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ABSTRACT

Corporal punishment was a world phenomenon based on the belief that for learners to behave correctly, they need to be punished through pain inflicting means. However, some countries started realizing that corporal punishment had adverse effects on learners and learning and therefore abolished it. South Africa followed suit and banned corporal punishment in 2000 and in its place, the Department of Basic Education and Training introduced Alternatives to Corporal Punishment (ACP). Despite the introduction of alternatives to corporal punishment, cases of application of corporal punishment are still being reported. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District. Mixed method approach was followed. Semi structured interviews and questionnaires were used to collect data. The sample consisted of 13 principals, 30 educators and 322 grade 12 learners were involved in responding to the questionnaires. For the qualitative side, 2 Circuit Managers and 2 principals, 2 educators and 2 RCL learners participated in the semi structured interviews in this study. SPSS version 25 was used to analyse quantitative data and thematic analyses was used to analyse qualitative data. Results showed that there are alternatives to corporal punishment that are considered effective by all the respondents. These include inviting parents to school to discuss the behaviour of their children, the involvement of the School Governing Body, convening tribunal. The study also revealed that learners and educators hold different views when it comes to the effectiveness of other alternatives, which include, rendering community services by learners, suspension of learners for 14 days, additional work that can be done by learners at school and depriving learners from participation in extra- mural activities. The study recommends further research on the learner’s perception on ill-discipline in schools and the strategies that can be used by the teachers in maintaining discipline. This study concludes that the circuit managers, teachers, principals and learners take all the alternatives to corporal punishment wherein the parents are involved as effective. This study proposed the model for guiding the implementation on the alternatives to corporal punishment.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Corporal punishment was a world phenomenon based on the belief that for learners to behave as expected in an educational institution, they must be punished through pain-inflicted means. However, some countries started realising that corporal punishment had adverse effects on learners and learning and therefore, abolished it. Poland was the first country to abolish corporal punishment in 1783 (Department of Education and Training (DET), 2000a). Some countries introduced other means of disciplining learners and introduced alternatives to corporal punishment. These countries include United States of America, Canada, China, India, Italy, Kenya, Norway, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand (Gershoff & Bitensky, 2007).

Discipline is a contributory factor towards a conducive learning environment wherein self-disciplined learners are produced, as a results it underpins all the facets of school life. All the schools would like to prevent indiscipline as that would results in effective instruction within the safe and disciplined learning environment (Belle, 2016). Discipline challenges also cause loss of valuable instructional time as teachers spend most of their time attending to cases of ill-discipline by learners whether in class or outside the classroom instead of focusing on the teaching and learning activities. There is a mutual relationship between discipline and learning, if learners are self-disciplined there is likely to be effective learning in the school, as learners show positive behaviour towards the school organisation as a whole. However, the reality is that schools are faced with learners’ indiscipline on a daily basis and that has a detrimental effect to the process of teaching and learning. Teachers morale is also affected because of the prevalence of
ill-discipline in schools as instead of focusing on their core business which is teaching and learning they spend most of their time attending to issues related to ill-discipline. Govender and Sookrajh (2014) asserts that learners are better taught self-discipline when educators and the principal use less corporal punishment at schools.

Alternatives to corporal punishment such as the research-based discipline preventions, interventions and strategies were introduced with an intention to move from punitive to more preventative measures. However, some researchers such as Maponya (2015) view alternatives to corporal punishment as not effective in dealing with learner discipline in schools. This could be viewed from the angle that the principals and teachers lack power and authority in terms of learner discipline. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child aims to promote and protect the rights and interests of the child.

According to Belle (2016 dissertation: 65)

“In the Mauritian context, the Government of Mauritius has ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the child (1990) and passed the Child Protection Act 1994 and the Ombudsperson for Children Act 2003. All these Acts aim at promoting and protecting the rights of the child, and the government has a mandate to: “(a) ensure that the rights, needs and interests of children are given full consideration by public bodies, private authorities, individuals and associations of individuals; (b) promote the rights and best interests of children; and (c) promote the compliance with the Convention of Rights of the Child.” (The Ombudsperson for the Children Act 2003, Paragraph 5: 705).” From the above it can be deduced that different countries have taken drastic measures to ensure that the rights of the children are protected and nobody takes advantage of the children's vulnerability. Additionally, to emphasize on the importance of the banning of corporal punishment in Mauritius, at the beginning of each academic year a circular is issued to all schools by the Ministry of Education and Human Resources stating that perpetrators of corporal punishment are liable to legal
Belle (2016), conducted a study which aimed to determine the role of principals in maintaining effective discipline among learners in selected Mauritian state secondary schools. The study revealed that there is a misconception of learner discipline by different stakeholders in the Mauritian context, those stakeholders include but not limited to the Minister of Education, the Educational Zone Directorates, principals, school superintendents, educators, parents, learners. From the research it was clear that stakeholders still adopt reactive and punitive or corrective disciplinary approaches instead of proactive, preventive and positive approaches to learner discipline management, of which the former are what most of the countries want to shift from so as to embrace the latter.

In the study conducted by Gershoff and Font (2016) in the United States of America, they indicate that there are states, nineteen to be exact (Global Initiative, 2016), in which corporal punishment is still legal. However, it should be noted that principals and district superintendents have a right to decide whether to use corporal punishment as a form of discipline, even when it is legally permitted in a state. The authors also examined “the school-level disparities in corporal punishment for all public schools in the states where it is legal” (p.13). The findings revealed that school corporal punishment is used disproportionately, where it is continued to be used as some subgroups of children are more likely to be corporally punished than others. The authors focused on disparities that involved race, gender and disability status. When it comes to disability status it was revealed that “students with disabilities are at greater risk for corporal punishment than students without disabilities” (P. 12). The reason could be that student with disabilities need more support than those who do not have disabilities and instead of teachers giving them support and courage they treat them harshly and unkindly. Also it might be possible that the behaviour they exhibit in schools or in the classrooms come from their disabilities and not from their own doing. On the issue of gender, the study revealed that boys are more likely to be disciplined by using corporal
punishment than girls. On the issue of race, it was found that black children were more likely to be subjected to corporal punishment than their white counterparts. Furthermore, the authors highlighted the issue that this finding had nothing to do with Black children being a majority in the certain school, so it had nothing to do with them being in majority or minority. Also Black children were more likely to be expelled suspended and expelled that their white counterpart so, it seems that the former get harsher punishment than the former so the punishment does not match the behaviour shown. So in USA other than the fact that there are states where corporal punishment is still legal, the issue is compounded by the fact that there are also disparities in the manner in which it is administered.

In the South African context, corporal punishment was one of the most commonly means of enforcing learner discipline prior to 1994. It was historically accepted and tolerated as one of the disciplinary methods used by South African teachers (Hayman & Perone, 1998). Through changes after new democratic government in 1994, a constitution inclusive of all races was promulgated, a constitution which guaranteed the right to dignity, equality, freedom and security for all its citizens. So constitution is the Supreme law of the country and it lays foundation of all other policies and legislation. The following are sections that deal with various rights:

Section 10: “the right to have dignity respected and protected…”. My take is that this right also talks to learners that they have to respect their teachers it’s not a one-way street.

Section 12: “the right to freedom and security…” I’m of the view that both teachers and learners should be safe in school.

Section 16: “the right to freedom of expression...”. All parties in the school context should exercise this right responsibly, as it cannot be learners always saying what they want to teachers and expect teachers to swallow everything said by learners.

Section 29: “the right to basic education and further education…”. Mention is made of in loco parentis and the conditions for suspension and expulsion of pupils. Teachers have
the legal duty in terms of in loco parentis to ensure the safety of learners (Oosthuizen, 1998, cited in Prinsloo, 2005, p.9) in their care.

Furthermore, there was a special section on the rights of the child which was included in the Bill of Rights (Sec. 28 of the Bill of Rights) and that meant that children’s rights were taken seriously in the new South Africa.

Additionally, the South African Constitution Section 12, declares that everyone has the right not to be treated or punished by the use of the cane, or any inhuman or degrading way Republic of South Africa (RSA, 1996).

The other notable development was seen in the Sub section (1) of Sec. 16 of the South African Schools Act 84 of 1996 (hereafter referred to as SASA) wherein the governance of a public school was given to in its governing body. The school governing body (SGB) was given responsibilities which included that of developing a mission statement for the school, adopting a code of conduct for learners in consultation with the learners, parents and educators of the school, and preparing a budget every year with the estimated income and expenditure.

South African Constitution Section 12, minimised the use of corporal punishment that was further restricted by South African School’s Act (SASA) where it states that no person may administer corporal punishment at a school to a learner, and that any person who is found guilty of this offence would be convicted for assault.

All these acts led to the Department of Education to introduce the Alternatives to Corporal Punishment, in the classroom as a way of maintaining positive discipline by avoiding reactive, punitive, humiliating and punishing measures, but rather corrective and nurturing approach (DET, 2001).

The application of corporal punishment in schools is still continuing. Some studies (Hayman & Perone, 1998; Rademeyer, 2011; Röhrs, 2017) confirm that corporal punishment is common in South African schools even though it was abolished in 1996 with the introduction to Alternatives to Corporal Punishment (ACPs) in 2001. This is
supported by the surveys conducted in 27 studies when it was discovered that physical punishment is still prevalent (Gershoff & Bitensky, 2007). They further argued that recent research shows that up to 70% of primary schools and 50% of high school learners are subjected to corporal punishment. In some instances, corporal punishment has even led to serious injuries and even death of learners. This is alluded to after the death of an eight-year-old learner from the Free State in the year 2016. Röhrs (2017) further indicated that the post-mortem results revealed that the learner died as result of physical assault.

However, a national survey by the Centre for Justice and Crime Prevention (CJCP) (Burton, 2008) shows that of 5,939 pupils surveyed, 49.8% had been caned or spanked by the teacher or principal, as means of punishment for unacceptable conduct. The survey further indicated that certain provinces made progress in the reduction of corporal punishment at schools, for an example Gauteng had to drop about 61% to 22% in the years 2008 to 2012, but Kwazulu-Natal is currently at 73.7% (Stefanie Röhrs, 2017). The problem of disregarding the banning of corporal punishment is not only happening in South African schools, but also in countries like Kenya, Botswana, Ethiopia, India, Sweden and Vietnam.

According to Naicker (2014), discipline in the school context which disrupts the process of teaching and learning is divided into three categories. Its, disruption to teaching, defiance and disrespect towards teaching, and teacher targeted bullying. These categories are exhibited by learners differently in a classroom context. The disruption to teaching happens during the process of teaching and learning. It includes behaviour such as noise, tardiness, showing-off, teasing, irritating or disturbing peers, walking around without permission, incomplete homework, playing with cellular phones, making improper noises, inattentiveness, physical violence and verbal abuse (Tiwani, 2010).

The defiance and disrespect towards teachers is one of very dominant discipline issues in the classroom. Learners show defiance and disrespect in respect of rules, authority
and structures of the school system, they also don’t want to be reprimanded by the teachers which perpetuate the cycle of chaos in the classroom. They react defiantly and disrespectfully when reprimanded by the teacher. On the issue of bullying, the study conducted by De Wet’s in (2006) in Free state showed that 50% of the participants who were teachers revealed that they have been bullied by the learners.

There is a difference between discipline and punishment, Mabeba and Prinsloo, (2000), views that discipline refers to learning, regulated scholarship, guidance and orderliness in the context of school. So they view discipline as having order and learners being guided in a supportive manner towards the attainment of the learning outcomes. Thus, the manual Alternatives to corporal punishment: The learning experience (DOE, 2001) explains that “the purpose of discipline and punishment should be constructive and not destructive; educative rather than punitive. The aim of discipline should be to educate and nurture values of tolerance, respect and self-discipline in the learner”

In 2012, Venkataramani conducted a study in KZN with a purpose to understand the power dynamics experienced by teachers in the management of learner discipline. The study also investigated teachers’ knowledge of legislation and policy regarding discipline and the perceptions of their authority and power in relationship to learner discipline. The findings of the study revealed that while teachers have knowledge about the banning of corporal punishment but when it comes to alternatives to corporal punishment and other corrective measures that can be used to deal with learner’s ill-discipline their knowledge is vague. They also consider themselves powerless when it comes to their power of controlling misbehaviour practices exhibited by learners within the school. The study also revealed that teachers felt not supported in their struggle of dealing with ill-disciplined learners. So the current study adds to the voice of teachers who feel that the alternatives to corporal punishment are not helping in maintaining order and discipline in schools.

Mthanti and Mncube (2014) contend that corporal punishment impacts negatively on learners and result in such ills as absenteeism, fear, bunking classes and anti-social
behaviour. One of the primary responsibilities of the educators is to help students learn. Barbette, Norana and Bicard, (2005). It is difficult for learning to take place in a chaotic environment. Thus educators are challenged daily with the responsibility to create and maintain a positive, productive classroom atmosphere conducive to learning and managing the learning process. In attempting to address this challenge, educators find themselves making common classroom behaviour management mistakes. More than 17 years have elapsed since ATCPs were introduced. The observation media reports and newspaper articles involve that educators are still administering corporal punishment. This is also confirmed by the number of cases reported by principals and other officials including non-governmental institutions to the Department of Education in King Cetshwayo District in the Labour Relations Sections. Educators are losing their jobs due to continuous use of corporal punishment. It is against this background that this study was conceptualised to establish the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment. As Professor Kader Asmal, in Alternatives to Corporal Punishment (DoE, 2000), put it the reason for continued use of corporal punishment is that it’s quick and easy, whilst on the other hand other methods required time, patience and skill, which teachers often lack. There is dearth of literature regarding the effectiveness of the alternatives to corporal punishment introduced as a form of disciplinary measure that should be used by educators in Secondary Schools.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Based on the literature reviewed, the abolition of corporal punishment, according to section 10 of SASA and the achievements of these outcomes are gradually collapsing as discipline problems have been found to be on the rise in schools lately. More cases of challenging behaviour are reported in literature, in the media, in schools and in the communities. Some studies have established that even though corporal punishment has been abolished through Act No. 84 of 1996 (SASA) there are still reports that corporal punishment is being administered in some schools resulting in learners getting hurt and some resulting in death. Educators are being charged for misconduct related to application of corporal punishment and discharged from services. Despite the
introduction of alternatives to corporal punishment, cases of application of corporal punishment are still being reported through media and other means. Literature is silent on why corporal punishment is continuing despite its abolishment and the introduction of alternatives to corporal punishment in its place. Presently, no literature could be established regarding the effects of the introduced alternatives to corporal punishment in secondary schools including those in the King Cetshwayo district in the KwaZulu-Natal Province. A study regarding these literature deficiencies could ease the challenges experienced in secondary schools regarding maintenance of discipline where teachers, despite abolition of corporal punishment and policy on alternatives to corporal punishment continue to apply it even though perpetrators get punished by expulsion.

