

---

# Managing Students Without Coercion in an Era of no Corporal Punishment: A Study of Selected Secondary Schools In Rivers State, Nigeria.

OTEYI, JOYCE VADUKWEENEM Ph.D<sup>1</sup>, N NADIEZE, GODFREY  
CHUKWUMEKA Ph.D<sup>2</sup>

Department of Educational Management  
Faculty of Education, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt.

**Abstract:** High rate of misconduct posed by students in schools has become more complex and some scholars dispute that corporal punishment is the solution to these behavioural challenges in schools. The study evaluated management of Students without Coercion in an Era of No Corporal Punishment in Selected Secondary Schools in Rivers State objectively identifying the roles and consequences of coercive measures (corporal punishment) as well as alternatives to coercive. The study assumed absence of sex discrepancy which was tested using t-test analysis at an alpha level of 5% with SPSS version 21. Whereas, a criterion mean (2.5) of the modified Likert scale was the bench mark for research questions. Face and content validity were utilized. Cronbach alpha with a reliability index of 0.897 assessed the internal consistency of the study instrument. The report of the field survey showed synonymous agreement in the opinions of the male and females on the roles, consequences, and alternatives of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State. This study outcome corresponds with previous study and contradicts with some. This is based on different lots of factors like culture, geographic variations and more. Coercion is not the best way, students can actually be managed by applying the identified alternatives measures to corporal punishment without coercion and positive behavioural change can be achieved. In recent time corporal punishment is an abuse and highly prohibited hence, there is need to consider alternatives.

**Keywords:** Managing, Students, Coercion, Corporal, Punishment, Secondary, Schools, Rivers State.

---

## I. Introduction

Coercive measures are seen as violent measures or punishments used in managing behaviour. One of such measure is corporal punishment. Straus and Mouradian (1998) defined corporal punishment as the intentional application of physical pain as a disciplinary measure to change a behavior. Corporal punishment has been in existence for many decades, though in recent years there have been attempts to ban it (Iqbal, 2003) and currently the law prohibits it in many countries. Coercive measure has continued to be supported despite the assumed implications. This is seen in the work of Yaworski (2012) which examined the effectiveness of coercive method

of punishment in managing behaviour of students. The study utilized data from secondary sources. The study established varying discipline strategies in classroom management over the years.

Basically, the use of coercive measures in management of student behaviour is challenged with mixed feelings. Some support its usage while others argue and see it as a form of abuse. Experts noted that, approximately 2 to 3 million cases of coercive punishments were reported leading to about 20,000 medical treatment each year (Hyman, Zelikoff & Clarke, 1988; Poole, Ushokow, Nader *et al.*, 1991). Due to this statistics and other factors including the high rate of misconduct posed by students in schools which has become more complex; some scholars disputed that corporal punishment is the solution to these behavioural challenges in schools (Mugabe & Maphosa, 2013). Furthermore, the rate at which right of the child and human right protection is clamoured presently calls for an attention to this area.

Principally, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) stresses on the right of the child to protection of human dignity and physical integrity; hence, coercive measure is considered as an act against CRC according to UNICEF (2001). In the same way, the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) disagreed with the use of corporal punishment in schools rather the alternatives to corporal punishments were upheld. These alternatives include prevention and intervention programs as well as strategies for changing students behaviour (NASP, 2006). Some studies suggest alternatives to curb poor behaviour of students in school (Onyango, Raburu & Peter, 2016). The study of these scholars investigated the effectiveness exclusion in the management of student behaviour problems in public secondary schools in Kenya. The study utilized concurrent triangulation design as guided with a total study population of 380 teachers and used stratified random sampling technique. The findings exposed that there was a direct association between exclusion and management of student behavioural issues (Onyango, Raburu & Peter, 2016).

Non coercion measure is a technique that is warm and welcoming without tension. It is an alternative to corporal punishment. It is a vital method in maintaining classroom control which aims to develop a scene of effective communication, in which the teacher displays an attitude of respect for the students. School officials can exhibit friendliness to students and an attitude that they usually enjoy working with children in the academic setting. Students must be taught in an environment that clearly states they are valued and understood. The emphasis is on positive educational exchanges between teachers and students, not futile, contentious, win-lose contests. Alternatives to corporal punishment entail managing students without coercion to achieve a behavioural change.

