

THE BANNING OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM AND THE CREATION OF THE DESIRED SOCIETY IN MODERN WORLD: THE RAGING CONTROVERSIES

Authors

Jean Claude Zigama ⁽¹⁾; Patrick Acleus Kafu ⁽²⁾

Main Author's Email: jczigama@kabarak.ac.ke

(1.) Kabarak University, Kenya; (2.) University of Eldoret, Kenya.

Cite this article in APA

Zigama, J. C., & Kafu, P. A. (2025). The banning of corporal punishment in the school system and the creation of the desired society in modern world: The raging controversies. *Journal of education management and leadership*, 4(1), 19-32. <https://doi.org/10.51317/jeml.v4i1.697>



A publication of Editon Consortium Publishing (online)

Article history

Received: 05.03.2025

Accepted: 03.04.2025

Published: 02.05.2025

Scan this QR to read the paper online



Copyright: ©2025 by the author(s). This article is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).



Abstract

This paper examines the longstanding practice of school discipline, a fundamental aspect of educational management that has evolved over the centuries. It also explores the controversies surrounding the decision to out-law corporal punishment and its potential impact on the development of a disciplined and cohesive society. It also investigates the implications of this shift for the modern educational system. School discipline has traditionally been seen as a means to control students' behaviour while fostering the development of desirable character traits. The discipline is believed to prepare learners for their future roles in society. Teachers, who are primarily responsible for creating and enforcing discipline policies, have employed a variety of disciplinary approaches, including corporal and psychological forms. Among these, corporal punishment has been the most widely used, often ranging from mild to severe measures, and is viewed by some as a necessary means to maintain order. However, corporal punishment is frequently associated with potential harm, including physical injury, and is sometimes labelled as violent. In response to these concerns, the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) recommended in 1991 the abolition of corporal punishment in schools. This recommendation has sparked significant debate among key stakeholders in education, many of whom argue that banning corporal punishment is inappropriate. The significance of this paper lies in its contribution to the ongoing discourse on how school discipline shapes not only individual student development but also the broader societal fabric, fostering a stable, progressive, and well-disciplined society.

Key terms: Corporal punishment, development and creation, desired society, modern world, raging controversies.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Discipline has been an established feature in the management of education since time immemorial (Human Rights Watch, 2008). Its long standing purpose is to control learners in school setting, develop the desired character in the learners and prepare these learners for their expected roles in the development of the society when they grow up as adults. Since discipline forms the basis of the efficiency in the management of school education and promotion of the desired quality of education, teachers take these aspects of education seriously.

Generally, different forms of discipline are designed, developed, and administered in the school education system. According to the Society for Adolescents Medicine (2003) and the United States of America Department of Education (2001), there are two forms of school discipline commonly used in the administration of school education. Namely corporal (physical) punishment and psychological (non-physical) punishment. Vaughn (2006) defines corporal punishment as physical inflicted upon the learner/student who has participated in various rule infractions ranging from fighting a classmate to skipping school. But Maphosa and Shumba (2010) view corporal punishment as violent brutality meted out on a learner and/or any other agent of the school education system. This form of school discipline is normally the violent/ brutal form of discipline that is usually intended to inflict bodily pain on the learner.

However, the psychological forms of school punishment are usually described as softer/lighter" forms of school discipline that involve the use of alternative methods to corporal punishment of disciplining learners in school (Kindiki, 2009). Each of these two forms of school discipline has a wide range of types of punishment. For example, corporal punishment involves caning, whipping, spanking, shaking, pinching, use of electric shock, forcing the learners to partake in certain body postures for extended periods of time and/or excluding a learner from participating in a scheduled activity but psychological form of school discipline include guidance and counselling, suspension or expulsion from school, use of manual work like uprooting stumps, summons before the school management authorities, fines, detention and/or involvement of the use of the police (Wang'o & Ndung'u, 2003). The preference of the teachers to use any of the two forms of school discipline is usually determined by the anticipated effect, the competence of the teacher and the nature of the misdemeanour/ offence committed by the learners.

Raj (2001), in his work "understand corporal punishment in India", says teachers commonly use corporal punishment in school because it is easier, cheaper and more convenient to administer than the alternative methods of discipline. Further, he states that the effect of this form of punishment on the behaviour of learners is normally almost immediate. However, what makes corporal punishment unacceptable to some quarters of the stakeholders in education are excesses in its use, which occasionally causes body injuries to learners and even the death of learners. This is what resulted in the call for the ban/out-law of corporal punishment in school (Makhasane & Chikoko, 2016); it is the observed excesses in the administration of corporal punishment that made Agbenyaga (2006) refer to this punishment as "violence" against learners by school teachers. This is what agitated the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (1991) to call for the banning/out-lawing of this form of punishment in schools.