1.3 AIM OF THE STUDY

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of the ATCPs in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District. A model for promoting teaching and learning without application of corporal punishment despite the available alternatives to corporal punishment has been proposed.

1.4 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

This study was guided by the following research objectives:

- determine the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District;
- explore the perceptions of educators regarding the ATCP in maintaining discipline in Secondary Schools within the King Cetshwayo District;
- establish the views of learners in the implementation of ATCP in their schools;
- establish the challenges encountered by secondary school principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment.
1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study was guided by the following research questions:

- To what extent are alternatives to corporal punishment affecting maintenance of learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
- How do educators perceive ATCP in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
- What are the views of learners in the implementation of ATCP in their schools?
- What are the challenges encountered by Secondary School principals and circuit managers in the implementation of Alternatives to Corporal Punishment ATCP?

1.6 INTENDED CONTRIBUTION TO THE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE

The findings of this study may assist the Department of Basic Education (DBE) with the model proposed which may help in maintaining discipline in Secondary Schools. The study may further contribute through:

- an awareness on the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools;
- knowledge on the perceptions of educators regarding the alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline;
- knowledge on issues related to the views of learners in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in their schools;
- an awareness on the challenges encountered by Secondary School principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment.

1.7 DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

Umhlathuze Circuit Management Centre has a population of 138 schools, 138 principals, 2456 educators and 76561 learners. It has four wards, which are Esikhalenisenkosi, Ensingweni, Mthunzini and Ongoye. The study was conducted on
circuit managers, principals, educators and leaners focusing on the Esikhalenisenkosi ward under uMhlatuze Circuit Management Centre. The Esikhalenisenkosi ward has a population of 13 secondary school principals, 138 educators and 1621 grade 12 leaners.

1.8 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The research design and methodology of this study is briefly discussed in this section; the full discussion is done in Chapter 3.

1.8.1 Research design

This study followed a pragmatic paradigm. I used an empirical survey following a mixed-methods approach using both quantitative and qualitative research approaches to collect data through a questionnaire and an interview schedule.

1.8.2 Quantitative approach

1.8.2.1 Population and sampling

The population consisted of 13 secondary school principals, 138 educators and 1621 Grade 12 learners. Purposive sampling procedures was used to select the respondents for this study.

1.8.2.2 Instrumentation

The questionnaire and interviews were used as research instruments for this study. The researcher’s questionnaire comprises two sections. Section A of the questionnaire covered the biographical information. It required information from the respondents about gender, age and category. Section B of the questionnaire contained closed questions
about their knowledge and understanding of alternatives to corporal punishment. This section comprised thirty-four statements. The respondents were asked to rate their responses on a five-point scale ranging from fully agree to fully disagree with the option of neutral for those who were not sure.

This quantitative methodology is chosen in the light of the purpose of the study, the kind of information that is required and the available resources. McMillan, Schumacher (2006) and Kumar (2010) maintain that questionnaires permit anonymity, preclude possible interviewer biases and permit a respondent sufficient time to consider answers before actually answering. Data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analysed and interpreted than the data obtained from verbal responses and lastly, questionnaires can elicit information that cannot be obtained in other methods.

1.8.2.3 Data collection procedures

I received permission to issue questionnaires to the circuit managers, principals, educators and learners of the selected schools via the circuit office of the Umhlathuze circuit management centre. All participants signed consent letters before completing the questionnaires. As way of collecting data from participants, I used the services of the research assistant to distribute and collect questionnaires. The research assistant distributed the questionnaires and collected them after a week.

1.8.2.4 Data analysis

In relation to questionnaires, my important task was to reduce the mass of data obtained to a format suitable for analysis. The respondents’ responses were coded and frequency distributions tables were generated. I then used SPSS version 25 as a way of analysing data. Frequencies and frequency percentages, and cross tabulations were used to analyse data. Cross tabulations established the p values in order to establish the level of significance.
1.8.3 THE QUALITATIVE APPROACH

1.8.3.1 Sampling

Purposive sampling procedure was used to select two circuit managers as cases of misconduct are reported and investigated by them including cases of corporal punishment in schools. Two principals of Secondary Schools as they deal with learner discipline in schools, two educators as they deal with learners in a classroom situation and are expected to maintain learner discipline in schools. Additionally, two Learner Representatives from LRC participated in the study, because cases of this nature are reported to them and they are expected to refer them to the governing body educator and management of the school.

1.8.3.2 Instrumentation

The interview schedule was used to guide the semi-structured interview. The interview schedule consisted of four main questions, which guided the interview.

1.8.3.3 Data collection procedures

I asked for permission from the Head of Department (HOD) in KZN Department of Education, to conduct interviews in the sampled schools from King Cetshwayo District. Assuring the participant of their rights to participate or to withdraw at any time when they feel uncomfortable.

I adhered to all ethical considerations when collecting data in a manner that shows respect in terms of the language used, values and culture, the way questions were asked including social background of this area also observing religion of the participant and not imposing on nor influencing their responses. I recorded the interviews and transcribed them verbatim in terms of the responses received from the participants.
1.8.3.4 Data analysis

I employed thematic data analysis through identification of themes, guided by the research objectives.

1.9 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

I requested for permission to conduct the study from the KwaZulu- Natal Provincial Head Department of Education (HOD). After approval, I further requested for permission from King Cetshwayo District and the Umhlathuze circuit management.

1.10 KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION

Knowledge accumulated was communicated to the target audience in order to attempt a change in the perception of corporal punishment in education. The challenge was to upgrade the accessibility of desired information by reaching those stakeholders who could make a difference and share the information gained to benefit the learners and teachers.

1.11 CHAPTER DIVISION

CHAPTER 1

Chapter 1 presents the background to the study, the statement of the problem, aims and the objectives of the study, definitions of the operational concepts and the plan of the whole study.

CHAPTER 2

Chapter 2 provided conceptual and theoretical frameworks for the study, based on selected and relevant literature reviewed.
CHAPTER 3
Chapter 3 presents the research design and methodology of this study. The methodology presented includes the population, sampling and data collection procedures and the way data were analysed.

CHAPTER 4
Chapter 4 presents the data results of the study. The results are presented with the help of tables and remarks from interviewees.

CHAPTER 5
Chapter 5 provides a synthesis of findings, conclusion and recommendations. The model developed is also presented in this chapter.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1 presented the introduction of this study. The literature review of this study is discussed in this chapter, presenting the theoretical framework and thereafter literature on issues related to corporal punishment and the maintenance of discipline. The structure of this chapter is guided by the following research questions:

- To what extent are alternatives to corporal punishment affecting maintenance of learner discipline in Secondary Schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
- How do educators perceive alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in Secondary Schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
- What are the views of learners in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in their schools?
- What are the challenges encountered by secondary school principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment?

There are three sections that deal specifically with the issues of learner's discipline in the South African Schools Act, 84 of 1996 those are:

Section 8 (1-9) Code of conduct
b) Section 9 (1-5) Suspension and expulsion from schools
c) Section 10 (1-2) Prohibition of corporal punishment

Section 8 (1) of SASA empowers a governing body to adopt a code of conduct for the learners after consultation with the learners, parents and educators of the school. The code of conduct enables SGB to maintain discipline in a school.
The functions of a school’s code of conduct are clarified in section 8(2) of the SASA (SA,1996(a), amongst other things it is to establish a disciplined and purposeful school environment which is dedicated to the improvement and maintenance of the quality of the learning process. So the SGB which is the representation of parents in the governing structures of the school forms the integral part of the democratisation of the South African schooling system. However, the role of the SGB doesn’t end there they have to ensure that all stakeholders which include but not limited to parents, learners and teachers are aware of the contents of the code of conduct. So it should be displayed where it can be seen all the time so that, that will serve as a reminder of what is accepted and not accepted in that particular school.

Section 9 of the South African Schools Act contains the stipulations regarding suspension and expulsion of a learner from a public school. In the Province of Kwa Zulu Natal where the study is conducted, the above section has been amended in KZN Circular No. 33 of 2007. Amongst, the important additions made in the circular is that, the offences that are regarded as serious misconduct that may lead to suspension or expulsion of a learner it should be a school’s code of conduct must clearly be spell out. The other amendment is that the SGB must conduct disciplinary hearings in the manner contemplated in Sec. 8(1A) of SASA against the learner within seven school days after the suspension of such a learner. Furthermore, it is expected that the Head of Department (HOD) must consider within 14 days whether or not to expel a learner after receiving the recommendation of the school governing body.

The amendment also lists the kinds of misconduct under 5 levels and suggests measures such as verbal warnings or written reprimand by an educator and supervised school work that will contribute to the learner’s progress at school, demerits, performing tasks that would assist the offender, replacement of damaged property, detention in which learners use their time constructively but within the confines of the classroom and suspension from school activities, for example, sport and cultural activities.
Section 10 of SASA (SA, 1996a) states that corporal punishment is prohibited in schools. In its place, the Department introduced the Alternatives to corporal punishment. In 2001, the National Department of Education published The Manual Alternatives to Corporal Punishment: The Learning Experience: A practical guide for educators. In the manual, there are guidelines which are meant to help teachers maintain discipline in the classroom and the school. The other manual is called Alternatives to corporal punishment: Growing discipline and respect in our classrooms, also published in 2001, but was compiled by Wits Education Policy unit (Porteus, Vally & Ruth, 2001). Both these manuals emphasize the non-violent constructive approach to discipline. Learners’ misconduct is classified under five levels, namely, misconduct inside the classroom, breaking school rules, violation of school codes, very serious misconduct and committing criminal acts which breach the law.

The KZN province is one of the provinces that have taken strides in ensuring that teachers refrain from using the corporal punishment and that they are also aware and informed of the consequences of using it in the name of maintaining order and discipline in schools. Amongst the circulars that were distributed in KZN, is KZN circular No.55 of 2001 and KZN Circular No. 90 of 2001. Circular No.55 explains the establishment of a Discipline, Safety and Security committee (DSS) at different levels of the Department of Education and also unpack the duties and functions of these committees. Circular No. 90 of 2001 on the other hand provides policy guidelines on Discipline, Safety and Security committees in public schools. Furthermore, it mentions possible problems and key consequences and suggests corrective measures. Additionally, there is a manual that was published by the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education and Culture, which focused on learner conduct and discipline. The manual goes into depth in explaining the procedures followed in the drafting a code of conduct for public schools. In order to help the stakeholders, grasp the content in the manual, it has case studies and a multiple choice questions on the content covered in the manual. The date of publication is not mentioned in the document.
2.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is guided by the Skinnerian model, which supports the rewarding of good behaviour, while unacceptable behaviour receives no rewards and is eliminated. In maintaining discipline one generally rewards good behaviour and punishes bad behaviour (Phillips, 1998). The Skinnerian model as a behaviour modification paradigm is derived from the work of behavioural psychologist Skinner.

Skinner (1938) conducted research on shaping behaviour through positive and negative reinforcement and demonstrated operant conditioning, a behaviour modification technique which he developed in contrast with classical conditioning. According to Skinner (1938), behaviour followed by a reinforcing stimulus results in an increased probability of that behaviour occurring in the future. An aversive stimulus is the opposite of a reinforcing stimulus, something that might found unpleasant or painful. This leads to another principle of operant conditioning: A behaviour followed by an aversive stimulus results in a decreased probability of the behaviour occurring in the future. This suggests that if a learner is punished for behaviour regarded as unwelcome, the learner will probably repeat the behaviour less and less. Skinner did not advocate the use of punishment. His main focus was to target behaviour and see that consequences deliver responses. From his research came "shaping" which is described as creating behaviours through reinforcement. He also came up with the example of a child's refusal to go to school and that the focus should be on what is causing the child's refusal not necessarily the refusal itself. If learners are committing offences, teachers should concentrate on what is causing the offences rather than on the offence. Skinner has been a major influence behind the adaptation of clinical behaviour techniques to classroom settings (Duke & Meckel, 1980). His research suggested that punishment was an ineffective way of controlling behaviour, leading generally to short-term behaviour change, but resulting mostly in the subject attempting to avoid the punishing stimulus instead of avoiding the behaviour that was causing punishment. Skinner's theory suggests that the punishing stimulus does not stop the behaviour; the offender simply becomes more sophisticated at avoiding the punishment. Reinforcement, both
positive and negative, Skinner believed, proved to be more effective in bringing about lasting changes in behaviour.

Skinner’s Behaviour modification theory was used to guide the design of the questions for this study. The theory, often referred to as b-mod, is the therapy technique based on Skinner’s work. The theory states that extinguishment of undesirable behaviour (by removing the re-enforcer) and replacement with desirable behaviour by reinforcement is beneficial. It has been to work particularly well with children. Psychologists from a behaviourist orientation studied human behaviour in an attempt to understand the processes that induce the change in behaviour (Tuckman, 1992). Their results have been found to be relevant to this study.

Skinner argues that the principles of operant conditioning can be used to produce extremely complex behaviour if rewards and punishment are delivered in such a way as to encourage movement of an organism closer and closer to the desired behaviour each time Skinner (1951). In the conventional learning situation, operant conditioning applies largely to issues of class and student management, rather than to learning content. Operant conditioning will therefore apply to issues related to maintenance of discipline.

There two founders of this theories which are Pavlov and Thorndike. Pavlov refer to classical conditional model where dogs were conditioned by certain stimuli when it’s time to eat. they would relate a particular sound to food that is about to be provided. This would happen after long time when sound will lead to the food provisioning. Pavlov also experimented with secondary conditioning, generalisation and discrimination.

While Thorndike on the other hand showed that both humans and animals a connection can be made between specific behaviours and situations if the result of such behaviours is experienced as satisfying. He refers to this move as a law of effect. The Skinnerian model has been proven to be behavioural in nature. Skinner argues that a behaviour that is awarded particularly good behaviour tends to be rewarded and no rewards tends to be eliminated. This talks to alternatives to corporal punishment in that learners who
behaves well and are rewarded for that tends to repeat that good behaviour. whether a teacher would prefer to put a star in learners work after passing a test or giving a badge for that quarter to that learner that excel in that task or assessment. That learner is always encouraged to behave better in the classroom or in the school.

