for followers to help them define and clarify goals and assist them in avoiding impediments as they endeavour to attain the goals (House and Mitchell, 1975).

According to House and Mitchell (1975), the kind of leader behaviour included in the theory is directive leadership. It is characterised by a leader who lets subordinates know what is expected of them, provides specific guidance as to what should be done and how it should be done, maintains definite standards of performance, and asks that group members to follow standard rules and regulations. The proposition of this theory is that the leader's behaviour is motivational. Such behaviour complements subordinates' environment by providing the coaching and guidance necessary for effective performance. These proponents of this theory suggest that the leader's strategic function is to enhance subordinates' motivation to perform, satisfaction with the job, and acceptance of the leader. Therefore, House and Mitchell (1975) maintain that the relationship between leader directions or guidelines and subordinate satisfaction is contingent upon the structure of the task. Path-goal theory asserts that an individual will act in a certain way based on the guidance on how to follow the path to reach goals without encountering any problems. This implies that teachers must carefully follow all the regulation on corporal punishment as stipulated by the MOEST in order to reach the desired goals of correcting misbehaviour.

Strengths of the Theory

Path-goal theory emphasises that leaders can reduce or remove problems that face teachers while administering corporal punishment to students in secondary schools by adhering to the corporal punishment regulation. Adhering to the regulation can guide teachers along and support them in correcting students' misbehaviour. The theory is applicable because it enables teachers to be confident in case of emergencies and different situations when administering corporal punishment in their schools. The theory is flexible, and its ideas are easy to understand because it clearly explains the relationship between leaders (MOEST) and followers (teachers).

Weaknesses of the Theory

The theory in its present form is a tentative explanation of the effects of leader behaviour, or it is incomplete since it does not explain other factors rather than subordinate acceptance.

Justification of the Theory

The theory is applicable in an education setting since regulation on corporal punishment provided by leaders helps teachers accomplish their goals by following the specified directives. Therefore, when applied to this study, the theory held that researcher would expect independent variable (implementation of corporal punishment regulation) to influence the dependent variable (students' desired behaviour), because MOEST (leaders) provide guidance - regulation as a path for teachers (followers) to attain their goal i.e. correction of students' misbehaviour.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The extent to which teachers abide to corporal punishment regulation in public secondary schools.

Puranen & Roitto (2018) examined Gradual Changes to Discipline: A case study of punishment records and corporal punishment in three schools in Finland. The study was explorative. It applied a case study design under qualitative approach. The study applied what could be described as grounded theory that is often used in exploratory research. The study used document analysis guide as a research instrument. The study used empirical sources such as school punishment records that were taken into account. A vast array of punishment records from Finnish secondary schools were used in data collection.

The study findings revealed that despite the regulations and recommendations of educationalists at the time, punishments were still carried out in Finnish secondary schools without following them. The findings are too general. However, the study did not establish in particular the extent to which teachers do not abide to the corporal punishment regulation. This is the gap the current study filled. The study also used only document analysis guide as instrument for data collection. Therefore, the current study analysed quantitative data by using frequencies, percentages and means. The instruments used to collect data were questionnaire, interview schedule and document analysis schedule.

Ukpabio et al (2019) study on "Revisiting Disciplinary Control in Secondary Schools: The Issue of Corporal Punishment in Calabar South Local Government Area of Cross River State, Nigeria", adopted survey research design. The simple random sampling technique was used in selecting 200 teachers for this study. Questionnaire was used as an instrument for data collection. Three hypotheses were formulated to guide the study. The data obtained were analysed using independent t-test and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test statistics at 0.05 level of significance. The findings revealed that there is a significant difference in the administration of corporal punishment as a disciplinary control mechanism of secondary schools based on teachers' gender and teachers' teaching experience.

The findings were too general. The study did not reveal whether teachers follow corporal punishment regulation in the administration of punishment to misbehaving students or not. Hence, the current study investigated in particular, the extent to which teachers abide to corporal punishment regulation. Second, Ukpabio et al (2019) study did not indicate which survey design was used. The study surveyed only teachers as respondents. The current study,

however, used cross-sectional survey design under quantitative approach. The participants to the current study were heads of schools, teachers and students.