Journal of Education Management and Leadership

However, the decision to ban this form of punishment has generated a lot of controversy, which has formed the basis for the discussion of this paper. School teachers, parents, and a large proportion of school education managers have not agreed with this decision (Paintal, 2007). To them, the decision was made without proper consultation.

Given the above view, the present paper discusses the controversies surrounding the global banning/outlawing of corporal punishment in school education. However, to be able to discuss these controversies adequately, there is a need to examine other related issues like the concept of school discipline, the genesis/causes and/or triggers of the use of corporal punishment in the management of school education.

The commonly used/administered types of corporal punishment in schools, the effects of corporal punishment in the management of modern school education, the importance of banning/out-lawing corporal punishment in school education system, and the way forward in management of education in post-banning/out-lawing corporal punishment in school. These issues provide the build-up/background information to the raging controversies concerning/surrounding the banning/outlawing of this form of punishment in school education management. These aspects of school discipline are briefly discussed in the following sections of the paper.

Concept of Discipline and Other Related Concepts

Generally, discipline is conceived as the practice of training people/individuals to obey rules and regulations or a code of ethics and conduct using some form of punishment to correct disobedience/misdemeanour/misbehaviour.

In other words, discipline is an ethical/moral phenomenon in humanity that involves the design, development, and adherence to established guidelines and/or rules and regulations governing the operations of the community/organisation and/or institution (Bourdieu, 1977). More often than not, discipline is culture-based/specific/related. That is, discipline is designed, developed, and administered according to the established and practised culture of the community/organisation and institution. For example, there are forms of discipline, such as school discipline, armed forces, and military discipline. Which are different in detail but the developed and established cultures in different organisations and institutions (Govender & Sookrajh, 2014).

In the case of school discipline, which is the subject of discussion in the present paper, there are two distinct forms of discipline commonly used to control learners in schools, namely, corporal punishment and psychological punishment, also known as the alternative methods of discipline to corporal punishment. These two forms of discipline are somehow different in nature and practice, though they are similar in that they both focus on correcting the learner's behaviour/conduct. According to the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC, 2001), corporal punishment is any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light to the recipient affected victim. This view of corporal punishment is corroborated by Crawage (2005).

However, in his case, he refers to this form of punishment as "school violence" meted out to learners by teachers courtesy of exercising their power/authority over these learners. But Prinsloo and Nesor (2004) consider corporal punishment as an intentional physical condition and/or act meted out to learners by school teachers. No wonder many learners view corporal punishment as a "butchering experience" in school education management. However, the psychological form of punishment, comprising a variety of alternative methods of controlling learners in school and corporal punishment, is considered a "softer" and/or humane form of punishment to administer to learners. This form of punishment does not involve the use of physical force or chastisement on learners by teachers. It focuses on the use of guidance and counselling services, isolation/separation of learners found to misbehave from others, imposing appropriate fines on miscreants, suspension and expulsion of learners, subjecting misbehaving learners to physical exercises like running around a playfield and kneeling down wide with raised hand for an extended period, use of manual work like uprooting stumps of trees etc. (Kindiki, 2009).

It is the nature and practice of corporal punishment, which is always viewed as a brutal, violent and/or "butchering experience" for learners, that led to calls by educational psychologists, human rights activists and other concerned stakeholders in education to ban/out-law it altogether in school education management system. However, because of its well established status in management of school education has generated a lot of controversies especially when this coupled with the genesis/origins/causes and/or triggers of the use of corporal punishment as discussed herein below.

The Genesis/Origins/Causes/Triggers of the use of Corporal Punishment in School.

Studies on the use of corporal punishment in schools reveal a wide variety of origins/genesis as well as causes/triggers of this form of school discipline (Human Rights Watch, 2008). Among some other established origins/genesis and causes/triggers of the use of corporal punishment that are equally controversial are cultural practices, faith-based doctrines on the use of corporal punishment, the latent culture that influences teachers to use this form of punishment in schools, the mental health (neurosis) status of teachers and/or emerging issues/developments in the modern world and especially social media. All these factors have tended to have some impact on the persistent use of corporal punishment and call for its ban/out-law in school education management (Measor & Wood, 1985; Morrell, 2001; Agbenyega, 2006; Kindiki, 2009; Raj, 2011; Govender & Sookrajh, 2014; Tiwari, 2015).