Skinnerian model is behavioural in nature which means that if good behaviour is acknowledged it tends to be repeated, in this case if the leaner behaves good and the teacher appreciates that good behaviour the continues to improve in terms of discipline. Duke and Meckel (1980) argues that Skinner has an important role and influence in relation to the adaptation of clinical behaviour techniques to classroom set-up. Skinner had to focus his approach on reinforcement and reward. Charles (1989) further states that re-inforcers are like rewards and if correctly implemented they can influence one’s direction. He also uses terms like operant behaviour, schedule of reinforcement, reinforcing stimuli, positive and negative reinforcements and successive approximations referring to the behaviour of learner in improving discipline in schools.

According to Leahey, (2000) behaviourism theory is unlike other theories and this can be seen in everyday classroom learning in that there are different assumptions or opinions that appear on behaviourism theory. Behaviourism theory views that learning is changing the behaviour of students, from being able to produce oral or written product, and the responsibility of the educator is to control the stimulus and the learning environment in order to change the desired destination approaching, gift giver sand teachers of students who have been able to show significant changes while punishment given to students who are notable to show the change of meaning. Budiman (2017) mentioned that the characteristic of this theory is prioritizing the elements and a small part, is mechanistic, emphasizing the role of the environment, concerned with the formation of a reaction or response, emphasizing the importance of exercise, concerned with the mechanism of learning outcomes, concerned with the role of ability and learning results obtained is the emergence of the desired behaviour.
Skinner (1976) further argues that Behaviourism learning theory has to do with measurement of results, testing, analysing and observation, analysed. Repetition and training used so that the envisage behaviour can become a norm. The expected result of the application of the theory of behaviourism is the formation of a desired behaviour. Desired behaviour gets positive corroboration and behaviour that are less fit awarded negative. Evaluation or assessment is based on observed behaviour. According to this theory, brief instructions are followed example, either by themselves or through stimulation. Behaviourism Learning Theory is a theory of learning that emphasizes human behaviour as a result of the interaction between stimulus and response. Gage and Berliner proposes this behaviourism theory later developed into the flow of learning psychology that influence the development of education and learning theory known as behaviourism flow. This emphasis on the formation of the flow behaviour appears to be a result of learning. Alissa, (2003) further argues that Behaviourism theory with stimulus-response relationship model, seated person as an individual passive learning in that specific behavioural responses analysed by using training methods or adaptation alone. The emergence of behaviours will be stronger when given reinforcement and will disappear when sentenced. A person is considered to have learned something if he can show changes in behaviour. In line with this theory the substantial learning is in the form of inputs and outputs in the form of stimulus response.

The issue of stimulus is all that is given by the educator to the learner, while the response in the form of learners’ responses to the stimulus given by the educator. Sarah (2006). Further states that processes which occur between stimulus and response cannot be observed and cannot be measured what can be observed is stimulus and response. Therefore, it is something given by the teacher (stimulus) and something that is accepted by the students (response) should be observed and measured (Fauziati, 2016). It focuses on the theory of measurement, since the measurement is an important thing to notice changes in behaviour occurs or noting the learners’ behaviour.
Fauziati (2016) argues that the application of behaviourism theory in Audiolingual method follows a particular sequence in dealing with a learners behaviour so that the organism is the learner, the behaviour being verbal behaviour, the foreign language becoming the stimulus, response reaction serving as a stimulus to the learner, and the solidification as the extrinsic approval and praise of the teacher, fellow students, and self-assurance of target language use.

According to behaviourist theory, there five ways on which learners learn, namely shaping, modelling, rewarding and punishing, programmed learning and assigning. Blankship (1981) as cited by Budiman (2017) shaping refers to the process of reinforcing successive approximation to some terminal behaviour. It is crucial that educators must demonstrate and teach simple behaviours in schools during the teaching and learning process. Budiman (2017) emphasised that such a complex behaviour can be taught through shaping approximations as a way of imparting good behaviour to the learners regarding learner discipline. He further stated that this process must begin with the purposes of study, assignment analysis, activities of students and response to the reinforcement.

Another important type of learning on behaviourism is modelling. This method is used mostly by educators who are role models in classrooms. During the learning process, the learners imitate their teacher's behaviour. For example, an educator who is always punctual in class or assembly is modelling learners for punctuality in the learning process as they will imitate him/her for the behaviour of being punctual.

Rewarding and punishing is implemented in the learning process by an educator according to the learners' behaviour. For instance, a demerit for punishing and awarding stars for rewarding good behaviour. The rewarding of learners for good achievements and behaviour will in turn motivates their counter parts to follow suit in
learning process. Reward and punishment are methods applicable for Skinner behaviourism theories in teaching and learning process especially in learner discipline.

Programmed learning is the application of the principles of operant conditioning. This type of the learning process happens when learners are taught good behaviour or manners by the educator. For example, bullying amongst learners is strongly discouraged by educators and such learners are programmed to do that. Assigning is another learning component in behaviourism. Learners are assigned with different responsibilities during the learning process which train them to be responsible in class and in their entire lives.

Phillips (1998) states that when maintaining discipline one needs to award good behaviour and punish bad behaviour so that in this study when you set clear expectations for the learner, motivate the learner, encourage the learner you get good results and discipline in class but when learners misbehave you put them on detention, suspension, making them remove graffiti on the walls and cleaning environment, these alternatives serves as a way of punishing bad behaviour. Thus, in a behavioural theory, human behaviour is the result of learning which can be changed by manipulating and creating learning conditions. The strong emphasis of this theory is on the behaviour that it can be observed.

2.3 DEFINITION OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Corporal punishment is defined differently as is observed in the literature reviewed. According to the Department of Education and Training (DET), (2000) corporal punishment is defined as:

any deliberate act against a child that inflicts pain or physical discomfort to punish or contain him/her. This includes, but is not limited to, spanking, slapping,
pinching, paddling or hitting a child with a hand or with an object; denying or restricting a child’s use of the toilet; denying meals, drink, heat and shelter; pushing or pulling a child with force; forcing the child to do exercise.

This definition of corporal punishment has to do with physical infliction of pain to the learners, which causes discomfort to the learner whilst disregarding the psychological effects thereof (Reyneke, 2018). Closely related to the concept corporal punishment is discipline. Discipline is defined as the practice of training people to obey rules or a code of behaviour, and punishing them if they refuse to obey the rules (Milondzo, 2013). Two critical issues that are raised are the training of people to do as they are trained and the repercussions thereof. Masingi (2017) views the aim of discipline as providing security; the whole institution should be safe and secured, so that everybody within can freely participate.

2.4 DISCIPLINE

Learner discipline is widely regarded as having its roots in the years of protest against the apartheid government. Bush and Anderson (2003) note that one of the weapons of the black majority was for youngsters to strike and demonstrate against the policies of the Apartheid Government. This makes it difficult to establish a culture of teaching and learning (Bush & Anderson, 2003) leading to an emphasis on learners’ rights (Enslin & Pendlebury, 2000). McLennan (2000) links these issues and mentions that in township schools there was a culture of entitlement, that caused learners to become unwilling to do any work.

Learner discipline problems in South Africa range from late coming, truancy, neglecting homework, noisiness, physical violence, theft, graffiti, vandalism, lack of concentration, verbal abuse, criminality, gangsterism, rape, constant violation of the school’s code of conduct, and carrying substance abuse within the schools’ premises (Mabeba & Prinsloo, 2000). Ferreira, Badenhorst and Wilkenson (2007) further confirm the above, since they indicate that learners exercise bullying, assault, fighting among themselves,
absence from class arriving late, bunking classes, theft, undermining teachers’ authority.

These acts of bad behaviour by learners cause challenges and at times make it impossible for educators to maintain discipline. Ngcayi (1997) agrees with this view by stating that in South African schools many educators find it difficult to maintain discipline especially after the abolishment of corporal punishment.

Masitsa (2008) is of the view that discipline and disciplinary measures are two sides of the same coin. Discipline is taken as referring to amongst other things appropriate behaviour, to be in compliance with the accepted norms and rules of behaviour. This suggests that if the learner is not behaving accordingly there may be consequences for that misbehaviour. Whilst on the other hand disciplinary measures are a negative in nature, in the sense that fear and coercion have to be used for them to be successful. However, it should be noted that they do have positive effects in terms of maintaining discipline.

In Kenya, lack of discipline in schools has been one of the critical challenges facing schools whilst discipline is vital for learner academic performance and improvement (Njoroge & Nyabuto, 2014). Simba, Agak and Kabuka (2016) further indicate that Kenyan learners’ academic performance has received little attention in relation to discipline. Lindsay and Hart (2017) found consistent evidence that exposure to same race educators is associated with reduced rates of exclusionary discipline for Black learners.

School discipline policies and practices have a significant influence on both learners and school functioning and they assist in maintaining discipline but also improving learner performance in the classroom (Mayworm & Sharkey, 2014). Utilising the learners’ conduct system rather than the criminal justice system to address minor offences is more likely to lead to learners’ success (Schuck, 2017).
Denis and Frances (2014) conducted a study on alternatives to corporal punishment involving learners, educators and parents using questionnaires and interviews and it revealed that alternatives such as manual labour, professional support such as counselling and guidance, and small class sizes should be employed as alternatives to corporal punishment. Berlowitz, Frye, and Jette (2017) viewed zero-tolerance policies which deal with among other issues of discipline, anti-bullying strategies as a way of pushing learners out of schools to prison.

According to, the South African Schools Act (Republic of South Africa, 1996a) SGBs are directed to adopt a code of conduct for learners as a way of dealing with learner discipline in schools with an endeavour to promote the quality of the teaching and learning process in schools. A learner code of conduct aims to deal with disruptive learner behaviour among learners that have been found guilty of misconduct, which negatively affect the appropriate learning environment in the classroom (Mestry & Khumalo, 2012). They argue that the success of the learner code of conduct is in its effective enforcement, and the SGB delegates play a prominent role to implement the code of conduct on a daily basis to the school management team and educators.

The South African Government strives for a school environment that respects human rights and fundamental freedom. In terms of Section 8 (1) of SASA DoE (1996), discipline must be maintained in school so that the Culture of learning and Teaching (CoLT) should run smoothly without any disruptive behaviour. The far-reaching outcome of this clause on a national platform is the achievement of critical and developmental outcomes of educating learners into being able to demonstrate an understanding of interrelationships, working with others as team members and for being responsible citizens of South Africa.

Reyneke and Pretorius (2017) are of the view that discipline should be understood as part of a teaching and learning process in the school educational setting. They argue that discipline creates an orderly environment conducive to teaching and learning while teaching learners to behave in a socially responsible manner. Discipline should be
maintained in line with a constitutional imperative that the children’s best interests are of paramount importance in every matter that concerns them (Constitution, 1996). However, poor discipline in schools has been characterised as serious and pervasive, and affects teaching and learning negatively (Leigh, Chenhall & Saunders, 2009; Tozer, 2010). Disciplinary measures should be meted out fairly and proportionally to the transgression for which they are given (Jacobs, Ferreira, De Wet, & Coetzee-Manning 1996; Masitsa, 2013).

There are two approaches to discipline, which are retributive and restorative (Reyneke and Pretorius, 2017). At the centre of a retributive approach to discipline is authoritarianism, dominance, control, and power relations. The assumption is that children need to be punished regularly so that they are taught to respect rules and learn from their mistakes. The perception is that in the South African context the SGBs are still aligned to the retributive approach focusing on disciplinary hearings where they adhere to strict procedures and follow rigorous prescriptions as to how to conduct the hearing. For instance, when it comes to the suspension of the learners there are no rehabilitation programmes, which the learners have to undergo, which shows that the aim is to punish the learner and thus that is retributive in nature. On the other hand, the restorative approach is more empowering on the side of the learner as it capacitates the child on how to deal with similar situations in future. So at the centre of this approach are needs and interests of learners that require to be addressed correctly. Sprague, (2014), further argues that mending and maintaining relations are aligned with human rights, which should be considered when taking cognisance of learners’ holistic development. Anderson and Ritter (2017) in United States of America found that marginalised students are more likely to receive exclusionary discipline, even after controlling for the nature and number of disciplinary referrals, but that most of the differences occur across rather than within schools. The authors view the inclusion of an elaborate definition of corporal punishment and other non-physical harmful disciplinary measures in the Schools Act and the Employment of Educators Act as one of the measures of abolishing corporal punishment. They further argue that: “the absence of all-encompassing definitions may also result in learners tolerating unacceptable conduct
on the part of educators, because they (the learners) do not know that such conduct actually constitutes a violation of their rights and is either a common-law crime or child abuse in terms of the Children’s Act” (Anderson & Ritter, 2017).

2.5 ABOLITION OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

The opponents of corporal punishment argue that if it works as a deterrent, it should stop bad behaviour among disobedient children in the course of time. However, in schools where corporal punishment is applied, the same learners are repeatedly punished for the same offences (Porteus, Valy & Ruth, 2003). Thus, corporal punishment does not result in long-term behavioural change; rather, it teaches the child to avoid punishable behaviour when the person who does the caning is close by. It does not reinforce desirable behaviour, but teaches only what not to do, ceasing when the pain stops (Andero & Stewart, 2002:94). Many South African parents administer corporal punishment at home and therefore support its use at school (Morrel, 2002; Msomi, 2004). Maphumulo and Vakalisa (2008) challenged the use of corporal punishment. Andero and Stewart (2002) state that there are insufficient quality studies that document detrimental outcomes of non-abusive corporal punishment to support advice or policies against the use of corporal punishment. South Africa is still reported as one of the countries where teachers continue to use corporal punishment beside it being banned (Morrow and Singh, (2014). In the study conducted by The study by Ba-Saddik and Hattab, (2013) reveal that teachers and other school personnel use other forms of assault as corporal punishment and those include pinching, pulling ears, pulling hair, slapping the face, and throwing objects. Additionally, the Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children [Global Initiative], 2016g state that corporal punishment is legally prohibited in schools in 128 countries and allowed in 69 (35%). However, it should be noted that corporal punishment continues to be administered both in countries that have banned it and those where it is still legal and that results in a higher rate of learners who are assaulted worldwide (Covell & Becker, 2011). Those who are against the use of corporal punishment argue that it has proven not to be the predictor of better learning among students (Gershoff, 2016). So it does not lead to the
promotion of learning in the classroom and thus the argument that it is administered to help learners perform better in schools does not hold water. Gershoff (2016) is of the view that one of the reasons for learners not to perform better when they are subjected to corporal punishment is that learners are “are in constant fear of being physically harmed by their teachers”. Corporal punishment is also causes physically injury to the learners not only that there are few documented cases wherein children have died as a result of corporal punishment (Covell & Becker, 2011). The authors further asserts that, it also causes emotionally humiliation to learners, especially if punished in front of other learners, as it dehumanises the learners and is also linked to mental and behavioural problems. The other point worth highlighting is that other groups are targeted more for corporal punishment than others. For instance, in countries such as Singapore and Zimbabwe, its only boys who can be subject to school corporal punishment (Makwanya, Moyo, & Nyenya, 2012). Additionally, in the study conducted by Gershoff and Font (2016) in US, the results revealed that it was mostly black boys and children living with disabilities who were more likely to be punished than their peers. Gershoff (2016) asserts that there is no evidence that corporal punishment support learning instead it is linked to “physical harm, mental and behavioural health problems, and impaired achievement”. He further suggests that, reform legislatively is needed, advocacy and education especially on the side of the teachers as they need to be taught about the alternatives to corporal punishment so that they can abandon it completely.