Stein et al. (2019) conducted a study on relations of corporal punishment to academic results and achievements in secondary schools in Tanzania. The study targeted all 2,826 Form Four students in three districts - Ilemela, Nyamagana, and Magu - of Mwanza Region. The population was taken from all 73 public schools. The study used a representative questionnaire-based survey to collect data. The questionnaires were translated into Kiswahili. The schools were randomly selected to obtain a sample of 13 schools. A stratified method was used to draw a sample of 706 students who participated in the study. The study by Stein et al. (2019) revealed that corporal punishment administered by teachers to students for poor performance or misbehaviour in class is the most frequent form of violence at school, though only headmasters are allowed to execute corporal punishment. However, the study did not find in particular, the extent to which teachers follow corporal punishment regulation. The current study was expected to fill this gap. The study used only one instrument for data collection. A single instrument is considered as insufficient.

Nampoto (2018) analysed aspects of corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in Tanzanian secondary schools in Mtwara - Mikindani Municipality. The study used a qualitative research design. The researcher had sampled 4 out of 16 secondary schools from the municipality. The population comprised of 583 individuals. The sample included 88 students, 8 discipline teachers, 4 heads of schools, and 8 members of school boards. A simple random technique was used to select students. The simple random technique could not be used alone to sample out the students. All the heads of schools, discipline teachers, and members of school boards were purposively selected for the study. The study findings revealed that teachers do not follow corporal punishment regulation of 2002. However, the study did not find out the extent to which teachers follow the corporal punishment regulation. The current study filled this gap.

Invocavity (2014) conducted a study on the effects of corporal punishment on discipline among public secondary school students in Arusha. The study used a survey approach and examined six secondary schools. The study used cluster and convenience sampling techniques to obtain the samples of teachers, heads of schools, and discipline teachers. The sample included 288 students, 120 teachers, 6 heads of schools, and 6 discipline teachers. Closed-ended questionnaires and an interview guide were used as data collection instruments. Quantitative data were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22, and qualitative data were analysed using narrative form. The study findings indicated that corporal punishment regulation is not followed by the teachers in administering punishment to students. However, the study did not find out, in particular, the extent to which teachers abide to the regulation. Therefore, the current study was expected to fill this gap. Invocavity (2014) study did not explain how the six secondary schools were sampled. The current study, however, used stratified random sampling technique to get the sample.

METHODOLOGY

The study used cross-sectional survey design under Quantitative Approach. The instruments were questionnaire and interview schedule. The target population comprised all 41 public secondary schools, all heads of the schools and all teachers in Rombo District. The heads of schools were included in this study because they were the main implementers of corporal punishment regulation in schools. Teachers took part in this study because they were sometimes assigned to implement the corporal punishment regulation. Sampling of the respondents was done through probability sampling techniques such as stratified and simple random sampling techniques. Probability sampling was used to select schools and teachers; while heads of schools were included directly due to their positions. Questionnaires were used to collect data from teachers while interview schedule was conducted to collect data from the heads of schools. In order to ensure content validity, the questionnaire and interview schedule were given to two educational research experts from Mwenge Catholic University (MWECAU) to review and validate the instruments. This helped to assess the relevance, appropriateness of instruments and language used in the items. Reliability of the instruments was obtained by using Cronbach's alpha to measure internal consistency of the items. The reliability for teachers' question was 0.629. Therefore, the instrument was reliable since the level of reliability was above 0.50. Descriptive statistics were used to classify, organize, summarise and describe the important characteristics of the collected data. The descriptive statistics were presented by using tables. The data from open ended questions from both questionnaire and interview schedule were done by having the most recurring responses for quantitative analysis by using SPSS Version 26. Analysis was done by using frequencies, percentages and means.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The extent to which teachers abide to corporal punishment regulation in public secondary schools.

The first research question was directed at finding out the extent to which teachers abide to the corporal punishment regulation in public secondary schools. Tables 1 and 2 contain the summary of the responses from teachers and heads of schools correspondingly.