Culturally, studies show that some societies believe that children are born with demons/evil spirits and, therefore, they should be beaten to drive out these evil spirits from them. This is the same view held by the Christian faith in their doctrine that children are born with original sin, and this is what makes them misbehave. Hence, they need to discipline them. In fact, this is the origin of the cherished biblical adage that "spare the rod and spoil the child"; the same view is held by Indian and Ghanaian societies (Tiwari, 2015; Agbenyega, 2006).

In the case of latent culture, which focuses on the experiences of schoolteachers of corporal punishment during their pupilhood period, studies show that such teachers tend to use this form of punishment as an established practice, revenge and/or exercise of authority over learners (Raj, 2011; Govender & Sookrajh, 2014). In this case, such teachers take pleasure in using corporal punishment on learners in schools (Mophosa & Shumba, 2010).

However, there has been a long-held belief with its origin from the great thinkers in Education like Pestalozzi (Beatty, 1995) who thought/felt that children are miniature adults "who deserve beating/hitting and/or canning when they commit the offence. In other words, they should be treated as adults whereby violence/brutal treatment should be meted out to them whenever a situation is warranted.

Besides, studies have demonstrated that in some instances, teachers who use corporal punishment in schools are neurotic. In other words, these are teachers who are mentally sick and, therefore, should not be allowed to come into contact with learners (Bourdieu, 1977). It was the establishment of this fact concerning the mental status of teachers that led to the introduction medical examination for teacher-aspirants management of teacher education in the nineteen sixties (1960s).

But the emerging issues/developments in education and modern society seem to have a great impact on the development and use of corporal punishment in schools and have also given impetus to the calls for the banning/out-lawing of this form of punishment in the school education system (Trotman & Kerr,2001). Some of the emerging issues like globalisation process, social media and the emerging teacher-learner character have had great impact on the use of corporal punishment in school and have also equally generated negative attitude towards this form of school discipline in modern society.

Close examination of the above origins/genesis and triggers/causes of the use of corporal punishment in school clearly provides the potential for the effects and corresponding controversies of using/administering corporal punishment in schools. Also implicit in these origins/genesis and causes/triggers of this form of school discipline are the commonly used/administered types of corporal punishment by teachers in schools (Bos & Vaughn, 2006).

Commonly Used/ Administered Types of Corporal Punishment by Teachers in Schools

According to the United States Department of Education (2001 a), Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003) and Bos and Vaughn (2006), the commonly used/administered corporal punishment by teachers in schools includes canning/whipping of learners, hitting/slapping/boxing, kicking/shaking, pinching/pulling of ears, using electronic shocks and/or forcing learners to partake in certain physical postures for extended period of like kneeling with both hands raised up, physical exercise like running several times around the field grounds; etc. All these types of corporal punishment preferred by the teachers reflect cultural practices, the latent culture of teachers, biblical/koranic, deep-rooted teacher's habitus, authoritarian behaviour, mental health and/or colonial legacy of authoritarian education practices.

However, all these types of corporal punishment have common features when used to control learners. They usually inflict pain on learners, tend to cause body injuries/harm and occasionally result in the death of learners. Further, these types of corporal punishment cause long, detrimental psychological outcomes such as conduct disorders, fear of aggression, and the inability of learners to utilise problem-solving skills (Society for Adolescents Medicine, 2003). It is the nature and the practices of administering these types of corporal punishment that have not only determined their effect on school

discipline but also led to the banning/outlawing of corporal punishment in the management of school education (Yancy, 2001).

Effects of Administering/using and/or Banning/out-lawing the Use/administration of Corporal Punishment in School.

This section of the paper examines the impact/influence of administering/using and the banning/outlawing of the administration/use of corporal punishment in school. In other words, the focus is on the positive and negative effects of this process in the management of modern school education, the analysis that can be extended to the view of the proponents and opponents of the decision by the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (1991) to recommend the banning/out-lawing of the use of corporal punishment in school. Generally, the arguments advanced by the protagonist on the divide of the scenario are somehow convincing.

In this case, the proponents (supporters) of the decision to ban/outlaw corporal punishment in school argue that this form of punishment was against the principles and practice of Human Rights, especially Child Rights, as enshrined in the Human Rights of UNO of 1945. The opponents of this decision further argue that corporal punishment is an exercise of authority over learners(Kindiki,2009), which, in the long run, tends to prepare and produce radicals and hardcore criminals in modern society. Therefore, for this group of people, the use of alternative methods to corporal punishment will facilitate the preparation and production of individuals who are humane in outlook and desirable citizens in modern society. In other words, there is a likelihood of developing and creating society of well disciplined people.