2.6. INTRODUCTION OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

To help teachers deal with the concerns and frustrations they had regarding the banning of corporal punishment, coupled with failure in finding an efficient method of punishment, the Department of Education (DoE), then issued guidelines on school discipline in 2000 (Ngubane 2000; DoE 2000). The misconducts were categorised into five levels; level one deals with those misconducts which were regarded as minor and each level had suggested alternatives proposed for minor misconduct in the place of corporal punishment. Level two deals with misconduct that is regarded as somewhat more serious in nature with the matching alternatives. Level three deals with misconduct
that is taken as serious, whilst level four misconduct is considered as very serious. Level five deals with repetition of level four acts. Each level has its acts of misconduct and the suggested alternatives to deal with that (Masitsa, 2008).

The banning of corporal punishment in schools has been connected to the issue of growth in the indiscipline in schools (Naong, 2007). It was replaced by a discipline strategy called Alternatives to Corporal Punishment (ATCP) which consisted of different approaches to instil discipline in schools (Tungata, 2006; Moyo, Khewu & Bayaga, 2014). The ATCP strategies include verbal warning, demerits, additional work, tidying the classrooms, and detention. However, there is a sense that indiscipline continues to grow irrespective of the introduction of these alternatives. It has been established that in some schools, the ATCP is not used at all and in some cases it is incorrectly implemented, thus perpetuating disruptive behaviour in schools.

In a study conducted by Ferreira, Jacobs, Coetzee-Manning and de Wet (2009) which explored the use of strategies by educators to maintain discipline in Lesotho, most respondents (77.85%) indicated that they value parental involvement, as one of the alternatives that is effective in maintaining learner discipline in schools. Meetings with parents are an important strategy when disciplinary problems occur. This relationship needs to be carefully managed (Ferreira, Badenhorst & Wilkinson, 2007; Margolis, 2005) for it to promote the quality of teaching and learning. Additionally, Mthanti and Mncube (2014:20), asserts that: “the more learners, parents and staff are involved in school policy and decision-making, the more there is a genuine community, the more the school can resist violence."

Demerits and physical work are other alternatives to corporal punishment (Moyo, Khewu & Bayaga, 2014). However, Naong (2007) is of the view that demerits are punitive in nature, because they are imposed only when pupils behave unacceptably and no rewards are given for acceptable and improved behaviour, because the focus is on punishing rather than developing a learner to grow to be a responsible citizen.
Community service programmes are effective in reducing out-of-school suspensions. Implementing community service works as a viable alternative to in-school or out-of-school suspensions which has the potential to improve academic performance and conduct within public school settings (May, Stokes, Oliver & McClure, 2015).

2.7. EFFECTS OF DISCIPLINE

Learner discipline affects the promotion of teaching and learning. There are several causes of learner discipline, and these can be classified into five categories. There are learner-related factors, teacher-related factors, school-related factors, parent-related factors and society-related factors (Wolhuter & Steyn, 2012). The learner related factors are mostly associated with ages/phases of pupils. As a result, discipline problems seem to occur more frequently in Secondary than in Primary Schools, hence the focus of this study is on Secondary Schools. Teacher-related factors talk to the factors that include what the teacher needs so as to be effective, which also talks to issues of lesson presentation and classroom management skills. School-related factors, include decent school infrastructure, a market-related curriculum and has clear guidelines in terms of the assessment plan. The parent-related (family-related) factors include active parental involvement in the management of the school. Society-related problems include the external stakeholder involvement with the aim to create an environment conducive to teaching and learning.

Considerable studies (Soneson, 2005; Harber & Mncube, 2011; Makhasane & Chikoko, 2016) show that the administration of corporal punishment exposes learners to violent behaviour. Violence in schools is common as some learners in South Africa especially in Secondary Schools are engaged in violent behaviour on school premises and in their communities. One of the primary responsibilities of the educators is to help students to learn (Barbette, Norana & Bicard, 2005). It is difficult for learning to take place in a chaotic environment.
Gрегan-Kaylor (2006) argues that corporal punishment leads to feelings of revenge, anti-social aggression and a high rate of vandalism. Masitsa (2008) states that such punishment often leads to short-term compliance, but has negative short-term and long-term effects which is corroborated by Ancer (2011) who further states that there is a strong relationship between corporal punishment and the development aggressive behaviour. Mwamawenda (2008) argues that corporal punishment negatively affects relationships and often creates resentment and hostility and this has been associated with learners dropping out of school and a high level of vandalism of which I can attest to in relation to the previous experience at school level.

Mumthas, Munavvir and Gafoor (2014) state that inculcation of self-discipline is important for systemic pursuit of learning as some disciplinary practices of suspension, expulsion, and arrest for behavioural problems turning learners into criminal offenders during conflict (Skiba, 2014). They argue that punishment employing a noxious or painful stimulus generates a variety of problems and is negative to the learner. They argue further that corporal punishment severely and seriously affects the human dignity of the learner. Some code of conduct and certain policies have dramatically increased the number of learners put out of school for disciplinary purposes, and may be accelerating learners’ contact with law enforcement.

It is evident from foregoing exposition that the South African Government strives for a school environment that respects human rights and fundamental freedom. In terms of Section 8 (1) of SASA DoE (1996), discipline must be maintained in school so that the CoLT should be inculcated and academic activities run smoothly without any disruptive behaviour. The far-reaching outcome of this clause on a national platform is the achievement of critical and developmental outcomes of educating learners into being able to demonstrate an understanding of interrelationship, working with others as team members and for being responsible citizens of South Africa.

The South Schools Act 84 of 1996 states that the discipline must be maintained in the school and classroom situations so that the education of learners flourishes without
disruptive behaviour and offences (Hill & Hill, 1994; DoE, 1996; Potgieter, Visser, Van der Bank, Mothana & Squelch, 1997). Learners learn to the best of their ability in an environment that is safe and orderly. Teachers have the responsibility of creating a safe environment by maintaining learner discipline. However, learners continue to transgress schools’ rules and are constantly found guilty of misconduct (Zulu, Urbani, Van der Merwe & Van der Walt, 2004). If the school environment is not safe due to violent acts, teachers are likely to apply for displacement, thus affecting continuity in terms of teaching and learning (Mokhele, 2011). Moreover, they tend to take leave from school regularly, go to class unprepared, or underprepared and seek early retirement or medical boarding, thus leaving learners unattended, which may negatively affect the results of the school. Skinfold, DeMaris, Cernkovich and Giordano (2004) state that the impact of experiencing harsh physical discipline in childhood, engaging in problem behaviours during adolescence and young adulthood culminate in serious violence. The findings suggested that harsh corporal punishment in the early years result in greater perpetration of violence in your later life.

Skiba (2014) contends that suspension and expulsion has some challenges in terms of implementation thus leading to ineffective and its influence in changing learner behaviour as a way of maintaining discipline in secondary schools. May, Stokes, Oliver and Mclure (2015) who assert that implementing community service programmes works as a viable alternative in school and has the potential to improve academic performance and conduct within public school settings. This is in line with the findings by Agega (2011) who concedes that manual punishment such as cleaning toilets, bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct is one of the effective alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools.

Sheryl, Stephanie, Herrenkohl, Toumbourou and Catalano (2006) affirm that school suspension may be used to remove students in engaging in challenging behaviors from school for a period of time. Based on these findings, it becomes evident therefore; that suspension is favoured as an alternative that can be used in schools. Furthermore,
Ntshangase and Narainsamy (2013:657) echo that: “…… the issue of discipline in schools should be dealt with as a collective effort with the families and community.”

Reyneke and Pretorius (2017:118) argue that: “Despite strict procedural prescriptions regarding the suspension and expulsion of learners, there are no provisions as to what should happen to the learner while he or she is suspended or awaiting expulsion.” except to put the learner at and bring him/her back after a period of 14 days. This provision is effective only the parents know how to assist the learner whiles on suspension and calls for an educated parent to play that role. Some learners view this alternative to corporal punishment as a holiday because no one holds them accountable for acts of misbehaviour. If the learner is finally expelled by the head of department as per the recommendation of the governing body after the tribunal, the departmental official is compelled to make an alternative placement to the satisfaction of the parent and the accused learner. The authors further argue that the learners “are out of school for some time, and then where applicable, return to school, the same school or to another school without any obligatory intervention to address the underlying problems or to enhance their best interest.”

According to Masitsa (2008) his study asserts that demerits focus on what a child should not do and because, at times, there is no consistency in administering demerits, learners end up seeing them as a mockery. To this effect; Moyo, Khewu and Bayaga (2014) conducted a study on disciplinary practices in schools and principles of alternatives to corporal punishment strategies. They wanted to establish consistencies between disciplinary processes and alternatives to corporal punishment in schools. Three main questions were to be answered: (1) How much variance of offences can be explained disciplinary measures of alternative to corporal punishment? (2) How well do different measures of alternative corporal punishment predict offences? (3) Which is the best predator of the offences given a set of alternative measures? The study had 58 participants. The results show that there were was no established consistency between the principles of the alternatives to corporal punishment and disciplinary practices in schools as a way of maintaining discipline in secondary schools.
This study is in line with Maphosa and Shumba (2010) who concur that a verbal warning is one of the main practices suggested as an alternative to corporal punishment. Their focus on educators’ disciplinary capabilities after the banning of corporal punishment and the introduction of alternatives to corporal punishment in South Africa. They were trying to establish the views of educators in implementing these alternatives and their effectiveness. The study revealed that educator feel disempowered, leaners do not fear nor respect educators because they will be no consequences, and they these alternatives time consuming and ineffective in maintaining learner discipline particularly in secondary schools.

Tozer (2010) maintains that verbal warning is an effective disciplinary measure administered by the class educator on the spot but he warns that it can have negative connotations and can trigger fear thus exposing learners to verbal, physical, and psychological abuse. Whilees implementing this alternative in maintaining learner discipline it is also important to hear learners voice, this finding seems to corroborate Reyneke. (2013:236) who asserts that “It is also important that all the children involved in a situation be afforded an opportunity to participate and voice their opinions.”

This finding seems to be consistent with Enea and Dafinoiu (2009:188) who asserts “Behaviour contracts are one of the most efficient strategies for gaining cooperation and commitment to the client. The contract is necessarily in a written form, specifies the actions agreed by the client for the achievement of the goal and contains a description of the conditions accompanying these actions.”

This finding seems to corroborate Riley-Tillman, Chafouleas, and. Briesch & Eckert (2008:80) who assert:” ....... teachers also rated the Daily Behavior Report Card DBRC as a highly acceptable way to measure behaviour “. The authors further “suggest that the use of a DBRC might best be used in low-stakes cases (e.g., monitoring the effect of a pre-referral intervention) and as a supplement rather than a wholesale replacement, to more established methods such as systematic direct observation (SDO).” This is
supported by Tuckman (1992) who asserts that people like psychologists have the potential to induce a change in behaviour.

2.8. EDUCATORS’ PERCEPTION OF EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN MAINTAINING DISCIPLINE

Reyneke and Pretorius (2017) view other alternatives to corporal punishment such as putting learners in detention, being sent out of class, forced to do community service as unreasonable as they are imposed to learners without the underlying reasons for the misconduct being addressed. While suspension is one of the alternatives to corporal punishment, however, Reyneke and Pretorius (2017) warn that if it is not attached to adequate rehabilitation or support programmes, it does not help the learner, as it becomes purely punitive with no intention to help the learner improve the behaviour.

According to Marais and Meier (2010), teachers in South Africa are becoming increasingly distressed about disciplinary problems in schools. Teachers link the growing problem in schools to the banning of corporal punishment even though ATCPs were introduced (Tungata, 2006). For these teachers, the ATCPs were not effective.

Nakpodia (2010) conducted a study in Nigerian Secondary Schools with a special focus on educators’ disciplinary approaches on learners’ discipline. The study argues that disciplinary power of educators is proven by the fact that it is exercised. It is a necessity in every community whose members guide them to their end by providing them with rules of actions. Disciplinary measures had to change over time with specific reference to corporal punishment, suspension and expulsion and civil rights issues, because of the increasing number of cases relating to misconduct and its results have shown that misbehaviour and poor discipline have become a serious problem in our schools and to the management system.

Various strategies of discipline were used in Kenyan schools to instil discipline (Agega, 2011). The effectiveness of these strategies varied from school to school and also
depended on the offence committed. Agega (2011) found that for minor discipline manual punishment was effective while for major discipline alternative strategies, which include suspension, expulsion, guidance and counselling, peer mediation and teacher-student conferences were also effective. The study recommended in-service courses for teachers and to regularly upgrade their teaching skills that would prevent learner misbehaviour.

In Tanzania there is a common belief among teachers and parents that discipline is essential for effective teaching and learning. Learner discipline can develop small learning groups thus enhancing independent learning options and in turn, this can encourage learner participation, discourage and prevent disruptive problems and behaviour, and provide academic success. Different challenges and dimensions of learners’ discipline engulfed in classroom and school discipline discourses of rewards and punishment (Ladislaus, Semali, Philbert & Vumilia, 2016). Most scholars discuss indiscipline among pupils in schools and its effects on learning outcomes, like Simuforosa and Rosemary (2014); Thornburg, (2008) Onyechi, Okere & Trivellor, (2007) who disagree on the relationship between issues of discipline, academic performance and improvement.

Teachers in South Africa expressed their unhappiness about the introduction of ACPs. For the strategy is ineffective, inadequate and it is a waste of time and creates the impression that the Department of Basic Education (DoBE) is trivialising the problem and does not understand its magnitude as far as its impact in the learning and teaching environment (Wilson, 2002).

Maphosa and Shumba (2010) state that one of the main practices suggested in ACTP strategy to corporal punishment is verbal warning. Tozer (2010) further defines verbal warning as a disciplinary measure administered by the class educator on the spot, but more serious, bad, dangerous or annoying disciplinary measures, together with formal reprimands, must be addressed in the school office. The above-mentioned actions can
trigger, anger, have negative connotations and trigger fear, since it can expose learners to verbal, physical, and psychological abuse.