Table 1: Teachers' response on the extent to which teachers abide to corporal punishment regulation in public secondary schools (n=80)

ITEMS	TAVLE		TALE		TTAE		TASE		TAVSE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
i) Teachers use a light, flexible stick when punishing misbehaving students	1	1.3	15	18.8	17	21.3	45	56.3	2	2.5	2.60
ii) Teachers must count the strokes (at least four) when punishing students per mistake	16	20.0	14	17.5	27	33.8	10	12.5	12	15.0	3.15
iii) Only female teachers should punish female students	8	10.0	2	2.5	9	11.3	15	18.8	46	57.5	1.89
iv) The head of school is responsible to punish all misbehaving students in the school	8	10.0	8	10.0	10	12.5	10	12.5	44	55.0	2.08
v) Head of school assigns male teachers in writing to punish female students if female teachers are not available	8	10.0	7	8.8	9	11.3	11	13.8	45	56.3	2.03
vi) Teachers consult the head of school for permission before punishing misbehaving students	7	8.8	3	3.8	13	16.3	25	31.3	32	40.0	2.10
vii) Teachers consider the age of student before punishment	13	16.3	16	20.0	14	17.5	8	10.0	28	35.0	2.72
viii) Before punishing students, teachers have to consider health of the students	46	57.5	14	17.5	4	5.0	9	11.3	7	8.8	4.04
ix) Teachers record all corporal punishment in the record book	7	8.8	11	13.8	16	20.0	31	38.8	15	18.8	2.55
x) Teachers consider the type of offence before punishing students	12	15.0	6	7.5	39	48.8	10	12.5	13	16.3	2.93
General Mean											2.61

Source: Field Data, 2022

Key: f = frequency % = Per cent TAVLE =To a very large extent; TALE =To a large extent; TTAE =To the average extent; TASE =To a small extent; TAVSE =To a very small extent

Data in Table 1 revealed that 56.3 per cent of teachers rated to a small extent that they use the required type of stick when punishing misbehaving students. Besides, 21.3 per cent of teachers indicated to the average extent of the requirement; while 18.8 per cent of teachers rated to a large extent of the practice. This meant that (40.1%) used the required type of stick to punish misbehaving students. Therefore, according to these findings, teachers use the required type of stick to punish misbehaving students by a mean score of 2.60.

Furthermore, the data in Table 1 revealed that 57.5 per cent of teachers rated to a very small extent that they considered gender of both teachers and students when punishing students. Meanwhile, 18.8 per cent rated the practice was to a small extent. Therefore, according to these

findings, teachers considered gender before punishing students by mean score of 1.89. This indicated that male teachers usually punish female students contrary to the corporal punishment regulation. The regulation prohibits male teachers to punish girl students unless otherwise allowed by heads of schools in writing if female teachers are not available in the schools.

Data in Table 1 further revealed that 55.0 per cent of teachers rated to a very small extent heads of school alone punish all misbehaving students in schools. This might be due to the reason that heads of schools mostly are preoccupied by administrative duties. In addition, 12.5 per cent of teachers rated the practice to a small extent. According to these findings, the heads of schools to a very small extent punish all misbehaving students by a mean score of 2.08. The findings concur with Stein et al (2019) whose study revealed that corporal punishment administered by teachers to students, is that only headmasters allow them to execute corporal punishment.

Furthermore, data in Table 1 show that 56.3 per cent of the teachers rated to a very small extent; heads of schools do assign male teachers in writing to punish female students if female teachers are not available. Only, 13.8 per cent of teachers indicated the practice was to a small extent. Therefore, according to these findings, teachers to a very small extent considered gender of students before punishing them by mean score of 2.03. This indicated that male teachers usually punish female students contrary to the corporal punishment regulation. This might be due to the reason that teachers have no sufficient time to seek for permission from their heads of schools to punish girl students. The findings concur with Invocavity (2014) whose study found that teachers do not follow corporal punishment regulation when punishing misbehaving students in public secondary schools.