In recent time corporal punishment is an abuse and highly prohibited hence, there is need to consider alternatives. This current study investigated this. Also, there is paucity of data to this regards especially in the area of this present study. Besides, lots of school teachers have argued its effectiveness especially in classroom management thus; this study put this in consideration.

The outcome of this study will aid school administrators and policy makers to see these alternatives as useful tools which can be implemented in schools. Although, this present study is school based study, the result obtained from this study could possibly be useful to parents and guidance in child management at home.

Two theories guided this study namely; Behavior Modification theory advanced by Thorndike (Corsine, 1987) and Choice theory.

Thorndike's Behavior Modification Theory (Rosenhan & Seligman, 1995) highlights human behavior in relation to the law of effect. According to the theory behavioral responses to stimuli that are followed by a satisfactory response will be strengthened, but responses that are followed by discomfort (coercion) will be weakened.

Choice Theory was propounded by William Glasser in 1998; it is a psychological model that states that purposes underlie all behaviours. This gives an explanation to the reason humans behave the way they do. According to Choice Theory, throughout an individual's life, the behavioural intent is to meet one or more of innate five basic

human needs (survival, freedom, fun, power, and love/belonging) that are built into human genetic structure. The theory has its ideology that all behaviour is intentional. Although everyone has all 5 of these needs, the drive for love and belongingness tends to be the most important. According to choice theory, it is through the development of close, caring relationships by teacher-student that they can most effectively fulfil other needs and achieve happiness. Unfortunately, school managers frequently use external control (i.e. various types of coercive force) like corporal punishment to attempt to get students corrected with the misguided belief that this is the way to get the best. On the other hand, using external control on others as the case between teacher and student tends to result in conflict, frustration, and disconnected relationships for both teachers and students.

### **Aim**

The study was aimed at evaluating management of Students without Coercion in an Era of No Corporal Punishment in Selected Secondary Schools in Rivers State.

**Objectives:** The specific objectives which guided the study include identifying;

1. The roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State
2. Consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State
3. Alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

**Research Questions:** The study attempted to answer the following research question

1. What are the roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?
2. What are the consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?
3. What are the alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?

### **Hypothesis**

#### **Null Hypothesis:**

1. There is no statistically significant difference in the mean responses based on gender on the roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State
2. There is no statistically significant disparity in the mean scores of the perceptions of male and female respondents on the consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State
3. There is an absence of statistically marked discrepancy between the mean score of male and female views on the alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

## **II. Materials and Methods**

The current study employed descriptive survey design with the collection of quantitative data. Target population for the current study consisted of 7142 teachers in Rivers State Senior Secondary schools comprising of 3681 males and 3461 females. A sample size of 400 respondents was drawn from the said population using Taro Yamane formula. Stratified random sampling technique was used to identify the schools as well the proportions

sampled. A combination of primary and secondary data sources were utilized in this study. Self-structured Questionnaires titled “Managing Students without Coercion in an Era of No Corporal Punishment Questionnaire (MSWCENCP)” was used for data collection. The study instrument adopted the modified 4 point likert scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree on a numeric scale of 4,3,2&1 respectively. A criterion mean of 2.5 was used to answer the research questions while independent sample t-test was used for the test of significance at an alpha level of 5%. SPSS version 21 was used to calculate for mean, standard deviation and t-test. To ensure validity, the researcher developed the instruments with the help of expert judgment of supervisors.