However, the opponents (those opposed to) of this decision of banning/outlawing the use of corporal punishment in the school education management system have many ramifications. First, it has tended to promote the increase of indiscipline among learners in school. Secondly, the suggested alternative methods of discipline to corporal punishment in the school education management system are reported not to be working (Maphosa & Shumba, 2010; Kindiki, 2009). This is because the alternative methods are new developments in the management of school education discipline; they are not time-tested like corporal punishment, which has been associated with the management of education since time immemorial. Besides, the banning/out-lawing of corporal punishment in schools seems to be a policy on paper but not in practice. This form of punishment is still widely practised in schools in many parts of the world (National Council for Protection of the Child Rights in India, 2011; Ogbe, 2015; U.S Department of Education, 2001; Kennedy, 1995; Kindiki, 2009).

This situation is exacerbated by the existing cultural practices, colonial legacy in the case of modern Africa, faith-based doctrines concerning the discipline of children and/or the mental status of practising teachers in modern schools (Yancy, 2001; Hayman, 1995; Society for Adolescents Medicine, 2003). Of great concern to the opponents of the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment in schools is that the decision to ban/out-law it was not properly thought out as it was not a reflection of the character of the modern world that is riddled with a myriad of interesting, emerging issues/developments that does not immediate solutions. These features have compromised the development and administration of the desired ethics that are supposed to form the basis for conducting school discipline in the school education management system globally.

The position taken by the two protagonists on the decision (proponents and opponents) form perfect basis for discussing the importance of banning/out-lawing corporal punishment in schools. This is because it is possible to identify the key issues underlying the decision to ban/out-law this form of punishment and its implications for the management of school discipline in contemporary educational settings.

Importance of Banning/Out-lawing Corporal Punishment in the Management of Modern School Education System

This section of the paper is designed to discuss the need for banning/outlawing corporal punishment in schools, the role of this decision in managing school discipline in school today and the value of banning/outlawing this form of punishment in school today.

The facts of the importance of banning/out-lawing corporal punishment in the school education management system, as outlined herein below, are derived from divisive arguments of two opposing camps, proponents and opponents, concerning the decision to ban/out-law this form of punishment in schools in 1991 (United Nations Committee on the Rights of Child,1991). Consequently, the educational importance of this decision is as outlined in the discussion that follows;

1. There is a need to re-think how modern school discipline should be managed in the absence of corporal punishment, which has been an established feature and practice in the management of the school education system. Another cause of worry is that even the suggested alternative methods of school discipline to corporal punishment are said not to be effective at all (Maphosa & Shumba, 2010a). This leaves both the community and managers of modern education in a dilemma. Consequently, the two main stakeholders in education are back on the drawing table with regard to the administration of school discipline in schools.
2. The banning/out-lawing of corporal punishment is the underlying scenario of managing school discipline that needs urgent attention from managers of modern education. There are issues like the raging disagreements between the proponents and opponents of the decision to ban/out-lawing corporal punishment in school, the implementations of the ban/out-law decision of corporal punishment in schools, which appear to be a policy on paper but not in practice globally (Kindiki, 2009); the Habitus perspective of corporal punishment as advanced by Bourdieu(1977) which in simply terms means deep-rooted cultural conditioning of teachers and the community to support the use of corporal punishment in schools; then, there is the issue of who should be authorised to administer this form of punishment in school- any teacher, designated individual in the school setting and under what circumstances should this form of punishment be administered. These and other related issues are important in the decision to ban/outlaw this form of punishment in schools.
3. The banning/outlawing of corporal punishment in school has, in effect, broadened the base and scope of stakeholders in the management of school discipline. Traditionally, management of these aspects of education has been teacher-specific. It has always been the business of teachers to manage school discipline for the purpose of controlling learners. But the decision to ban/out-law this form of punishment has brought in new players like human rights and child rights activists, parents and other busy bodies have been brought on board in the process of managing school discipline. This development is most likely to create confusion in the management of discipline in schools, although it makes the management of this aspect of education an inclusive process.

4. The other importance of the decision to ban/out-law corporal punishment in schools is that it has facilitated the professionalisation and ethical operation of this process in the management of school education system. This development calls for re-tooling of stakeholders in management of school discipline with modern and relevant competence to undertake the new task of managing school discipline in schools today.

5. The banning/outlawing of corporal punishment in school has now brought in a new dimension in the management of school discipline - the humanisation of this process. This development is a departure from the entrenched practice of managing school punishment based on the habitus concept of punishment and militarism. Hence, there is a need to turn to humane alternative methods of managing school discipline like guidance and counselling, the use of fines, physical exercises and manual work to discipline learners in modern schools.