De Waal and Rossouw, (2004) rank learner discipline as one of the major concerns expressed by all stakeholders in the education process in South Africa. Additionally, Reyneke (2013) also views learner discipline as a serious problem in South African schools, as a result, many educators blame the dangerous state of poor discipline in many schools. The majority of educators (58%) were found to view the banning of corporal punishment is affecting discipline negatively and were therefore, in favour the reinstatement of corporal punishment in schools.

In the study conducted by Ntshangase and Narainsamy (2013) to investigate teachers’ understanding of the context of alternative methods to maintain discipline in South African schools, teachers had their preferred detention and/or corner of isolation in a classroom, making learners pick up papers in the school yard, verbal reprimanding and reporting learners to their parents. Some used detention of learners during breaks and after school.

Mestry and Khumalo (2012) are of the view there is a perception amongst stakeholders that learner discipline is a serious problem rendering many schools as ineffective institutions of teaching and learning. In addition, there is a requirement that every public school should have a disciplinary policy or a learner code of conduct to ensure a disciplined teaching and learning environment.

Mthanti and Mncube (2014) conducted a study in which they explored the nature of school violence, in particular the use of the prevalent corporal punishment in two secondary schools in Umlazi. The findings of the study revealed that teachers were engaged in bullying behaviour that exacerbated the culture of violence at the schools. Future teachers were found to be verbally, physically and psychologically violent towards learners, particularly in the way that corporal punishment as a ‘corrective measure’ was applied despite strict laws. This could be attributed to the fact that
teachers view alternatives to corporal punishment as ineffective in maintaining learner discipline.

In Lesotho Ferreira, Jacobs, Coetzee-Manning and de Wet (2009) conducted a study in which they explored the educator strategies to maintain discipline in schools. Their findings revealed that mostly educators have to deal with two categories of indiscipline. The first one was what they termed the “low levels of indiscipline which included, late coming, absenteeism, neglect of duty and inappropriate dress code.” The second category they identify as that of “challenging behaviours which include disruptive and provocative behaviour, the telling of lies, dishonesty” (Ferreira, Jacobs, Coetzee-Manning and de Wet, 2009).

When it comes to the strategies they used to maintain discipline, the ones that came on top with (83.04%) was that of educators coming properly prepared; the second aspect is that of positive discipline (78.20%), thirdly educators viewed the discussions or meetings with the parents of the learners (77.85%) as effective. When it came to strategies least used it was detention (20.76%), followed by community service (22.15%) and isolation outside the classroom (31.49%). The other unexpected findings from the study was there was no correlation between perceived effectiveness of a strategy and its popularity. It was evident that the educators took the time factor into consideration in the sense that they usually used the strategy that was less time-consuming. There has been shocking videos show educators administering corporal punishment to learners in the cruellest ways as a result there are several investigations undertaken by SACE and the police into the use of corporal punishment by educators (Reyneke, 2018). In order to deal with this problem “according to the Minister of Basic Education, the Council of Education Ministers approved a protocol to provide uniform standards to deal with teachers who are found guilty of administering corporal punishment. This protocol will include a definition for corporal punishment and will address instances where educators publicly humiliate learners. This protocol will be made available for public comment” (Reyneke, 2018).
However, Reyneke (2018) cautions that the power imbalance between educators and learners could also exacerbate the already existing discipline challenges. The case in point is the issue of refusing learners’ permission either to use the bathroom, or eat or drink, or instruct learners to sit in an uncomfortable position as punishment. Those acts impact on learners’ ability to control their own bodies and reduce their bodily security and might cause humiliation.

It is imperative that educators receive training which capacitates them with skills of dealing with conflict and discipline issues in the school environment. The training should include provision of trauma counselling to those that are affected, and effective ATCPs. Educators should also take into cognisance the fact that they are role models to their learners, which means that their behaviour should always be exemplary (Ntuli, 2013).

Anderson and Ritter (2017) in United States of America found that marginalised students are more likely to receive exclusionary discipline, even after controlling for the nature and number of disciplinary referrals, but that most of the differences occur across rather than within schools. Omote, Thinguri and Moenga (2015) in Kenya sought to justify that maintaining school discipline is a key strategy to foster academic achievement and promote socially and morally responsible behaviour among leaners in schools. They conclude by emphasising the need for collaborative partnerships among parents, educators and stakeholders to promote values that assist in managing school discipline, especially those pertaining to learners (Anderson, & Ritter, 2017). Semali and Vumilia (2016) confirmed that teachers and parents agree that learner discipline is essential for conducive teaching and learning to take place.

Ngidi (2007) asserts that teaching experience has a significant influence on educator’s usage of detention and that the teaching phase has a significant influence on their usage of demerits. This study was also investigating the usage of different measures for learners inside the classroom as alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools. The findings show that educators approach vary from one another in terms of additional work, community service, demerits, verbal warning,
detention and small menial tasks as alternative to corporal punishment in secondary schools. Further to that the findings confirm that educators gender has an important influence on the usage of community service as a form of punishment. The results also indicated that teaching experience has a significance influence on educator’s use of detention and that the teaching phase has a significance on their usage of demerits. The results also revealed that educators use of corporal punishment differ from school to school and in terms of material conditions from which they operate.

Joubert and Prinsloo (2000) maintain that it is the responsibility of the educators to maintain discipline in school at all times. The above-mentioned researchers have a strong view that the South African Schools Act (RSA, 1996) gives more powers to the SGBs to deal with matters that relate to learner discipline. This is the same act that introduced the abolishing of corporal punishment in relation to schools. This finding seems to be consistent with the South African Schools Act of (Republic of South Africa, 1996a) (both Section 8 and Section 20) which makes it mandatory for all SGBs to develop and to adopt a code of conduct for learners. This code must be aimed at establishing a disciplined and purposeful school environment dedicated to improving the quality of the learning process.

This finding seems to be consistent with Reyneke (2018) who is of the view that, “To refuse learners permission to, for instance, use the bathroom, or eat or drink, or instruct learners to sit in an uncomfortable position as punishment impacts on learners’ ability to control their own bodies and reduces their bodily security.” It is of course wise to note that it might be challenging to justify such instructions. The humiliation which a learner undergoes e.g. when refused to go to the bathroom is unacceptable.

Segalo and Rambuda (2018) conducted a study on South African public school teachers’ views on right to discipline learners. This study employed a qualitative research method. A sample of eight educators, which was four males and four females with teaching experience ranging between 0-10 years, 11-20 years and 21 years and above were selected for the study. Data was collected through interviewed using a
focus group strategy. A qualitative interview structure was used to ask questions relating learner discipline and teacher authority. The questions were phrased such that they allowed for clarification and probing. Patterns were identified by using a thematic data analysis and data was categorised according to the main themes that developed from the focus group interview, (Gribich 2013). The research does not address the effects of alternative to corporal punishment.

The findings of the study advocate that teachers are uncertain about disciplining learners due to human rights that are stipulated in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act No. 108 of 1996a and the South African School`s Act, No. 84 of 1996b that protect children`s rights to human treatment and the abolishment of corporal punishment. Several themes emerged from the study which involved learners` lack of respect, morals and values, teachers` sense of disempowerment, ineffective parental involvement, teacher sense of disempowerment and poor classroom management. The researchers stated that the findings of the study expose the threat postured by legislation on the teachers` rights to discipline learners. They recommended amongst others that schools and parents must meet on a quarterly basis to discuss school ethos and values that the school would like to instil in order to ensure that customs and values that are advocated at homes are brought to schools and vice versa, educators should review their understanding on how to effect positive discipline and explore new methods of minimising incidents of ill-discipline and that departmental officials must conduct workshops to educators in relations to human rights, educators` rights and roles and responsibilities in learners discipline.

2.9. THE VIEWS OF LEARNERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN THEIR SCHOOLS

Reyneke (2013) is of the view that learners need to be prepared for their future responsibilities as citizens of a democratic society. Public schools play a major role in that preparation process and thus it is important that the education system is governed
in terms of democratic processes. If the education system is not democratic it will be impossible for the democratic values to be transmitted to learners.

Reyneke (2018) reported that in 2011, 16.7% of learners reported that they had been exposed to corporal punishment, and in 2016 the percentage decreased to 9.8% of learners. In 2016, out of the total of roughly 14 million learners who attended public schools, more than 1.3 million learners were still subjected to corporal punishment. The gravity upon which corporal punishment is administered is huge as it has a direct effect on their health. Furthermore, a learner was injured to his eye when his educator used corporal punishment against a fellow learner (Reyneke, 2018). Learners are at risk of being exposed to conduct that may infringe on constitutional rights, as they are still subject to corporal punishment that can be avoided.

Children’s rights are often divided into prevention, protection and participation rights. The inclusion of the learners in the governance structures of the school was a way of addressing the participating right of children. However, as much as that is the case the children still depend on the adult cooperation for their rights to be fully exercised. Another salient issue is that of capacity. The question arises whether children have the capacity to take decisions which need to be juxtaposed against the issue of them being able to freely participate in society (Reyneke, 2018).

In some schools, learner participation in debates about corporal punishment improved the functioning of the SGB as it gave everyone a sense of ownership and accountability particular on matters that relate to discipline. This was proven correct in two schools where they mentioned that it had helped to alleviate some problems that had occurred in the past. They further confirmed that it had become easier to meet the needs of learners through the involvement of learner governors and much had been achieved for the learners through their involvement in the SGBs. Furthermore, the composition of the SGBs was based on what SASA stipulates. Walker, Ramsey and Gresham, (2003) conducted another qualitative study on the educators’ disciplinary capabilities after the banning of corporal punishment in South African schools. This study was triggered by
the escalation of cases of learner indiscipline in schools which affected safety and security concerns. Three rural and experienced educators from three rural schools in Eastern Cape constituted the sample. Interviews were used to gather data. The study found that Secondary Schools, especially those with 500 or more learners and schools located in rural areas reported the highest incidence of most forms of learner and educator violence and violence-relate behaviour.

Educators generally feel disempowered in their ability to institute discipline in schools in the absence of corporal punishment (Maphosa & Shumba, 2010). Educators think that learners do not behave well as they do not respect teachers. Although educators are aware of alternative disciplinary measures, they view them as ineffective and time-consuming. This research confirms some of the findings of this study.

Skiba, Michael, Nardo and Peterson (2002) argue that the disproportionate discipline of African-American learners was extensively documented, yet the reasons for those disparities are less well understood. This study revealed that boys engage more frequently in a broad range of disruptive behaviour, but there were no similar findings for race. Rather there appeared to be a differential treatment emanating from classroom level, wherein African-American students are referred to the office for infractions that are more subjective in interpretation. Implications for teacher training and structural reform are explored.

Ladislaus, Semali, Philbert and Vumilia (2016) argues that when a learner is behaving well in class in relations to activities recognition must be made with more focus on reward systems like giving star charts, badges or classroom award must be done so as to encourage good behaviour. Carter (2011), further confirms that rewarding desirable behaviour is more beneficial and effective than punishment of undesirable behaviour. And if the learner is not behaving alternatives that discourages bad behaviour must be implemented putting learners in isolation, this finding seems to be consistent with Ferreira et al. (2009) whose findings from the study that was done in Lesotho revealed that (31.49%) of the respondents who were teachers in this instance agreed that they
use isolation outside the classroom as a disciplinary measure. Clear expectations must be made to learners so as to ensure that learners know what it is that needs to be achieved. This finding seems to be consistent with Torres (2014), who asserts that there has to be “clear expectations for students (i.e. prescribing exactly what a student is expected to do and holding them accountable to it with consequences and rewards), and spending as much time as possible on instructions.”

A relevant study was conducted by Egeberg and McConney (2018) where he used a mixed approach in investigating on what is believed by students about effective management in western Australian high schools. The purpose of that study was to examine the students` perceptions of teachers on effective classroom management by creating and maintaining safe and supportive learning environments. The researchers conducted a survey which constituted of 360 students from different high schools to be captured on their views on their classroom experiences. They started with the quantitative followed by the qualitative method. The later method enabled a broad and a deep examinations of the participants` perspectives. The study started with a survey of students in order to identify differences amongst the group like public versus independent schools or boys versus girls. The results were followed by an in-depth qualitative study consisting of student focus group. There was an open-ended free response question that was asking students on what effective teachers should do that could help to create and maintain safe and supportive learning. The study was interpretative in nature as it focused on the characterization and interpretation of the perceptions of students regarding classroom management. Several themes emerged, like meting students` needs through caring relationships between students and teachers, effectively engaging students in learning and managing through responsibility in their findings that they discovered that there is little difference amongst the different groups on their views on effective classroom managers.

Stanley (2014) used a quantitative method in his study of selected secondary schools in Lagos, Nigeria on discipline and academic performance. The purpose of this study was to establish the relationships between school discipline and learners` academic
performance. The participants of the study were 380 which constituted of 220 females and 160 males in ten schools. The researcher used a questionnaire as a main data gathering tool. The data was analysed and interpreted using percentages and the Chi-square method. Likert scale was used to measure responses from the questionnaire, that is, a five-point scale namely, strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree and strongly disagree. The researcher also uses interviews as a data gathering tool where he interviewed administrative of the staff of the schools which included the deputy principal and the principal.

The researcher discovered that more than 70 % of the respondents were of the idea that management of school discipline has negative impact on the students’ academic performance, a greater percentage of the respondents strongly agreed that the observance of time management has an effect on the academic performance of students and 78.9% of the respondents were not in support of punishments and does not improve academic performance. The researcher recommended that school principal and educators must apply strict measures on time allocation in relation to time table. This demands that there should be strong adherence from students regarding time allocated. The researcher further recommended the establishment of disciplinary committees.

2.10. THE CHALLENGES ENCOUNTERED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND CIRCUIT MANAGERS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

One of the problems that is associated with corporal punishment is the manner in which it was applied, which ultimately led to its banning in South Africa (Morrel, 2001). Although abolished, teachers continued to apply it, several studies (Ngcobo & Tikly 2010; Mthanti, & Mncube, 2014; Masitsa, 2008) affirm that corporal punishment is still being administered in rural and township schools that are predominantly black while in former Model C schools it is no longer administered. Ngcobo and Tikly (2010) discovered that in the latter schools it was difficult to implement the alternatives to corporal punishment as such principals have to take a lot of time explaining to all
stakeholders that all learners would have to comply to alternative disciplinary measures. This displays that corporal punishment is still implemented in some communities in South Africa. Reasons for the continued use of corporal punishment are unknown since alternatives to corporal punishment are documented.