### III. Results

**Research Question 1:** What are the Roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?

Table 1: Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

/N	Roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment)	Male Mean	N=23 7 SD	Remark	Female	N=16 3 SD	Remark
1	Corporal punishment is a positive disciplinary method borne out of love	3.24	0.559	Agreed	2.96	0.512	Agreed
2	I was subjected to coercive measure and suffered negativity then as a student	2.08	0.548	Disagreed	2.51	0.548	Agreed
3	Corporal punishment in schools is a vital efficacious, non-injurious technique of training and discipline	2.43	0.687	Disagreed	2.11	0.694	Disagreed
4	For many students, physical punishment is the only technique left to preserve academic and behavioural control.	2.96	1.008 7	Agreed	3.45	0.965	Agreed
5	Removal of corporal punishment causes greater disciplinary difficulty in our schools and reduced teacher security	3.06	0.775	Agreed	3.21	0.685	Agreed
6	Corporal punishment is only used as a “last resort” for correction when all else has failed	2.89	0.616	Agreed	2.94	0.64	Agreed
7	Students are better-controlled, learn appropriate appreciation for authority, develop better social skills, as well as improved moral character, and learn to better discipline themselves.	3.45	0.595	Agreed	3.05	0.588	Agreed
8	Students learn to control unwanted behavior through the use of coercive techniques	2.77	0.735	Agreed	2.67	0.754	Agreed

9	Non-corporal forms of discipline simply do not work	1.96	0.791	Disagreed	3.17	0.808	Agreed
	Total	24.84	6.31		26.07	6.19	
	Grand Mean	2.760	.7016	Agreed	2.897	.6882	Agreed

Source: Field Survey (2020).

Table 1: presented Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State. Nine (9) items were used to respond to the construct for research question 1. Report from the study shows that. about eight (8) items were agreed upon by the respondents irrespective of the group. However, the male and female respondents showed nonconformity in two (2) of the items while there was a mutual disagreement on an item by both males and females. Also, the grand mean depicts agreement by the two independent groups. See table 1 for detail.

**Research Question 2:** What are the Consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?

Table 2: Mean and Standard Deviation of Consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

S/N	Consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment)	Male	SD	Remark	Female	SD	Remark
10	Punished Students become more rebellious and are more likely to demonstrate vindictive behaviour, seeking retribution against school officials and others in society	2.65	0.88	Agreed	2.75	0.686	Agreed
11	Aware of the deleterious short- and long-term consequences of corporal punishment.	2.58	0.453	Agreed	2.68	0.524	Agreed
12	Victimized students have difficulty sleeping, fatigue, feelings of sadness and worthlessness, suicidal thoughts, anxiety episodes, increased anger with feelings of resentment and outbursts of aggression, deteriorating peer relationships, difficulty with concentration, lowered school achievement, antisocial behaviour	3.14	0.567	Agreed	2.84	0.638	Agreed
13	Intense dislike of school authority, somatic complaints, a tendency for school avoidance and school drop-out, and other evidence of negative high-risk behaviour	2.65	0.694	Agreed	2.85	0.764	Agreed
14	Operant aggression of punished student (a direct verbal or physical attack against the punishment source) with the intent is to destroy or immobilize that source to prevent delivery of further punishment.	3.25	0.621	Agreed	3.67	0.809	Agreed

15	Physical attack on teacher	2.43	0.662	Disagreed	3.09	0.766	Agreed
16	Corporal punishment causes physical abuse and attracts medical attention like Educationally Induced Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (EIPSD)	2.17	0.684	Disagreed	2.31	1.106	Disagreed
17	Medical complications may prevent students from returning to school for days, weeks, or even longer.	2.35	0.781	Disagreed	2.11	0.651	Disagreed
18	Students who are victims of corporal punishment do not learn to adopt societal values and attitudes as his or her own and is not motivated by intrinsic or internal factors; rather, they learn to elude detection, and to use violence as a means to influence others	2.63	0.662	Agreed	2.56	0.776	Agreed
19	These victims of aggressive acts eventually learn via modelling to initiate aggressive interchanges.	2.58	0.694	Agreed	2.51	0.801	Agreed
	Total	26.43	6.70		27.37	7.52	
	Grand Mean	2.6430	.6698	Agreed	2.737	.752	Agreed

Source: Field Survey (2020).