Data in Table 1 also indicate that 57.5 per cent of the teachers rated consideration of health of a student before punishment was to a very large extent; while 17.5 per cent indicated the consideration was to a large extent. This means that majority (75%) indicated that they consider the age of a student before punishment. In addition, 11.3 per cent rated the practice was to a small extent. Hence, according to the data teachers consider the health of a student before punishment by mean score of 4.04. The findings link with Path-goal theory which asserts that an individual will act in a certain way based on the guidance on how to follow the path to reach goals without encountering any problems.

Furthermore, data in Table 1 revealed that 48.8 per cent of teachers indicated that they considered the type of offence before punishment was administered to the average extent; while 15.0 per cent rated the practice was to a very large extent. This means that moderate majority (63.8%) of teachers consider the type of offence before punishment to a student. Also, 16.3 per cent of the teachers rated to a very small extent consider the type of offence. Therefore, according to these findings, teachers considered the type of offence before punishment is administered to a student by mean score of 2.93. The findings differ from Puranen & Roitto (2018) who found out that teachers use corporal punishment to students irrespective of regulations and recommendations.

Data in Table 1 also displayed that 40.0 per cent of teachers rated to a very small extent consult the head of school for permission before punishing misbehaving students; while 31.3 per cent

rated the practice was to a small extent. So, the majority (71.3%) of teachers to a very small extent consulted the heads of schools before punishing misbehaving students. In addition, 16.3 per cent of the teachers indicated they make consultation to the average extent. Therefore, according to the findings, teachers do not ask for permission from heads of schools before punishment to a student by mean score of 2.10. The findings concur with Stein et al (2019) whose study revealed that corporal punishment was administered by teachers to students, instead of headmasters to administer corporal punishment.

According to the data in Table 1, it is shown that 38.8 per cent of the teachers rated they record all corporal punishments in the record book to a small extent; while 18.8 per cent rated to a very small extent recorded all corporal punishments in the punishment book. This means that (57.6%) of teachers record corporal punishment to a small extent. Moreover, 20.0 per cent of the teachers record all corporal punishment to the average extent; while 13.8 per cent of the respondents rated the practice was to a large extent. This means that (33.8%) teachers rated to the average extent record all corporal punishment in the record book. Therefore, according to these findings, teachers recorded all corporal punishments to a small extent giving a mean score of 2.55. The findings are similar to Path-goal theory which asserts that an individual will act in a certain way based on the guidance on how to follow the path to reach goals without encountering any problems.

Data in Table 1 also show that 20.0 per cent of teachers to a very large extent counted the strokes to ensure they are at least four when punishing students per mistake; while 17.5 per cent of the teachers rated the practice was to a large extent. This means that (37.5%) of the teachers count the strokes to ensure they are at least four per mistake. Again, 33.8 per cent of the teachers indicated the practice was to the average extent. Moreover, 12.5 per cent of the teachers indicated to a small extent count the strokes to ensure they are at least four per mistake; while 15.0 per cent rated to a very small extent practice it. This means that (27.5%) of teachers indicated to a very small extent counted the number of strokes. Hence, according to these findings, teachers (37.5%) count the number of strokes to at least four per mistake when they punish students by mean score of 3.15. This implies that teachers are happy with the limitation of strokes of a stick. The findings were contrary to Nampoto (2018) whose study revealed that teachers do not follow corporal punishment regulation of 2002.

Furthermore, data in Table 1 revealed that 35.0 per cent of the respondents rated to a very small extent considered age of student before punishment; while 10.0 per cent rated the practice was to a small extent. Therefore, (45%) of teachers to a very small extent considered the age of a student before administering punishment. Besides, 20.0 per cent of the teachers to a large extent indicated that they consider the age of a student before punishment and 16.3 per cent rated to a very large extent. This means that (36.3%) of the teachers consider the age of a student before punishment. Hence, according to these findings most teachers rated to a very small extent considered age of the students before punishment by mean score of 2.72. This implicates that students are easily identified by class or form rather than age. The findings of the study concur with Invocavity (2014) who found out that teachers do not follow corporal punishment regulation in secondary schools.