However, besides the discussion of the importance of the decision to ban/outlaw the use of corporal punishment in school, there is a need to examine the controversies generated by this action in relation to the management of school discipline today. These controversies are real and varied and need the urgent attention of the main stakeholders in education in general and school discipline in particular if the desired quality of education and, by extension, the development and creation of the desired society in the modern world is to be realised. So far, established controversies arising from the above decision are briefly presented in the following section of the paper.

Controversies Concerning the Banning/Out-Lawing of the Use of Corporal Punishment in School

These are the emerging issues and/or conflicting reactions of the stakeholders in education and especially school discipline concerning the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment in school. Among the notable controversies, though limited by the available space, include the following;

1. The timing of the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment on the recommendation of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (1991) and the Jomtien UNESCO Conference of 1990 that pushed for the banning/out-lawing of this form of punishment in schools. It was around the same period that activists Caucus like Human Rights (UNESCO,1983) and Child Rights (Jamtieus,1990) were gaining momentum in the fight against the use of this form of punishment in schools as it was considered a form of "Violence" and/or "Brutal treatment" by teachers against learners.

Unfortunately, the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment in schools was not taken at the right time. The decision was made during the period when there was an increased level of indiscipline in schools around the world. It was around this time when there were reports of learners carrying lethal weapons like guns and knives for self-defence and use against fellow learners and teachers (U.S Department of Education, 2001a). In Africa, this was the time that there was a spread of arson cases committed in schools by learners in Kenya (Kindiki, 2009) and increased violence between and among learners in South Africa (Maphosa & Shumba, 2010). Because of these incidents, there was bound to be resistance from the stakeholders in education in general and school discipline who believed that only corporal punishment could stamp out the widespread indiscipline in schools

2. Related to the timing of the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment in schools is the genesis/origins and/or triggers of this decision. Interestingly, the initiators of these actions were not professionals in education but activists like Human Rights and Child Rights (UNESCO, 1983). In facts, there was no proper and adequate consultations on this matter between the initiators of the

Journal of Education Management and Leadership

decision and the main stakeholders in education and especially school discipline who are presumably the teachers and managers of education (Bos & Vaughn, 2006). In other words, there was no consensus on this matter. Hence, there are emerging conflicts and sharp reactions from teachers who strongly believe corporal punishment is the most effective form of school discipline. This is the view held by authorities in education (Bos & Vaughn, 2006; Kindiki, 2009) and agencies of education (Human Rights Watch, 2008; U.S Department of Education, 2001a; Society for Adolescent Medicine, 2003)

3. Of great interest is the fact that corporal punishment is a well-established form of school discipline that cannot be wished away with a stroke of a pen. It is one form of school discipline that has been associated with management of education since time immemorial. It's a question. Therefore, banning/out-lawing its use in school is not a walk in the park as Harber and Muthukrishna (2000) have asserted. Consequently, the decision to do away this form of school discipline was not expected to be smooth.

4. As intimated elsewhere above, the genesis/origins and/or triggers of the decision to ban/out-law corporal punishment in schools was controversial. The initiators of this process were activists and other on-lookers on matters of education. Consequently, there was no proper preparation for launching the administration of this process in the management of school education. There were no support structures, including a policy framework to govern the administration of the decision to ban/outlaw the use of corporal punishment in schools, and technical, logistical, fiscal, and psychological support to facilitate the management of this highly controversial decision.

5. The influence of emerging issues and developments in education and modern society - such as increased sophistication, technological advancements that generate equally sophisticated artefacts for use in education, the globalisation of education and society, growing stakeholder involvement in education, and the changing characteristics of both teachers and learners - are major factors exacerbating the challenges of managing discipline in modern school systems.

6. The dilemma facing teachers and managers of education today is how to effectively control learners in school without the use of a cane/rod. These emerging issues/developments have made learners unruly and uncontrollable in modern school.

7. The mismatch between the policy on paper and policy in practices as articulated by Kindiki (2009) in his work, investigating policy implications for the abolition of corporal punishment in secondary school in Kenya. According to him and Alsaif (2015), Ismen (2021), the U.S Department of Education (2001a), Human Rights Watch (2008), the National Council for Protection of the Child Rights in India (2011) and Ogbe (2015), there is a huge gap between advocacies/wished for with regard to banning/out-lawing corporal punishment and what is actually being practised in the field.