Table 2 presented some perceived consequences of coercion-corporal punishment based on the responses from the teachers. Summarily, the teachers had mutual agreements in items 10, 11, 12, 14 & 19. Nonetheless, male teachers disagreed on 'Physical attack on teacher' (mean=2.43) while female teachers agreed on that (mean=3.09). But both groups disagreed on "Corporal punishment causes physical abuse and attracts medical attention like Educationally Induced Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (EIPSD)- with mean scores of 2.17 and 2.31 for male and females correspondingly; & Medical complications may prevent students from returning to school for days, weeks, or even longer- with mean values of 2.35 & 2.11 for males and females respectively". However, the study confirms an indication of common agreement in general with a grand mean±SD of 2.6430±.6698 and 2.737±.752 for male and female respondents in that order. This implies that the two groups have the same opinion on the consequences of coercion in managing secondary school students.

**Research Question 3:** What are the Alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation of Alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

S/N	Alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State	Male	SD	Remark	Female	SD	Remark
20	Present educational material that is stimulating to the students aimed at their ability levels is a soft option	3.45	0.668	Agreed	3.50	0.797	Agreed
21	Involvement/participation of Students, as well as their parents in decision-making about school issues	2.78	0.78	Agreed	2.94	0.714	Agreed

	affecting them, including educational goals and disciplinary rules.						
22	Most students prefer and may benefit from alternative academic courses	2.37	0.687	Disagreed	2.61	0.698	Agreed
23	Peer support programs that utilize techniques such as Rap Groups and Socio-drama to encourage acceptable behaviour.	2.64	1.002	Agreed	2.75	0.748	Agreed
24	Nonviolent disciplinary techniques like soft verbal reproofs, extinction are not helpful	3.31	0.595	Agreed	1.87	0.709	Disagreed
24	Non coercion method like social isolation, grounding deal with the students	3.41	0.719	Agreed	3.68	0.809	Agreed
26	Student self-governance offers an alternative means for constructive management of selected problem behaviours in the classroom.	2.80	0.759	Agreed	2.95	0.766	Agreed
27	Use of school counsellors	2.99	0.764	Agreed	3.15	0.806	Agreed
28	Exclusion-In-school suspension for students requiring such measures.	3.03	0.751	Agreed	3.22	0.674	Agreed
29	School policy de-emphasize the necessity for corporal punishment.	2.68	0.70	Agreed	2.89	0.676	Agreed
30	Inclusion-Persistent use of intangible rewards (as love, praise, and attention by the teacher) for appropriate behaviour	2.89	0.798	Agreed	3.36	0.681	Agreed
	Total	32.35	8.22		32.92	8.08	
	Grand Mean	2.9409	.747	Agreed	2.99	.7344	Agreed

*Source: Field Survey, 2020.*

The outcome of Research Question 3 “What are the Alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?” is demonstrated on Table 3 (items 20 -30). The respondents (male and female teachers) shared similar opinions in many as well as differing views in a few. The males disagreed (Mean=2.37) with the fact that “Most students prefer and may benefit from alternative academic courses” as an alternative tool to coercion in student management in secondary school whereas, the females (Mean=2.61) agreed with the concept. However, the female teachers disagreed on “Nonviolent disciplinary techniques like soft verbal reproofs, extinction are not helpful” while the outcome of Research Question 3 “What are the Alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State?” is demonstrated on Table 3 (items 20 -30). The respondents (male and

female teachers) shared similar opinions in many as well as differing views in a few. The males disagreed (Mean=2.37) with the fact that “Most students prefer and may benefit from alternative academic courses” as an alternative tool to coercion in student management in secondary school whereas, the females (Mean=2.61) agreed with the concept. However, the female teachers disagreed on “Nonviolent disciplinary techniques like soft verbal reproofs, extinction are not helpful” while the male teachers had a contrary view. Furthermore, both gender agreed on other items with respect to alternatives to coercion in this era of no corporal punishment. Notably a grand mean of 2.9409 and 2.99 for males and females for all items that measured the construct proves an overall agreement by both genders. See table 3 for details.