Table 2: Heads of schools' response on the extent to which teachers abide to corporal punishment regulation in public secondary schools (n=7)

ITEMS	TAVLE		TALE		TTAE		TASE		TAVSE		Mean
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	
i) Teachers must use a light, flexible stick when punishing misbehaving students	2	28.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	71.4	2.14
ii) Teachers must count the strokes to be at least four when punishing students per mistake	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9	1	14.3	2.71
iii) Only female teachers should punish female students	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.3	5	71.4	1.71
iv) The head of school is responsible for punishing all misbehaving students in the school	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	2	28.6	4	57.1	1.57
v) Head of school should assign male teachers in writing to punish female students if female teachers are not available	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	2	28.6	4	57.1	1.57
vi) Teachers should consult head of school for permission before punishing misbehaving students.	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9	2.43
vii) Teachers must consider age of students before punishing them	1	14.3	0	0.0	2	28.6	4	57.1	0	0.0	2.71
viii) When teachers punish students, they have to consider the health of the students	6	85.7	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.71
ix) Head of school should record all corporal punishment in the punishment book and sign it	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	3	42.9	1	14.3	2.71
x) Teachers should consider the type of offence before punishment	0	0.0	1	14.3	0	0.0	5	71.4	1	14.3	2.14
General mean											2.44

Source: Field Data, 2022

Key: f = frequency % = Per cent TAVLE =To a very large extent; TALE =To a large extent; TTAE =To the average extent; TASE =To a small extent; TAVSE =To a very small extent

Data in Table 2 show that to a very large extent 85.7 per cent of heads of schools indicated that teachers consider health of students before punishment. Moreover, 14.3 per cent of heads of schools rated the practice to be average extent. According to these findings, heads of schools by a mean score of 4.71 consider health of students before punishing them. The research findings were contrary to Nampoto (2018) whose findings revealed that teachers do not abide to the corporal punishment regulation.

Data in Table 2 also revealed that 71.4 per cent of heads of schools rated to a very small extent that they use the required type of stick to punish misbehaving students. In addition, 28.8 per cent of heads of schools rated the practice to a very large extent. Therefore, according to these findings, majority of heads of schools indicated to a very small extent the required type of stick was used for punishing students by a mean score of 2.14. This implies that a light, flexible stick cannot cause bodily pain to a secondary school student. The findings concur with Puranen & Roitto (2018) whose findings revealed that despite the regulations and recommendations of educationalists at the time, punishments were still carried out in Finnish secondary schools without following them.

Furthermore data in Table 2 show that 71.4 per cent of heads of schools rated to a very small extent only female teachers should punish female students; while 14.3 per cent indicated that only female teachers should punish female students to a small extent. This means that majority (85.7%) did not consider gender of students before punishment. Moreover, 14.3 per cent of the respondents indicated the practice to a very large extent. Therefore, most of the heads of schools to a very small extent considered gender of students before punishing them by mean score of 1.71. This implicates that teachers are driven by absentmindedness that prevents them from considering gender of students before punishment. The findings of the study concur with Invocavity (2014) who revealed that corporal punishment regulation is not followed by teachers in secondary schools.

In addition, data in Table 2 revealed that 71.4 per cent of heads of schools said teachers to a small extent considered the type of offence before punishment; while 14.3 per cent rated the practice to a very small extent. This means that majority (85.7%) of the heads of schools indicated the practice was to a small extent. Moreover, 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice was to a large extent. Therefore, according to the findings heads of schools to a small extent considered the type of offence before administering punishment to misbehaving students by a mean score of 2.14. This might be due to the attitude of teachers on punishment to students. The findings differ from Path-goal theory which asserts that an individual will act in a certain way based on the guidance on how to follow the path to reach goals without encountering any problems.

Furthermore, data in Table 2 indicates that 57.1 per cent of heads of schools rated to a very small extent were responsible to punish all misbehaving students in the schools; while 28.6 per cent indicated the practice was to a small extent. This means majority (85.7%) of heads of schools to a very small extent punish all misbehaving students in schools. In addition, 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice was to a large extent. Therefore, according to these findings, heads of schools to a very small extent punish all misbehaving students in schools by

a mean score of 1.57. This might be due to the fact that heads of schools are mostly preoccupied by administrative duties.