Despite existing, elaborate policies banning/outlawing the use of corporal punishment in schools in many regions and/or countries of the world., as demonstrated by these authorities and agencies, this form of punishment is still widespread the world over. The question is, what happens when the member states of the international community are the ones who have committed themselves to ban/out-law this form of school discipline in their jurisdiction?

8. The existing mismatch between the policy and paper (the intended/wished for/advocacy) and the policy in practice (being done in the field) can be heavily attributed to the failure to design and conduct proper education on the use of alternative methods to corporal punishment in the management of school discipline in schools today. The main controversy is who should do this. That is the expertise. The present crop of teachers and managers of education who are direct products of

corporal discipline, courtesy of latent culture, are ill-equipped to provide the required education on the proposed alternative methods to corporal discipline.

9. The main strength of corporal punishment as a form of school discipline is that it has been around for use in education for some time. It has been associated with the management of school education from time immemorial. In other words, this form of punishment is an established feature in the management of school education, and it is time-tested by nature. It has well-established traditions, principles, and practices that guide its governance in school education management; unlike alternative methods, which are new developments in the management of school discipline, has no established traditions and principles and practices and, worse off, they are time-tested as an effective form of school discipline.

Consequently, their efficacy, efficiency and effectiveness as alternative methods to corporal punishment are in doubt. Many teachers and managers of education have little faith in them as forms of school discipline. Therefore, this facilitates the continued use of corporal punishment in schools around the world (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2010; Raj, 2011; Ogbu, 2015; Tiwari, 2015).

10. Just under forty years of its introduction and administration, the effect of banning/out-lawing corporal punishment in the management of school discipline is begging to show. Currently, there are reports of increased and/or widespread indiscipline cases in schools around the world. Learners appears to be uncontrollable, militant, disrespectful to teachers and destructive to school property (Kindiki, 2009; Prinsloo, 2008). This development confirms the importance of corporal punishment as a form of school discipline in the management of school education.

2.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusion: In the discussion and presentation of this paper on the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment in schools, a few critical conclusions on this matter can be made as follows:

Given the nature and practice of a corporal form of school discipline that has invariably been described as "violence, brutal/cruel/inhuman treatment" of learners by teachers, the banning/outlawing of the use of this punishment in school in 1991 was not timely but overdue. The use of this form of punishment in the management of school education was a contravention of the intentionally established communique on Human Rights and Child Rights as set out in the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (1991), United Nations Organisation States on Human Rights of 1945 and, the Jomtien UNESCO conference of 1990.

Though the decision to ban/out-law the use of the corporal form of school discipline was landed by Human Rights, Child Rights and Educational psychologists as the right direction in the "Humanisation" of the management of modern school education, it has been found to be replete with unsurmountable controversies as presented in this paper. These controversies are related to the governance of the decision to ban/out-law the use of this punishment in school, the influence of the existing cultural practices in education and society, the deep-rooted latent culture of corporal punishment in teachers and the emerging issues/development in education and modern society and their impact on the implementation of this decision worldwide. There is still resistance to the ban/out-law of the use of corporal punishment in schools. In fact, there exist repeats of continued use of this form of punishment in many parts of the world today.

Journal of Education Management and Leadership

Admittedly, the banning/out-lawing of the use of corporal punishment in schools is a delayed recognition that learners have been mistreated in the management school education system for rather too long and deserve to be treated/handled humanely in schools as expected by international agencies like UNESCO, UNICEF,...etc. It is a delayed recognition of this absurd feature in the management of the school education system because this form of punishment has been administered by teachers who pride themselves on being ethical professionals in education and especially in their teaching career, who should have known better the folly of this form of school discipline yet they have been the main perpetrators of this "barbaric" form of school discipline.

Another important conclusion that can be drawn from the discussion of this paper on the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment is that school discipline should reflect the emerging issues/developments in education and modern society. In other words, school discipline should always resonate with the emerging issues/developments when managing modern school discipline. Therefore, there is a need to think through when designing, developing and administering school discipline today. The key word, on the whole, is the relevancy of the designed and administered school discipline to the established and practised school education system and society.

The foregoing discussion, and especially the discussion focusing on controversies concerning and/or surrounding the banning/out-lawing the use of corporal punishment in schools, calls for the need to provide a way forward for the management of school discipline in post-banning/out-lawing the use corporal punishment in schools. This is developed and discussed in the section of the paper that follows:

Recommendations: This refers to the needed/required causes of action and/or strategies for the management of school discipline in the post-ban/out-law of corporal punishment in schools era in the modern world. Among the suggested courses of action to develop and adopt to manage school discipline during the present era include the following:

1.The development and administration of school discipline in schools is usually an ethical process that involves consideration of the cherished values/ethics of the society from which the practice education is derived, or it serves in general and those values/ethics of education itself specifically. Therefore, to be able to manage school discipline in post-ban/out-law of corporal punishment in schools efficiently and effectively, there is a need to design and conduct relevant research in education in general and ethics/values of education and modern society to establish the appropriate ethics/values to use when developing and administering modern school discipline.