**Null Hypothesis 1:** there is no statistically significant difference in the mean responses based on gender on the roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

**Table 4:** z- test statistics of the mean responses based on gender on the roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

Variable	N	Mean	SD	p-value	z-calculated	z-critical	Decision
Male	237	2.760	0.702	P>0.05	1.94	1.96	<b>Ho Retained</b>
Female	163	2.897	0.688				

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

Table 4 represent the null hypothesis 1 with mean±SD as 2.760±0.702 and 2.897±0.688 for male (N=237) and female (N=163) respondents respectively, the result showed an insignificant ( $Z_{cal}=1.94$ ;  $Z_{crit}=1.96$ ;  $p>0.05$ ) mean difference in the responses based on gender on the roles of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State. This implies that the opinions of both male and female did not differ thus, the null hypothesis of no difference was retained.

**Null Hypothesis 2:** there is no statistically significant disparity in the mean scores of the perceptions of male and female respondents on the consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

**Table 5:** z- test statistics of the perceptions of male and female respondents on the consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

Variable	N	Mean	SD	p-value	z-calculated	z-critical	Decision
Male	237	2.643	0.669	P>0.05	1.29	1.96	<b>Failed to Reject Ho</b>
Female	163	2.737	0.752				

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

Table 5 shows z- test statistics of the perceptions of male and female respondents on the consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State. The result revealed  $Z_{cal}=1.29<Z_{crit}=1.96$ ,  $p>0.05$  and mean perception of males as 2.643±0.669, N=263 and females as 2.737±0.752, N=163. The study failed to reject the null hypothesis of no statistically significant



disparity in the mean scores of the perceptions of male and female respondents on the consequences of coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State. This means that both male and females shared similar views.

**Null Hypothesis 3:** there is an absence of statistically marked discrepancy between the mean score of male and female views on the alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

**Table 6:** z- test statistics of male and female views on the alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State

Variable	N	Mean	SD	p-value	z-calculated	z-critical	Decision
Male	237	2.941	0.747	P>0.05	0.66	1.96	Failed to Reject Ho
Female	163	2.990	0.734				

Source: Field Survey, 2020.

Table 6 illustrates Ho3 which appeared to be correct after the test of hypothesis, the study observed an absence of statistically marked discrepancy between the mean score of male and female views on the alternatives to coercive measure (corporal punishment) in managing students in secondary schools in Rivers State ( $Z_{cal}=0.66 < Z_{crit}=1.96$ ,  $p>0.05$ ). Therefore, the researcher failed to reject the Ho because the views of male respondents equals that of their female counterparts.

### Discussion

Generally, results obtained from this study showed the role of coercive measure with respect to corporal punishment as a method for managing student behaviour with enormous agreement by the two groups (respondents). However, the various groups (male and female) disagree on the issue of the consequences of corporal punishment. Nonetheless, both male and females shared similar opinions on the non-coercive alternatives.

Specifically, the roles of corporal punishment as a coercive measure in managing students behaviour as identified in this study is comparable with earlier studies. From an observation view point, teachers tend to employ such measures for correction and some argued the effectiveness of the alternative measures. This did not differ in a separate study by Kavula (2014; Nakpodia, 2012; Sorrel, 2013). Nakpodia (2012) and Kindiki (2015) reported that classroom management is challenging in the absence of coercive measure especially in this era of no corporal punishment. The awareness of this law by the students have caused an increase in misconduct routinely since the law prohibits teachers from using corporal punishment.

Further findings from this study revealed the role of coercive measure-corporal punishment in managing student behaviour as identified by the respondents which were all secondary school teachers as seen in objective 1. The research question 1 and hypothesis 1 which showed strong agreement when the construct was analysed is evidence that, teachers in public secondary schools still prefer corporal punishment. According to them, it is borne out of love with the intention of correcting students. This however, may not be free from bias as the study only included teachers as respondents. This is in harmony with different studies (Grusec&Goodnow, 2014; Kindiki, 2015). On the other hand, Gershoff (2012) said coercive measures affect mental health.