There are many challenges that principal and circuit managers as representatives of the HOD in their sites are faced with. One of them is that once the decision has been taken to suspend and expel the learner there are no provisions as to what should happen to the learners while they are suspended or awaiting expulsion, that is beside the strict procedure that is followed to arrive at that decision (Reyneke & Pretorius, 2017). As much as the principals recommend expulsion they still have the MEC to take the decision of whether that recommendation is approved or not. At that time the learner will stay at home literally doing nothing that might help in dealing with causes of their ill-disciplined behaviour. So, when learners return to school or attends another school they have still not been helped by any intervening measures.

Additionally, De Jure (2013) adds that management have challenges especially with respect to expelled learners, as there is reluctance from Heads of Department (HODS) to approve a recommendation of expulsion. Consequently, the principals are not supported in their endeavour to implement discipline measures in schools. A case in point is the matter of Maritzburg College versus Dlamini where three learners at the school were involved in an incident in which they had consumed alcohol and had smashed a window of a hired bus. The HOD of KwaZulu-Natal neglected to decide the matter for 21 months, later on the HOD decided that it was unlawful to suspend learners pending his decision. However, when the school appealed the decision of the HOD the High Court ordered the expulsion of the learners. This case highlights the challenges that school management face in an endeavour to maintain discipline in schools. ACP guidelines cannot be considered as a legal document. The educator cannot be found guilty of misconduct by not following it. Only the Parliament that can address an offence of this nature by following the prescribed, legislative steps (Reyneke, 2018).
Different Provincial Education Departments have issued circulars addressing educators and reminding them that corporal punishment is prohibited. These circulars explicitly define what corporal punishment is. However, these circulars are also not legally binding and thus not legally forcible (Reyneke, 2018). Reyneke argues that the circulars issued by different provincial departments in South Africa are not uniform and inconsistent. Learners have human rights and can stand up for them, which signals the growth in terms of the democratic systems of the country, however sometimes they misuse that right (De Jure, 2013). Educators are sometimes confronted by learners, who are assertive, use their rights inappropriately and sometimes exaggerate their rights.

SGBs have limited knowledge regarding legislation (Mestry & Khumalo, 2012). Some of the reasons that are given are that in some schools the SGBs do not even have a matric certificate, in some instances they are not trained on what is expected of them so as to fulfil their roles effectively. As a result, they are not capacitated to amongst other things develop and implement policies needed in the functioning of the school. So most of the time it will be the principals and teachers who are left on their own to draft the code of conduct without any input from the SGB and also make sure that the same code is adopted and enforced in the school.

A study by Mestry and Khumalo; (2012) which focuses on the experiences of the SGB in managing discipline through the design and enforcement of the code of conduct, revealed that members of the SGB generally do not have relevant knowledge and skills to design and enforce the code of conduct. Their literacy level acted as a barrier obstructing them to do their work. It also became evident that the members of SGB are not always at school and as such they are far removed from daily occurrences within the school. Additionally, Wolhuter and Steyn (2013) view the size of the school as the other challenge that can have an impact on pupil-parent relations with regard to discipline. If the school is too big there is a likelihood that there will be more cases of discipline problems, which in a way require close working relations with parents and learners to deal effectively with the discipline problems.
As the principals cannot take the decisions concerning disciplinary measures alone and have to wait for other stakeholders to be involved like the members of the SGB who are not always at school, the misbehaviour continues within the school premises (Masitsa, 2008). In trying to deal with the problem the Minister of Education in 2006 (The Citizen 2006) announced that she had an intention of introducing a legislation in parliament that will deal with measures aimed at decreasing the poor discipline in schools that results in school violence. The measures included providing and improving security infrastructure in schools such as fences, floodlights, security officers who will have powers to search and seize dangerous weapons from learners; random searches are also done at schools for drugs and weapons (Masitsa, 2008). There is also a very close relationship between discipline and academic performance of learners. A study conducted by Stanely (2014) in Nigeria which dealt with the effects of discipline on students’ academic performance in some Secondary Schools revealed that there is a relationship between the two, in the sense that if there is an effective school discipline system in place at the school it somehow has a positive impact on learners’ behaviour. Moreover, it improves their performance in general. Those who are in charge of school management should also have an effective leadership style, which can capacitate them with the knowledge and skills of dealing with learner discipline.

Moyo, Khewu and Bayaga (2014) reveal that there was no established consistency between disciplinary processes and practices in the school environment and the principles of the corporal punishment strategy. Some studies (McKinney, Brown, Malkin, 2018, Nunes & Mota, 2017) suggest that parental structures are associated with positive outcomes in learners such as increased self-esteem and psychological well-being, whilst parental rejection and permissiveness, are associated with negative outcomes such as depression, anxiety, aggression and suicide. Considerable studies (Fouri & Midouhas, 2017; Pinquart, 2017) agree that discipline practices focused on communication and nonviolent conflict resolution are associated with increased moral development and prosocial behaviour, whereas discipline practices characterised by harsh force and control are associated with emotional and behavioural problems.
Davidoff and Lazarus (2002) found that limited resources, poverty, high levels of crime and violence translate to the behaviour of the society of the learners at school. School violence are linked with the problems experienced by the society at large (Mncube & Harber, 2013); addressing school violence is essential for social transformation. In fact, Davidoff and Lazarus (2002) view schools as occupying a central position in Education Change. This research does not address issues that relate to the effects of corporal punishment in secondary school.

2.11. Conclusion

This chapter presented the literature reviewed on issues related to the alternatives to corporal punishment. Chapter 3 will present the research design and methodology followed in this study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 presented the review of literature from different sources relevant to this research on the historical and theoretical overview of corporal punishment and discipline. The focus was on educational law in school governance and corporal punishment as a way of disciplining learners in schools. This chapter presents the method of the investigation and the instrumentation used in this study. The discussion in this chapter includes the research design, methodology, population sample, instrumentation and administration of the research tool.

3.2 RESEARCH PARADIGM

Research paradigm is viewed as a framework that defines what is acceptable and what is not, and the way the social world is viewed and perceived by social scientists (Kumar, 2014). It is also defined by Sefotho, (2014) as beliefs, practices, or worldviews which influence researchers.

According to Bertram and Christiansen (2014), a research paradigm signifies a specific world view that defines, for the researchers who hold the view, what is acceptable to research and how this should be completed. It can also be argued that there are various paradigms. It is important to consider a paradigm as the researcher needs to reflect and be aware of the lens through which data will be handled and interpreted (Arend et al., 2013). Consequently, the researcher philosophical stance for the current study is John Dewey’s Pragmatic Paradigm. According to Morgan, (2014) a pragmatist focuses on “characteristics approaches to inquiry” instead of adopting post-positivism, constructivism and epistemological world views. Hall, (2012) illustrates that “positivism
and its successor post-positivism are closely identified with quantitative research and constructivism with qualitative research, making neither particularly suitable for mixed methods research”. Furthermore, Morgan (2014) holds the view that in the pragmatic paradigm “knowledge is not about an abstract relationship between the knower and the known, instead, there is an active process of inquiry that creates a continual back-and-forth movement between beliefs and actions”. Just like the Mixed method approach which is considered as a third approach after the quantitative and qualitative approaches the Pragmatic Paradigm is also regarded as a third choice which combines both qualitative and quantitative designs (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). It is then not surprising that a number of Mixed Methods scholars, adopt pragmatist paradigm due to interest in “both quantitative and qualitative data” (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). Therefore, pragmatist paradigm appears to be suitable in this study since the researcher used questionnaires, and semi structured interviews to collect data in the field. It is recommended; Mixed Methods researchers should adopt pragmatism as a “philosophical worldview” when conducting research (Creswell, 2008, Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).

The philosophy that is adopted by the mixed methodologist is that of combining the insight from both the qualitative and quantitative research for the better understanding of the research problem. Creswell and Plano Clark, (2007) admits that pragmatists can use any method, technique or procedure associated with either qualitative or quantitative research design. To this end, (Johnson et al., 2007:125), agrees that “pragmatism offers an epistemological justification and logic (i.e. use the combination of methods and ideas that helps one best frame, address, and provide tentative answers to one’s research question(s) for mixing approaches and methods”.

The use of pragmatic paradigm by the researcher in the current study will help in getting reliable research findings on the effects of using alternatives in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo district by usage of both qualitative and quantitative data sources. As a result; according to Teddle and Tashakkori, (2009) researchers who use the mixed method approach work “primarily within the pragmatists
paradigm and interested in both narrative and numeric data in their analysis.” A pragmatic approach seems to be appropriate for this as it is believed, that pragmatic approach facilitates programme implementation and quality improvement (Glasgow & Riley, 2013). Consequently, Johnson et al., 2007) observes pragmatic paradigm as the ‘key’ paradigm for Mixed Methods design.

3.3. RESEARCH APPROACH

In the present study, I used a mixed-methods approach during data collection, analysis and interpretation. This approach is viewed by Creswell, (2014:219) as a method that “collects both quantitative and qualitative data, analyses them separately, and then compares the results to see if the findings confirm or disconfirm each other.” The concurrent use of qualitative and quantitative data in the present study will assist not only in triangulating, but also in comparing research findings from both data sources (questionnaires and semi-structured interviews).

Almalki, (2016), identifies three distinct approaches to research which are quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. In the current study, I utilized Mixed Methods approach. There are numerous definitions of mixed methods by different scholars. According to Creswell and Garett (2008:322), it “Involves collecting both quantitative and qualitative data (in response to quantitative and qualitative research questions), the merging, linking, or combining of the two sources of data, and then conducting research as a single study or a longitudinal project with multiple phases.” I used a mixed-methods design due to “its strength of drawing on both qualitative and quantitative research; minimising the limitations of both approaches” (Creswell, 2014:218). This approach is viewed as a “third methodological movement” after the quantitative and qualitative approaches and it has so much to offer especially in the social science research (Doyle, Brady & Byrne, 2009:183). It is defined as: “… the type of research in which a researcher or team of researchers combine elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e.g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data
collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration” (Johnson et al., 2007:123).

Creswell (2012) defines mixed methods as a way of collecting, analysing and mixing both qualitative and quantitative methods in the same study in order to get a clear understanding of a particular research problem. Creswell emphasised that the use of mixed methods research will help the researcher in order to combine their strengths and minimize their weaknesses. Ponce and Pagan-Maldonado (2015) stated that in mixed methods are based on the fact that there are problems whose complexity cannot be fully researched when the integration of qualitative and quantitative approaches are not undertaken as components of the study. They further argued that mixed studies are able to address research problems which have subjective and objective elements in its manifestation. The collection of the qualitative and quantitative data offers the researcher a greater opportunity to have a more complete information that is more descriptive from the research problem which allows the researcher to make more informed decisions.

According to (Doyle, Brady & Byrne, 2009) mixed method approach has benefits which include triangulation which assists in validity as there is cooperation between qualitative and quantitative data. It also talks to completeness because the joint use of qualitative and quantitative provides the complete picture of the phenomenon under study. It also helps in answering different research questions which cannot be answered by either qualitative or quantitative methods. It also assists in explanation of findings as findings from the quantitative can be followed up with qualitative and also in the illustration of data as more explanation can be put on quantitative findings. One of its aims is to “is to expand and strengthen a study’s conclusions”, (Schoonenboom & Johnson, 2017:4). The authors further argue that “the power of mixed methods research is its ability to deal with diversity and divergence” (p.5).

Mixed Methods approach was found to be an appropriate choice for this study, due to the researcher’s interest in “both quantitative and qualitative data.” The researcher
utilized questionnaires and semi structured interviews as data collection instruments. The data collected from the two instruments were thus linked and integrated. The approach was used in this study to draw strengths and lessen weaknesses from each research instrument. Using this approach allowed the researcher to link, connect and merge both quantitative and qualitative data in answering research questions. Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) state that qualitative and quantitative data can be collected and analysed researchers in a sequential and/or simultaneous and rigorous manner with an intention to integrate the two forms of data. They further state that as this approach combines two approaches it thus has a greater degree of understanding to be formulated than if a single approach were adopted to specific studies. It is also utilised to avoid hurdles of utilizing “quantitative or qualitative approaches alone, and to find a comprehensive answer to the research question (Ozden, 2015; Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, Onwuegbuzie & Johnson 2006).

Subsequently; in the current study, the researcher linked, connected and merged both quantitative and qualitative data in answering research questions. Aligning with the above, the researcher anticipates that the outcomes of this study, which were acquired through triangulation and comparison of findings from different data sources, would assist in improving learner discipline in the classroom. This notion is supported by Creswell and Plano Clark, (2007:7) points out “by mixing the datasets, the researcher provides a better understanding of the problem than if either dataset had been used alone. Furthermore, Johnson and Onwuegbuzie, (2004:19) contends that; “if findings are corroborated across different approaches then greater confidence can be held in the singular conclusion accordingly. The researcher used quantitative and qualitative research instruments concurrently so as to connect, make comparison, merge and come up with concrete research findings. This is in line with Pluye and Hong, (2014:30) who notes that the “simultaneous use of both qualitative and quantitative data” gives a ‘better’ understanding of a ‘phenomenon’ under study.

The researcher used interview as a method of data collection approach for qualitative methods. All the participants that were interviewed were deemed important because
they have a role to play in making sure that the ATCP are effectively implemented so as to deal with learner discipline. The participants as they have information based on their experiences, emotions, and feelings concerning the issue of learner discipline in schools.

3.4 RESEARCH DESIGN

There are four major mixed methods designs articulated by Creswell (2008) in Ngulube and Ngulube (2015) those are explanatory, exploratory, triangulation, and embedded mixed methods design. Triangulation design was adopted for this study and this design used to be called concurrent triangulation design (Creswell, et al., 2003). It is also presented as “QUAL + QUAN (equal-status concurrent design”) (Schoonenboom & Johnson (2017:13). The aim of this design is to “use quantitative and qualitative approaches simultaneously in the development of their study. Generally, parallel phase studies consist of studying the problem in an integrated manner from the quantitative and qualitative approaches” (Ponce & Pagan-Maldonado, 2015:117). Additionally, (Creswell, 2014) is of the view that this design involves collecting both quantitative and qualitative data, analyses them separately, and then compares the results to see if the findings confirm or disconfirm each other” In adopting the mixed method approach and the triangulation design for this study a decision was taken that quantitative as well as qualitative data will be collected concurrently. As a results both methods were given a priority, the mixing was at the data analysis level. As Schoonenboom and Johnson (2017) puts it that there should be at least one point of integration where both components of qualitative and quantitative data are brought together in an integrated manner. Therefore, in this study analytical point of integration was used.