2.There is need also to develop, formulate and adopt the necessary structures to facilitate the development and use of alternative methods of discipline to corporal punishment in school, such guidelines that cover policy framework, technical, logistical, fiscal and psychological support for conducting these process to eliminate such gaps like the reported mismatch in policy on paper and policy in practice (Kindiki,2009). The consequences of instituting such structures will be to facilitate the smooth transition from corporal form of school discipline to the alternative method of discipline which is looking in the presents operation.

Journal of Education Management and Leadership

3.It is also imperative that teachers and potential managers of modern education, as the main stakeholders in the management of school discipline, are properly prepared for alternative methods of discipline to corporal punishment in school. This approach will facilitate the introduction and administration of these alternative methods of discipline in the management of school discipline today. To strengthen the preparation of teachers and education managers in modern approaches to school discipline, it is essential to train all prospective teachers and trainees in the ethics of the teaching profession that contain the essentials of alternative methods of discipline to corporal punishment in schools (Trotman & Kerr, 2001).

4.Importantly, too, there is a need to organise and conduct public education on alternative methods of school discipline to corporal punishment in schools to raise this awareness of modern society of the importance of these humane strategies for managing school discipline. This strategy is likely to enlist the support of the public/ general society for adopting the use of alternative methods of managing school discipline in school as opposed to the age-old archaic, culture-based corporal form of discipline (Morrell, 2001).

5.The existing gap between policy on paper and policy in practice in the administration of the ban/out-law of the use of corporal punishment in schools as reported by Kindiki (2009) is worrying. This is the same observation made by Ogbe and the U.S Department of Education (2001a) concerning the continued use of corporal punishment in Ghanaian and some states in the United States America, respectively, though this form of school punishment has been banned/out-lawed since 1991 (United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, 1991). Therefore, it is suggested that a strong monitoring mechanism be established in member states of the International Community (UNO) to weed out this "cruel" form of school punishment. Besides, teachers and education managers should be properly trained in modern strategies for managing discipline in schools (Paintal, 2007).

6.Besides the above, there is a need to develop and establish well-coordinated legislation policies worldwide concerning the decision to ban/out-law corporal forms of school discipline. Such legislation should reflect the current social, political, economic and cultural issues associated with the expectations of the modern world. This legislation should be sensitive to issues related to democracy, gender, human and child rights, religion, and media, which facilitate the development and creation of the desired society in the modern world. In effect, these critical social issues need to be re-defined and included in the package of modern school discipline to replace the banned/out-lawed corporal punishment in school (Human Rights Watch, 2008).

7.There is need to have paradigm shift in the administration of teacher preparation, programme which has remained conservative/conventional and traditional in nature. The curriculum of this program should be broadened to include areas that will enable teacher-aspirants/teacher-trainees to play a leading role in the development and administration of modern school discipline, including the much-talked-about alternative methods of discipline to corporal form of school discipline. The new areas to include in this curriculum are social studies, emerging issues/development in education and modern society, and ethics of the teaching profession, whose aspects of ethics of justice, critiques, care, and profession are relevant to the management of alternative methods of school discipline (Kafu,2007; Chiang & Shouse, 2011; Tiwari,2015). The broadening of the teacher education curriculum to include

the above stated areas will be the sure way of professionalising the management of school discipline in school in modern world.

From the importance of banning/out-lawing corporal punishment in schools, the controversies concerning/surrounding the decision to ban/out-law the use of corporal punishment in school and the suggested way forward of managing the challenges arising from/posed by this decision, there is a clear conclusion to be drawn from the discussion of the issues of banning/out-lawing corporal form of discipline in school in the modern world as presented herein below.