Data in Table 2 also revealed that 57.1 per cent of heads of schools rated to a very small extent assigned male teachers in writing to punish female students if female teachers were not available. Moreover, 28.6 per cent indicated the practice was to a small extent. This means that majority (85.7%) of heads of schools did not assign male teachers to punish female students in schools. In addition, 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice was to a large extent. Therefore, according to these findings, heads of schools did not assign male teachers to punish female students in schools by a mean score of 1.57. This might be due to the fact since heads of schools are mostly engrossed by administrative duties have no time to authorise male teachers in writing to punish girl students per incidence.

Furthermore, data in Table 2 indicate 57.1 per cent of heads of schools rated to a small extent they consider the age of students before punishment. Moreover, 28.6 per cent indicated the practice was to the average extent; while 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice was to a very large extent. This means that (42.9%) of heads of schools considered age of students before punishment to the average extent. Therefore, according to these findings, heads of schools (57.1%) to a small extent considered age of students before punishment giving a mean score of 2.71. This might be due to the reason that students can easily be identified by form or class rather than age. The findings coincide with Puranen & Roitto (2018) who uncovered that despite the regulations and recommendations of educationalists at the time, punishments were still carried out in Finnish secondary schools without following them. The findings deviated from Path-goal theory which asserts that an individual will act in a certain way based on the guidance on how to follow the path to reach goals without encountering any problems.

Data in Table 2 further show 42.9 per cent of heads of schools to a small extent indicated that they recorded all corporal punishment in the punishment book and signed it; while 14.3 per cent rated the practice was to a very small extent. This means that (57.2%) of the heads of schools to a small extent recorded all corporal punishment in the punishment book and signed it. Also, 14.3 per cent of the heads of schools indicated that they kept punishment records and signed them to a very large extent; while 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice was to a large extent. This means that (28.6%) kept punishment records and signed them to a large extent. Moreover, 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice to be average. Therefore, according to these findings, heads of schools recorded to a small extent all corporal punishments in the punishment book and signed it by a mean score of 2.71. This might be due to the fact that heads of schools are mostly preoccupied by administrative duties and they have no time to record all corporal punishments in the book.

Data in Table 2 further indicate 42.9 per cent of heads of schools indicated to a very small extent were consulted by teachers for permission before punishing misbehaving students; while 14.3 per cent rated the practice to be to a small extent. This means that (57.2%) of the heads of schools rated to a very small extent were consulted by teachers for permission before punishing misbehaving students. Also, 14.3 per cent of the heads of schools indicated that there were consultations by teachers to a very large extent; while 14.3 per cent rated the practice was to a large extent. This means that (28.6%) indicated the consultations were to a large extent.

Moreover, 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice to be average. According to these findings, heads of schools rated to a very small extent were consulted by teachers for permission before punishing misbehaving students by a mean score of 2.43. This implies that due to absentmindedness heads of schools have no time for consultations.

In addition data in Table 2 revealed that 42.9 per cent of heads of schools indicated to a small extent they counted the number of strokes to ensure that they were at least four when punishing students per mistake; while 14.3 per cent rated the practice to a very small extent. Generally, this means that (57.2%) of the heads of schools rated to a small extent counted the number of strokes to ensure they are at least four when punishing students per mistake. Also, 14.3 per cent of the heads of schools to a very large extent indicated that they counted the strokes to ensure they are at least four when punishing students per mistake; while 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice to be to a large extent. This means that 28.6 per cent of the respondents to a large extent counted the number of strokes to ensure they were at least four when punishing students per mistake. Moreover, 14.3 per cent of the respondents rated the practice to be to average extent. Therefore, according to these findings, heads of schools to a small extent count the number of strokes to at least four when punishing students per mistake by a mean score of 2.71. This might be due to the fact that heads of schools punished students when they were angry and causing them to overstep the limit.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study assessed the extent to which teachers follow corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools. The study found out teachers to a very small extent considered gender of students before punishment. All heads of schools to a very small extent were responsible to punish all misbehaving students in secondary schools. Heads of schools to a very small extent assigned male teachers in writing when female teachers were not available in secondary schools. Heads of schools kept punishment records to a small extent. Therefore, according to the study findings, the researcher concluded that, to a very small extent teachers follow corporal punishment regulation in curbing students' misbehaviour in public secondary schools.