The other benefit of this design is that it is getting information from different sources using different methods (Almaki, 2016). In the current study in order for the researcher to answer the research questions both quantitative and qualitative data were given equal weight. Equal weight was given to both quantitative and qualitative given during the data collection process, data was analysed separately and findings were compared
to have better understanding of the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary schools in King Cetshwayo Secondary schools. This is in line with Creswell and Plano Clark, (2011:65) who maintains that; “the two methods may have an equal priority so that both play an equally important role in addressing the research problem.” Subsequently, the researcher found that the triangulation design which involves the concurrent use of qualitative and quantitative data, assist in triangulating and comparing research findings from both data sources (questionnaires and semi structured interviews) in the present study will thus give a better understanding of the effects of corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo.

3.5 POPULATION AND SAMPLING PROCEDURES

Population from the current study was drawn from King Cetshwayo district, which is one of the twelve districts in the KZN Province. It is located in the North Coast of UThukela River. The districts have two hundred and four (204) secondary schools and it has five Circuit Management Centres (CMCs), and the Umhlathuze Circuit Management Centre (CMC) is one of them. The Umhlathuze Circuit Management Centre (CMC) has a population of 138 schools, 138 principals, 2456 educators and 76561 learners and has four wards, which are Esikhalenisenkosi, Ensingweni, Mthunzini and Ongoye.

Abbott and McKinney (2013) define sampling as the process of selecting people who will be part of the study as participants. There are factors that need to be taken into consideration when selecting a sample such as the research objectives of the study and the characteristics of the study population (May 2011). Both the quantitative and qualitative techniques were used to collect data (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2010).

The focus of this study was the Esikhalenisenkosi ward, it had a high number of corporal punishment cases reported and it has school that belong to both urban and rural setting. It has a population of 13 Secondary School principals, 138 educators and 1621 grade 12 learners. Participants were selected from learners (RCL members),
educators, principals and Circuit managers who on daily basis are involved in the environment where there is a challenge of learners who are not disciplined. Only RCL representatives were selected to be part of the study because they also part of the SGB which deals with learner discipline in schools. Most the educators of public secondary schools are recruited by the Department of Basic Education and there are some who are recruited by the SGB’s. However, all teachers have the same minimum teaching qualification which is a diploma or degree in teaching (M+3).

Simple random sampling procedure was used for quantitative methods while purposive sampling procedure was used for qualitative methods. Using the Raosoft Sample size calculator, tolerating a margin error of 5% to give a 95% confidence level from a total population of 1772, the sample consisted of 355 participants. The principals were purposely selected due to a fewer number of participants as there are only 13 schools while the other respondents were selected through a simple random sampling procedure. These methods are favoured for their unbiased nature, and their closeness to fulfilling the major assumption of probability, namely that each element in the population stands an equal chance of being selected (Kumar, 2010).

Aligned with Mixed Methods sampling processes, purposive sampling was used to select circuit managers, principals, teachers and learners so as to get their views about the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment as a way to maintain discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo district (Teddlie & Yu, 2007). During the process two circuit managers, two principals, two educators and two learners who were members of the RCL were chosen for semi structured interviews and 282 were chosen to complete the questionnaire. Two circuit managers as cases of misconduct are reported and investigated by them including cases of corporal punishment in schools. Two principals of secondary schools were also selected as they are dealing with learner discipline in schools and two educators as they deal with learners in a classroom situation and are expected to maintain learner discipline in schools. Additionally, two learners from Representative Learner Council (RCL) to participate in the study as some cases of this nature are reported to them and they are expected to refer them to the
School Governing Body (SGB), which they are members of and they are thus part of the management of the school.

When choosing the participants, the researcher was also guided by his experience as a District Director. Undisciplined learners are regularly sent to school principals when they present unmanageable classroom behaviour, who then convene the tribunal working with the SGB members. The decisions taken by the SGB are then recommended to circuit managers and then the District Director especially those cases that are serious in nature. The District Director further recommends to the office of the HOD especially if it is an expulsion case.

Furthermore, the researcher selected those participants in these schools whom he judged to be informative, thoughtful, and experienced with the issues of learner discipline. The researcher believed that the identified sample would be in a position to respond suitably to research questions, thus; provide reliable research findings.

The role of the researcher; when using purposive sampling, is to identify participants according to their level of information (Gulati & Taneja, 2013). Purposive sampling assisted in selecting information rich participants which are circuit managers, school principals, teachers and RCL representatives who gave adequate responses on the effects of using alternatives to corporal punishment as a way to maintain discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. The researcher believed that Circuit managers, principals, teachers and Grade 12 learners who are part of the RCL from Esikhalenisenkosi ward will provide information rich responses to the research questions. As the ward is one of those wards with many cases of learner’s ill-discipline being reported to the District office. Hence, it is also imperative that research participants have experience and expertise on the research topic (Lichtman, 2006).

When using concurrent Mixed Methods approach data collected from a bigger sample of quantitative data may be integrated with a smaller sample of qualitative data
Consequently, in the present study, the sample of 282 participants was selected

### 3.6. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

In order for the researcher to be in line with the mixed methods approach, the researcher used the following research instruments:

#### 3.6.1 Questionnaire

McMillan and Schumacher (2006:169) refers to a questionnaire as a set of questions dealing with some topics or a set of related topics, given to a selected group of individuals for the purpose of gathering data on a problem under consideration. Nkunda, (2010:2) asserts that, questionnaires are used to collect facts “about people’s beliefs, feelings, experiences in certain jobs, service offered, activities and so on”. So questionnaire was used as a data-collection tool in this study as the study focuses on the views the circuit managers, principals, teachers and learners have on the effects of alternatives to punishment as a way to maintain discipline.

Questionnaires were considered as flexible instruments as respondents could complete them in their time and usually in the absence of the researcher (Nkunda, 2010). Questionnaires can also be used when data is collected from a big number of research participants (Wilkinson, 2003). Consequently, use of questionnaires in the current study assisted in collecting data from a big number of participants (282), which ensured data authenticity. Secondly, they assisted in getting accurate data from respondents in the case of sensitive questions as alluded to by Kumar (2012). This study dealt with questions which may be perceived as being ‘sensitive’ since participants were asked about the usage of alternatives to corporal punishment knowing that it is possible that some of them might still be using it irrespective of it being banned.

The researcher took into consideration the ethical issues which include ‘anonymity and confidentiality’ and these were considered when designing questionnaires as guided by
Somekh and Lewin (2006) as some of the items in the questionnaires were deemed to be sensitive. ‘As a result, all participants, during questionnaires completion sessions, were informed that their names were not required in the questionnaire form. So the use of questionnaire helped in the current study so as to avoid asking questions which can be considered to be personal and which cannot be answered truthfully during the semi structured interviews. In other instances, questionnaires are used to monitor and assess impact (Nkunda, 2010). Similarly, in the present study; the use of questionnaires would help in monitoring and evaluating the use of alternatives to corporal punishment as a discipline tool in schools.

The questionnaires had close-ended questions which consisted of items that were easy to ask, easy to respond to and did not need any further comments from the respondents. A Likert scale questionnaire was used in this study. Respondents were requested to choose what applies to them from a five-point scale questionnaire ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree, with the option of neutral for those who were not sure. The limitations of using this scale were considered as given by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007). They argued that it is difficult for the researcher to understand the respondents` degree of sensitivity from the data they cannot bear. There is no possible way to verify whether the respondents are telling the truth or falsifying their responses; there is no assumption of equal intervals between the categories, and it is also impossible if the respondent might have wished to add some comments on the point under investigation.

With due consideration for its strength and its limitations, the researcher trusted this instrument in this study. Great care was taken in the construction of the questionnaire in order to ensure the validity and the reliability of the data to be collected and in achieving the objectives and answering the research questions of the study. The questionnaire was divided into two sections. Section A required biographical data and Section B was about the understanding and the implementation of effects of alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District.
Simple and straightforward language was used in order to avoid misinterpretation of the questions.

The questionnaire had two sections. Section A of the questionnaire covered the biographical information. It required information from the respondents about gender, age and category. It was a crucial part of the questionnaire, because it provided an understanding of how diverse the respondents were. Section B of the questionnaire contained closed questions about their knowledge and understanding of alternatives to corporal punishment. This section comprised thirty-four statements. The respondents were asked to rate their responses on a five-point scale ranging from fully agree to and fully disagree with the option of neutral for those who were unsure.

The researcher assumed that the findings of this study would enable policy developers, education managers and educators, to develop programmes that would help teachers in the effective usage of alternatives to corporal punishment as a way of maintaining discipline in schools. In this instance Creswell and Plano Clark, (2007:13) agree that “audiences such as policy makers, practitioners, and others in applied areas need multiple forms of evidence to document and inform the research problems. The researcher, therefore expect the findings of the current study to help in coming up with disciplinary measures that are effective in maintaining learner discipline in schools.

3.6.2 Validity of the questionnaire

Behr and Schneider (2001) refers to validity as an indispensable characteristic of measuring devices. Leedy (1993), Pillay (1998) affirms that validity is the extent to which a measuring instrument fulfils the purpose for which it was created. It is therefore, the degree to which an instrument succeeds in measuring what it has set out to measure. Van den Aardweg (1998:237) argues that a valid research instrument is one that has established or detects some real ability, attitude or prevailing situation that the researcher can identify and characterise. If the ability or attitude is itself stable, and if a respondent’s answer to the items is not affected by other unpredictable factors, the
administration of all the instruments should produce essentially the same results. The validity of this instrument was tested using KMO and Bartlett's Test, which suggested for it to be valid it should be above 0.5 % and in this instrument it was found that it was 0.821. Therefore, this instrument that was used to collect quantitative data was valid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett’s Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. 1: Validity test

Figure 3. 2: Normality test

Maree and Fraser (2004) maintain that reliability of a research instrument refers to the degree of consistency of measuring what it is supposed to measure. Van den Aardweg
(1998) states that reliability is a statistical concept and relates to consistency and dependability, which means consistency in obtaining the same results when measuring phenomena that have not changed. He identifies the following types of reliability:

### 3.6.3 Reliability of the questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

**Figure 3. 3: Reliability test**

Additionally, Seliger and Shohamy (1989:185) maintain that reliability “provides information on whether the data collection procedure is consistent and accurate.” Reliability involves the consistency, accuracy, reproducibility or replication of the results. The question then arises as to ask what a satisfactory level of reliability is, and the answer to this question depends on how a measure is being used. Nunnally (1978) suggests that reliabilities of 70 or higher will be sufficient in the early stages of research on predictor tests or hypothesised measures of a construct. To this effect McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 248) state that “a good rule of thumb is to be wary of reliability below .70”.

There are two main ways that are used to assess the reliability of a procedure; it is the internal and external reliability. According to Nunan (1992:14), internal reliability refers to “the consistency of data collection, analysis, and interpretation.” On the other hand, external reliability is defined by Nunan (1992:14) as “the extent to which independent researchers can reproduce a study and obtain results similar to those obtained in the original study.” External reliability can be guaranteed in various ways, namely through quantification, the statistical application of a reliability test to test or questionnaire items,
such as the Cronbach Alpha, and the guarantee of the participant’s attention. The following tests were used to ensure reliability of the instrument used in this study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.4: Reliability statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary: Item Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-Item Correlations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.5: Summary of item statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.6: Scale statistics

The results show that the instrument reliability is 0.890 which is above 0.7 that serves as a minimum in relation to instrument (questionnaire) reliability. Therefore, this questionnaire was reliable.
3.6.4 Semi structured interviews

An interview is a flexible instrument that is used to gather data, which enables multi-sensory channels (verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard) to be used (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). Additionally, Matthews and Ross (2010) define an interview as a method of collecting data; which enables direct communication between two individuals; the interviewer and the interviewee, the former is able to elicit information, opinions and feelings through the use of questions and interactive dialogue.

It is not a normal conversation, but a planned one aiming at achieving a particular objective through questioning and getting a response from the interviewee. Interviews were chosen for this study because of its advantages cited by Cohen et al. (2007), and Lincoln and Guba (1985) which include depth, flexibility and which provide a high response rate as interviews can be rescheduled to suit time and location of the interviewee. The researcher used interviewing as it was found to be the most suitable method for an in-depth understanding of the perception of educators, views of learners and challenges faced by principals and circuit managers in the implementation of the alternatives to corporal punishment. The interviews were used to verify information gathered from the questionnaires. Interviews also assisted in getting relevant information which would not be easy to establish through the use of questionnaires only. During the interview sessions, the interviewer is able to listen to people who are involved in the phenomenon under study.

The researcher used semi-structured interviews to gather information from learners (RCL members), educators, principals and Circuit managers. This was a preferred type of interview from the familiar three types which are structured interviews, unstructured interviews and semi-structured interviews. It is considered as the most popular type of interview used in educational research (Basit 2010). One of its advantages is that the researcher can change some of the questions or the order of the questions during the interview depending on what happens in the interview.
Interview schedule

The interview schedule was used to guide the in-depth semi structured interview. The interview schedule consisted of four main questions, which guided the interview. I used a set of pre-planned questions in an effort to cover the same areas of interest with each participant during the interview. This technique also gives the participant the opportunity to provide more relevant information as the interview continues. This technique assisted in the gathering of information about effectiveness of alternatives to corporal punishment in secondary schools in the King Cetshwayo district.

The role of the researcher

The role of the researcher is of critical importance as he or she is considered as the primary instrument when semi structured interviews are used, he is the main instrument for obtaining knowledge (Mathews & Ross 2010). He asks questions, probes and prompts, so as to gain detailed information from participants. So it becomes imperative that the interviewer has some skills and knowledge that he brings to the interview (Marshall & Rossman 2011). However, care should be taken in ensuring that the three is the risk of the interviewer’s bias, which may threaten the trustworthiness of the research findings. As a result, the researcher triangulated the findings by using various research methods, different types of respondents/participants and different school sites, so as to ensure trustworthiness of the research.

Individual interviews were conducted with all participants which include learners (RCL members), educators, principals and Circuit managers. In total, two principals, two learners, two educators and two Circuit managers were part of the individual semi structured interviews.
3.6.5 Data collection procedure

In the current study, the triangulation design was used by the researcher during data collection stage to get an in-depth understanding of learners (RCL members), educators, principals and Circuit managers on the effectiveness of the alternatives to corporal punishment to maintain learner discipline in schools. In using the mixed method approach Azorin and Cameron, (2010) state that regarding priority, mixed methods researchers can give equal priority to both quantitative and qualitative research, or emphasize more on qualitative or quantitative parts. The advantage of using both methods equally is what Steckler et al., (1992:4) observes that, “when both methods are used equally, often the results from each approach are used to cross-validate the study findings.” So the researcher conducted the process of questionnaires completion parallel to semi structured interviews sessions. Consequently, the researcher collected both the quantitative and qualitative data parallel to each other in one phase. The questionnaire forms were distributed by the researcher to the respondents personally in each school. Distributing the questionnaires personally, increased the response rate of the respondents (Wilkinson, 2003), ultimately, data was collected through questionnaires from two hundred and eighty (282) participants. On the other hand, the researcher collected qualitative data through semi structured interviews to eight participants. The researcher spent about 30 to 60 minutes in one interview session with each participant, and that helped in getting enough information. An interview schedule was prepared which served as a guide until the end of interview sessions, that did not stop the participants to probe for more information so as to get interviewees to narrate their stories more openly.