3.0 REFERENCES

1. Agbenyega, J. S. (2006). Corporal punishment in the schools of Ghana: Does inclusive education suffer? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(3), 107–122. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03216844>
2. Alsaif, O. A. (2015). *Corporal punishment in schools: Theoretical discussion and personal experience*. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 8(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.19030/cier.v8i1.9179>
3. Beatty, B. (1995). *Preschool Education in America: The Culture of Young Children from the Colonial Era to the Present*. Yale University Press.
4. Bos, C. S., & Vaughn, S. (2006). *Strategies for teaching students with learning and behaviour problems* (6th ed.). Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
5. Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Corporal Punishment Outline of a Theory and Practices*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Chiang, Y. & Shouse, R. (2001). Taiwan's ban on corporal punishment; Teachers' perceptions of/impacts and meaning. *International Journal for Educational Reforms*, 20(2), 111–131.
7. Crawage, M. (2005). *How Resilient Adolescent Learners in Township Schools Cope with School Violence; A Case Study*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Johannesburg, Republic of South Africa.
8. Gazioghu A. E. I. (2021). Excused and Legitimised Violence in School (In Education Quarterly Reviews, 4 Special Issue; Primary and Secondary Education, 253-263).
9. Govender, D. S., & Sookrajh, R. (2014). 'Being hit was normal': Teachers' (un)changing perceptions of discipline and corporal punishment. *South African Journal of Education*, 34(2), 1–17.
10. Harber, C. & Mathukrishna (2000). School effectiveness and school improvement in context: The case of South Africa. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11, 421-434.
11. Jomtien UNESCO Conference (1990). Education for All (EFA). UNESCO Publications.
12. Kafu. P. A. (2007). Ethics of Teaching profession; An innovation in Teacher Education. Unpublished Course Material. Moi University, Kenya.
13. Kennedy, L. (1995). U.S. Department of Education. (2001). *The condition of education 2001* (NCES 2001–072). National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2001/2001072.pdf>
14. Kindiki, J. N. (2009). *Investigating Policy Implications for the Abolition of Corporal Punishment in Secondary Schools in Kenya*.
15. Makhasane, D. S. & Chikoko, V. (2016). Corporal punishment, paradoxes and implications for school leadership; A case study of Two South African High schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 36(4).

Journal of Education Management and Leadership

16. Maphosa, C. & Shumba, A. (2010). Educational disciplinary capabilities after the banning of corporal punishment in South African Schools. *South African Journal of Education, 30*, 387–399.
17. Morrell, R. (2001). Corporal punishment in South African schools: A neglected explanation for its persistence. *South African Journal of Education, 21*(4), 292–299.
18. National Association of School Psychologists Human Rights Watch (2008). Violent Education. Corporal Punishment of Children in U.S. Public Schools.
19. National Council for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR). (2011). Unpublished research conducted on corporal Punishment in Indian Public Schools.
20. Ogbe, J. O (2015). Analysis of parents/teachers' perception of the use of corporal punishment in primary schools in Delta and Edo State. Nigeria. *Journal of Education Practices, 24*.
21. Omar A. A. (2015). Corporal punishment in school: Theoretical discussion and personal experience. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research, 8*(1).
22. Paintal, S. (2007). Banning corporal punishment of children. An Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI). Position Paper. *Childhood Education, 83*, 410-413.
23. Prinsloo, J. & Nesor, J. (2007). School Violence is regarded as any international physical or non-physical (Verbal) condition or act resulting in physical or Non-physical pain being inflicted on the recipient of that act while the recipient is under school supervision/Jurisdiction.
24. Raj, L. (2011). Understanding corporal punishment in India. *Career Education an Interdisciplinary Education Journal, 1*, 3-18.
25. Shapiro, J. P & Stefkovich, J. A. (2010). *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education*. Routledge.
26. Sikes, P. J., Measo, L. & Woods, P. (1985). *Teacher Careers: Crisis and Continuities*. Falmer Press.
27. Society for Adolescents Medicine (2003). Corporal punishment in schools: Position paper of the Society for Adolescents Medicine. *Journal of Adolescents Health, 32*, 385-393.
28. Tiwari, A. (2015). Making out judgements right; Ethics of corporal punishment in Indian schools. *Intentional Education Studies, 8*(5).
29. Trotman, J., & Kerr, T. (2001). Making the personal professional: Pre-service teacher education and personal histories. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 7*(2), 157–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600120054955>
30. U.S Department of Education (2001). No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Sub-part- Teacher Liability Programme. Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov>
31. UNESCO. (1983). *Human rights and child rights*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
32. United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (1991). UNESCO Publications.
33. United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child. (2001). *General Comment No. 1: The aims of education (CRC/GC/2001/1)*. Retrieved from <https://www.refworld.org/docid/4538834d2.html>
34. Wango'o, G. & Ndungu, F. (2003). Discipline and punishment in schools. Unpublished Presentations. Kenya Educational Staff Institute (KESI).
35. Yancy, J. (2001). *Voluntary Corporal Punishment Reduces Suspension*. Secondary English.