The findings from this study suggest willingness of teachers to try the alternative measures; this was shown on the responses on the third objectives. Notably, non-coercion in behavioural management is not a recent

development rather it's been there from eighties and nineties. There are several alternatives to coercive measure proven to be effective in managing behaviour as reported in this study and from the review of literatures. Teachers are encouraged to apply the strategies for better management of students especially in this period. Exclusion as reported in earlier study (Welch & Payne, 2012; Sorrel, 2013) promised to be helpful as this present study showed that in-school suspension could be a good alternative. This is not completely free from criticism (Zaccaro, 2014; Bejarano, 2014). Nonetheless, some respondents felt certain about the method in this current study and this is backed up by other studies Agesa (2015).

However, Roache, Joel, Lewis and Ramon (2011) indicated that inclusive method is more useful. Inclusive method such as rewards which was identified as alternative to corporal punishment appears same with the study of Roache, Joel, Lewis and Ramon (2011) in Australia. Non coercive measure of behavioural management includes assertiveness. Effective communication is an important technique in maintaining classroom control. It provides a background in which the teacher displays an attitude of value for the students. In addition, teachers can have knowledge of student. Besides, it is essential to present educational material that is stimulating to the students and is aimed at their ability levels. Some students may benefit from alternative academic programmes, subjects, and these should be offered. Also, collaborative effect of student and parents should not be undermined. Students, as well as their parents, should be carefully involved in decision-making about school issues affecting them, including educational goals and disciplines. Moreover, schools should have peer support programs that utilize techniques such as debate society, JET clubs, drama and more to encourage acceptable behavior. Furthermore, some evidence suggests that student self-governance like student union, offers an alternative means for constructive management of selected problem behaviors in the classroom (Lewis, 2015).

The application of nonviolent methods in managing students behaviour is now an option of choice for teachers irrespective of how and what they feel about the conventional coercive means. It is important to note that, students today come to school with a diverse orientation and bias than past generations. The world is dynamic and conventional; students disciplining approaches are no longer thriving. All forms of discipline cum corrective measures today are seen as abuses. There is a myth about corporal punishment which is that, corporal punishment is a more effective tool. This negative, coercive discipline and punishment approach is based on the belief that it is necessary to cause suffering to correct or teach. Currently, people have argued this proposing that people learn better when they feel better, not when they feel hurt or worse. Chronic exposure could cause hardness and punishment loses its effectiveness when students are not afraid. This is due to the fact that coercion breeds resentment. In addition, if students behave because they are forced to behave, the teacher has not really succeeded. Students should behave because they want to or not because they have to, in order to avoid punishment. It is imperative to note that, students are not changed forcefully. Students can be coerced into temporary compliance otherwise known as forced obedience. The role of internal motivation cannot be downplayed since it is about willingness of the student to make informed decision than been coerced, it last longer and effective. Coercion as a tool is not a lasting change agent. Once the punishment is over, the student feels free and clear. The way to influence people toward internal rather than external motivation is through positive, non-coercive interaction.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The study concluded that there is need for trial of modern alternatives to coercive measure especially now that teachers are faced with the ban and the fact that coercive measures like corporal punishment in schools is an ineffective, dangerous, and unacceptable method of discipline currently. Also, the use of corporal punishment in the school reinforces physical aggression as an acceptable and effective means of eliminating unwanted behavior even in the larger society. The researcher therefore, recommended the application of the identified alternatives even those beyond the scope of this study and urge that nonviolent methods of classroom control be utilized in the school systems.