Basing on the research conclusion, the researcher made the following recommendations to the educational stakeholders; the government, school administrators and teachers. The government should form a committee to revisit and reconsider corporal punishment regulation. Teachers should consider the gender of students before administering corporal punishment in public secondary schools. Also, heads of schools should enhance abidance to corporal punishment regulation in secondary schools. Heads of schools should be responsible for punishing all misbehaving students in public secondary schools. Heads of secondary school should assign male teachers in writing to administer punishment if female teachers are not present in schools. Furthermore, heads of schools should record all corporal punishments in the book for future reference.

REFERENCES

- Aslam, M. S., Ghazal, S., & Irfan, A. (2021). Short and Long-Term Impact of Corporal Punishment; A Phenomenological Analysis of How Students Cope and Survive. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 31(2).
- CRC (2006). *The Committee on the Rights of the Child*. United Nations.
- EAC (2012). *The Bujumbura Declaration on Child Rights and Wellbeing in the East African Community*. East African Community.
- Gershoff, E. T, and Sarah A. F., "Corporal Punishment in U.S. Public Schools: Prevalence, Disparities in Use, and Status in State and Federal Policy." *Social policy report* vol. 30 (2016): 1.
- Gershoff, E.T., (2017). School corporal punishment in global perspective: prevalence, outcomes, and efforts at intervention, *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 22:sup1, 224-239, DOI: 10.1080/13548506.2016.1271955 T
- Gershoff, E. T. (2008). *Report on physical punishment in the United States: What research tells us about its effect on children*. Center for Effective Discipline.
- GIEACPC (2011). Briefing on the Human Right Council *Universal Periodic Review*: Legality of Corporal Punishment of children in the United Republic of Tanzania. Retrieved in 2021 from www.Endcorporalpunishment.Org
- GIEACPC (2020). Corporal Punishment of Children in The United Republic of Tanzania. Retrieved in 2021 from www.Endcorporalpunishment.Org
- House, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. (1975). *Path-goal theory of leadership*. University of Seattle Dept. of Psychology.
- Human Rights Watch (2017). *I had a Dream to Finish School*, Barriers to Secondary Education in Tanzania.
- Invocavity, J. (2014). *The Effects of Corporal Punishment on Discipline among Students in Arusha Secondary Schools* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
- Nampoto, H. B. (2018). *Aspect of Corporal Punishment on Maintaining Discipline in Schools in Tanzania: A Focus on Secondary Schools in Mtwara- Mikindani Municipality* (Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania).
- Northington, C. (2007). The corporal punishment of minorities in the public schools. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 9(3), 57-59.
- Ngussa, B. M., & Mdalingwa, S. (2017). Students' Perception on Corporal Punishment and its Effect on Learning: A Case of Secondary Schools in Babati Rural District, Tanzania. *Mediterranean Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences (MJBAS)*, 1(1), 84-93.
- OAU (1979). *African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child*. Organisation of African Unity.
- Puranen, K., & Roitto, M. (2018). Gradual changes to discipline: A case study of punishment records and corporal punishment in three schools in Finland after the 1872 School Order Act. *Nordic Journal of Educational History*, 5(2).
- Stein, M., Steenkamp, D., & Tangi, F. (2019). Relations of corporal punishment to academic results and achievements in secondary schools in Tanzania. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(8), 85-104.
- Ukpabio, G. E., Usen, M. F., & Etor, C. (2019). Revisiting Disciplinary Control in Secondary Schools: The Issue of Corporal Punishment in Calabar South Local Government

Area of Cross River State, Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(6), 67-67.

United Republic of Tanzania (1978). *The National Education Act*. Government Printer.

United Republic of Tanzania (1979). *Corporal Punishment Regulation*. Government Printer.

United Republic of Tanzania (2002). *Corporal Punishment Regulation*. Government Printer.