**References**

- [1.] Agnesa,R. (2015). *Effectiveness of alternative disciplinary strategies used in secondary schools in starehe division, Nairobi county* .(Master's Thesis) University Of Nairobi.
- [2.] Bajarano, M.(2014). *The role of race in zero tolerance in exclusionary discipline* (phD Thesis) University of central Florida Orlando, Florida.
- [3.] Corsine, R. J. (1987). *Concise Encyclopaedia of Psychology*. New York: John Wiley and Sons Pearson.
- [4.] Grusec, J.E. and Goodnow, J.J. (2014). Impact of parental discipline methods on the child's internalization of values (A reconceptualization of current points of view). *Develop Psychol.* 30: 4-19.
- [5.] Gershoff, E.T. (2012). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences (A meta-analytic and theoretical review). *Psychol Bull.* 128, 539-537.
- [6.] Herman, D.M.(1985). A statutory proposal to prohibit the infliction of violence upon children. *Family Law Quarterly Journal (FLQ)*. 1(19), 1-42
- [7.] Huesman, L.R. &Podolski, C.L. (2013).Punishment : a psychological perspective . In McConville,.S. (Eds.) *The use of punishment* (55-62). London: Routledge.
- [8.] Hyman, I.A. (1988). Eliminating corporal punishments in schools : moving from advocacy research to policy implementation. *Child legal right.* 9: 14-20
- [9.] Hyman, I.A., Zelikoff,W. & Clark, J. (1988). Psychological and physical abuse in the schools: A paradigm for understanding post-traumatic stress disorders in children and youth. *Journal of Traumatic Stress (JTS)*. 1 (1), 243-266.
- [10.] Iqbal, N. (2003) Rights-pakistan: Call to spare the rod grows louder.*Global Information Network*.New york
- [11.] Kavula, M. (2014).*Effects of principals' alternative disciplinary methods on students discipline in secondary schools in kitui county*. (phD Thesis) university of Nairobi.
- [12.] Kindiki, J. (2015). Investigating police implication for the abolition of corporal punishment in secondary schools in kenya. *International Journal of Educational Administration policy studies (IJEAP)*. 7 (3), 72-82.
- [13.] Lewis, C. (2015). The roots of discipline in Japanese preschools (Meeting children's needs for friendship and contribution). *Advances Early Educ Day Care.* 6, 269–278.
- [14.] Mohrbutter, T.L. (2011). *In-School-Suspension: A quality assessment of principals' perception*. (phD Dissertation).North Carolina state University.
- [15.] Mugabe,J.&Maphosa, D. (2013). Methods of curbing learners misconduct in Zimbabwean secondary schools .*Journal of New Trends in Education and their Implication*.1 (1) , 111-122.
- [16.] Nakapodia, E.D. (2012). Teachers' disciplinary approaches to students discipline problems in Nigeria secondary schools. *Global Journal of Human Social science, linguistic and education* .12 (11), 144-151
- [17.] National association of school psychologists NASP (2006).*Corporal punishment:* (position statement).Bethsed, M.D, author.
- [18.] Ng, O. (2015).*Errorlessclassroom management: success focused proactive intervention for students with challenging behaviours*.(PhD Thesis) University of Toronto
- [19.] Onyango P. A., Raburu, P. & Peter J.O.A. (2016). Alternative corrective measures used in managing student behavior problems in secondary schools in bondo sub county, Kenya. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences (MJSS)* 7 (1), 527 – 537.
- [20.] Poole, S.R., Ushokow, M.C. & Nader, P.R. (1991). The role of the pediatrician in abolishing corporal punishment in schools. *Pediatrics.* 88, 162–169
- [21.] Roache, Joel, Lewis and Ramon (2011).Teachers' views on the impact of classroom management on student responsibility.*Australian Journal of Education.* 2 (4), 23-27.
- [22.] Rosenhan, D. &Seligman (1995). *Abnormal Psychology*.(3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). New York: W.W. Norton and Company. 35-38.

- [23.] Sorell, M. (2013). *Conscious discipline implementation: A case study on teacher management of chronic problem behaviours*. (PhD Thesis) Western Carolina University
- [24.] Straus, M.A. & Mouradian, V.E. (2000). Impulsive corporal punishment by mothers and antisocial behavior and impulsiveness of children. *Behavioral science and law journal* (behav Sci law). 1 (16), 353-374.
- [25.] Welch, K. & Payne, A. (2012). Exclusionary school punishment: the effect of racial threat on expulsion and suspension. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. 10(2), 155-171
- [26.] Williams, G. (1998). *Managing students without coercion*. Rev. ed. New York: Harperperennial.
- [27.] Yaworski, L. (2012). *Corporal Punishment: Schools Ask, "Spare The Rod or Use It?"* (Master's thesis) Brockport State University of New York.
- [28.] Zaccaro, T. (2014). *Unregulated, untrained, unaware: Restraint and seclusion practices in educational setting*. Electronic Thesis and Dissertation, paper 45.