The researcher was granted permission (Appendix A) to issue questionnaires and to conduct interviews with the circuit managers, principals, educators and learners of the selected schools via the circuit office of the Umhlathuze circuit management centre. Participants signed the consent letters before completing the questionnaires and before interviews were held.
During the data collection process, the researcher used an audio-recorder. The permission to use the audio-recorder during the semi-structured interviews was part of the consent forms given to all participants, before they participated in this study. Consequently, each participant had to grant permission for use of an audio-recorder during the semi-structured interview session. The advantages of using an audio-recorder is that it is able to retain the natural language, it also gives an interviewer an opportunity to keep an eye contact and observe body language whilst conducting interviews and it can also be re-winded especially during the data analysis stage (Wellington, 2003:86). As a result; the researcher managed to write field notes during semi structured interview sessions. The two which are field notes taken during the interview sessions and data collected through an audio-recorder were transcribed, during data analysis stage.

3.6.6 Data analysis

As mentioned earlier, the study used the Mixed Method design approach of which according to Teddlie and Tashakkori, (2009:7) “Mixed Methods data analysis involves the integration of statistical and thematic data analytic techniques, plus other strategies unique to MM”. The researcher analysed data collected through questionnaires, separate from data collected through semi structured interviews. This view is supported by Creswell and Plano Clark, (2011:77) who states that; in triangulation design “the researcher analyses the two data sets separately and independently from each other using typical quantitative and qualitative analytic procedures”.

The use of semi-structured interviews, resulted in the generation of large quantities of data. Consequently, the collated data in this study were analysed using the following stages in content analysis (Mertler, 2006). The first stage was the transcription of all the data collected through the semi-structured interviews and recorded observations. The second stage involved reading and re-reading to ensure familiarisation with items noted. The third stage is open source coding which is a process of data reduction whereby the volume of information collated is reduced for the purpose of identifying and organising
data into important patterns and themes (Lee, 2007; Mertler, 2006). The pattern found were ideas and expressions that were found similar in the data, on the other hand the themes consisted of the participants’ knowledge, beliefs, experiences as well as their opinions in response to the research questions.

In the current study the researcher coded the qualitative data provided by the learners (RCL members), educators, principals and circuit managers in order to determine common themes (Merriam, 2009). On the other hand, quantitative data was analysed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The chi-square tests of independence were also conducted to examine differences in how respondents respond to the alternatives of using corporal punishment in terms of biographical items such as gender, age and educational category. The quantitative data was used to provide responses for research question one, as it looks at the extent in which alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools. Qualitative data was used to address research questions two, three and four as the purpose of the questions was to establish the perception of educators, views of learners and the challenges encountered by both school principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo district.

3.7. PRE TESTING THE INSTRUMENT

As the preparatory phase of data collection, the researcher conducted a pilot study, as piloting gives the researcher a chance to collect data on a smaller scale trial. It enables the researcher to try out interview questions and to find out if participants understand the language used in the questionnaire, so that if there are problems they can be solved before the start of the main research. The main aim is to refine the research instrument, of which in the case of this study that is the questionnaire and interview protocol (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). The participants for the pilot study were not the ones who formed part of the main study as much as they come from the same ward which is Esikhalenisenkosi ward.
Pre-testing of a questionnaire was conducted with ten (10) learners, three (3) educators and 1 (one) principal. I also conducted pilot testing on the development of the interview schedule that was to serve as a guide when asking questions from the participants during the same-structured interviews to promote data accuracy and relevance during the collection stage. The purpose was to identify challenges with regard to “understanding and interpretation” of the questions by participants in the questionnaire form prior data collection phase.

3.8. ETHICAL ISSUES

Devers and Frankel (2000) are of the view that it is important for researchers to negotiate entrance to the research field from the authorities before conducting research. Before I started gathering data, I requested permission from the Provincial Head of Department to conduct research in the sampled schools. Presented the approval letter to the District office, circuit management to the schools and participants. Participants were informed of their rights to withdraw at any stage of the research and that their participation is voluntary.

All participants were also given informed consent letters, which state clearly that participation in the current study is voluntary and withdrawal would be acceptable at any stage of the research. The above is in line with Rossman and Rallis, (2003:74) who assert that obtaining “informed consent of participants is crucial for the ethical conduct of research.” In addition, I also explained verbally to all participants that withdrawal would be acceptable without repercussions, at any stage of this study. That is in line with Arend (2013) who assert that researchers may explain “verbally and in writing that participants could withdraw from the study at any time.”

I also explained verbally to all the research participants the start of interviews and the completion of the questionnaires that they have a right not to respond to any questions which makes them feel uncomfortable. Arend et al. (2013:157) is of the view that participants may withdraw from the interview if it caused them to be uncomfortable. In
the current study it was clearly stated in the informed consent forms that participants may refuse to answer any question which makes them feel uncomfortable.

Under no circumstances was the researcher involved in falsification of data references of any research findings. Plagiarism was avoided and other people’s work or data were clearly referenced. Direct quotations taken from different authors are reflected by quotation marks with accompanying citation. I applied for the ethical clearance certificate (Appendix B) from the research committee of the University of Zululand which was given in writing.

I requested the respondents to provide their personal views freely that have a true reflection of their understanding and implementation of SASA. The American Education Research Council (AERA) states that conflict arises when the researchers’ personal, financial and professional interests badly influence their behaviour to the participants and decision for their study

3.9 LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY

Since Matrix question format was used in the question developed to collect data for this study, it is possible that some respondents may have developed a pattern of agreeing strongly with some statements that indicated a particular orientation. In an attempt to address this, most questions were short and simple language was used. However, it is possible that ambiguity in questions may not be completely eradicated. Language may have also impacted on learners understanding of some questionnaire.

Despite the limitations indicated above data collected was of high quality. Everything possible was done to reduce the possible errors during interviews and in the questionnaire.
3.10 CONCLUSION

This chapter described the methods or procedures that were followed in this study during data gathering, using a mixed-methods approach. Furthermore, the research instruments used in collecting data, the population and sampling and ethical considerations were discussed. The following chapter contains data presentation and interpretation.
CHAPTER 4:

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 3 presented the research design and methodology followed in this study. This chapter focuses on the results from quantitative and qualitative data presented with the help of tables and remarks from participants. These results are discussed in relation to this study objectives and literature reviewed. The highlights from tables are given followed by an in-depth discussion, which is supported by the remarks from participants. In study Qualitative results were meant to strengthen quantitative results. It must be noted that there were 282 participants in terms of this study. Some tables have missing values hence the inconsistences in those tables when you analyse the total number, some respondents who did not return questionnaires caused this.

4.2. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

The demographic results are presented in this section.

Table 4.1: Biographical data table (N=282)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>20 years old and below</th>
<th>21 to 30 years old</th>
<th>31 to 40 years’ old</th>
<th>41 to 50 years’ old</th>
<th>51 to 60 years’ old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners 247</td>
<td>Educators 30</td>
<td>Principals 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that questionnaires were distributed to 282 participants and 61.3% of the respondents were females and (38.7%) were male respondents. This is also reflected by statistics of South Africa where female population is of majority as compared to males.

The results show that the majority (80.1%) of respondents were 20 years old and younger, and 9.7% of the respondents were 21 to 30 years, 3.2% were 31 to 40 years, 4.3% were 41 to 50 years old and 2.5% were 51 to 60 years. The results show that the majority of respondents are learners (88.2%) followed by educators with 10.7% and principals with 1.1%.

4.3. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF OVERALL RESULTS

This sub-section presents the over-all results from the study.

4.3.1. Summary of results

The summary of results is presented showing the descriptive statistics.

Table 4.2: Descriptive statistics table (N=282)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers makes them to improve their behaviour.</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering community services as alternative to corporal punishment has been used to stop learners found guilty of misconduct from misbehaving.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners found guilty of misconduct and who are suspended for 14 days change their behaviour.</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work such as cleaning toilets bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour.</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depriving learners from participation in extra-mural activities as form of punishment deters learners from misbehaving at school.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspending leaners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days’ stops them from misbehaving.</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behaviour when they are found guilty of misconduct has a positive influence on their behaviour.</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of learners found guilty of misconduct makes learners behave well at school because of fear of being expelled.</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demerit system to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour.</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good conduct by the learner.</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages misconduct by other learners as they know they will not be punished for misconduct.</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding learners from participating in school activities after being found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour.</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final written warning to learners guilty of misconduct improves learner discipline in class.</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing a contract with the learner found guilty of</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct makes the learner to behave well.</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct daily report for the learner found guilty of misconduct signed by all educators corrects learner behaviour.</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing duties that improve the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper way.</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourage learners to behave better.</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring learner found guilty of misconduct to an outside agency like social workers or psychologist has been found to be effective.</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying school code of conduct to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour.</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School governing body members assisting in disciplining learner found guilty of misconduct has a positive effect on learner discipline.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening tribunals for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good discipline.</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending civil prosecution by school governing body for learners found guilty of misconduct stops misbehaving.</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of privileges in the school for learners found guilty of ill-discipline encourages good behaviour to all learners in the school.</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mediation improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct.</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this figure represent the majority of the participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-learner parents’ meetings encourage good behaviour.</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour in school.</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward systems like giving star charts, badges or classroom awards to learners that conducting themselves well encourages good behaviour.</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-out strategy, which involves removal of the learners from the situation in which they are unable to exercise self-discipline to a cooling down place for learners found guilty encourages good behaviour.</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting clear expectations to learners prevents bad behaviour.</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged property such as graffiti on walls by learners found guilty of misconduct corrects misbehaviour.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five point Likert scale with items ranging from strongly agree, agree, not sure, disagree and strongly disagree was used in this study. To construct Table 4.1, it was decided that strongly agree and agree both means respondent is agreeing therefore these were captured as agree. Same goes for disagree and strongly disagree which were captured as disagree. Those who neither agree or disagree were captured as not sure.

In Table 4.1 the alternatives that were considered as most effective by the respondents judging by the percentages they were given which is above 70% are those that have to do with the involvement of parents in maintaining discipline in schools and reward
system. The parental involvement includes inviting parents to discuss learner behaviour in schools. The teacher-parent relationship is of utmost importance in a school environment, especially in maintaining order and discipline for effective teaching and learning to take place. It is not a surprising finding as the study conducted by Singh, Mbokodi and Msila, (2004) revealed that parental involvement was critical in the education of their children, the authors further argued that" the parents who spent some quality time with their children each day tend to be good motivators to their children” (p305). Skinner (1976) further argues that the rewarding of learners for good achievements and behaviour will in turn motivate their counterparts to follow suit in the learning process. Additionally, the KZN Curriculum Management and Delivery Strategy (2012, p.23) acknowledged that this alternative is effective.

*Strong parent and community support [as] one of the key factors for effective teaching and learning.*

To this end, Ntshangase and Narainsamy (2013:657) echo that:" ... the issue of discipline in schools should be dealt with as a collective effort with the families and community." The reward system also proved that it can be an effective alternative in maintaining learner behaviour following that of parental involvement. Carter (2011), confirms that rewarding desirable behaviour is more beneficial and effective than punishment of undesirable behaviour. It seems like in order to maintain discipline learners need affirmation from their parents in the form of their involvement in their children’s’ academic lives. The extrinsic rewards from the teachers also play a major role in keeping learners motivated to behave well in the classroom. So the support from parents and recognition by teachers help learners improve their behaviour.

It is surprising though that the structure such as the SGB while it is made up by the parents was not considered as one of the most effective strategies by the respondents. The second group of alternatives that were considered to be effective by respondents are those that take the misbehaving learner outside the classroom such as detention and time out strategy. This could be due to the fact that the other learners might refrain from misbehaving fearing that they might be taken outside the classroom. This finding
is consistent with Ferreira et al. (2009) whose findings from the study that was done in Lesotho revealed that (31.49%) of the respondents who were teachers in this instance agreed that they use isolation outside the classroom as a disciplinary measure.

4.3.2. Detention of learners

Detention, time out strategy and professional support was also considered effective because the learners find somebody who can listen to them with a sympathetic ear and also offer some solutions to their problems. This is consistent with the findings by Denis and Frances (2014) which suggested that alternatives such as professional support, which includes counselling and guidance should be employed as alternatives to corporal punishment. Additionally, SACE Report (2011: 34) states that it “is important that counselling services are made available for learners in dealing with causes and effects of……. This will help in reducing teachers’ workload as currently teachers are expected to occupy multiple roles of being counsellors and teachers at the same time”.

Fourteen (14) out of the 32 alternatives that were considered in this study were rated between 51.1 and 57.9 by the respondents. As much as the respondents rated these alternatives above 50 which means they see them as effective, it cannot be overlooked that they are not seen as that effective by the respondents. So, unlike the other two categories above which were seen to be effective by the majority of the respondents these ones are not as that effective as the views of 40 % and below respondents cannot be discarded. For instance, when it comes to the alternative that talks about “Performing duties that improve the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper way”, 51.1 of the respondents agree with that which means that the closer to half of the respondents don’t see this alternative as effective in maintaining learner discipline.

Suspension as well as expulsion of learners as alternatives were part of these alternatives. So the respondents don’t really rate them that high in terms of their
effectiveness. This could be because they are seen as disadvantaging the learners by taking them out of the school for a very long time. So it goes for additional work given to learners which is not seen as that effective. The study reveals that the alternatives that take learners out for a prolonged time without being in class as much as are regarded as effective by the respondents, they however fall under group no 3 in terms of effectiveness. Consistent with this finding is the argument by Reyneke and Pretorius (2017:118) that: “Despite strict procedural prescriptions regarding the suspension and expulsion of learners, there are no provisions as to what should happen to the learner while he or she is suspended or awaiting expulsion.”

The authors further argue that the learners “are out of school for some time, and then where applicable, return to school, the same school or to another school without any obligatory intervention to address the underlying problems or to enhance their best interest.” It can then be deduced that learners who are suspended might come back with the same problems as there are no interventions that are addressing their behaviour challenges while they are out of school.

The study also revealed that two alternatives which are…. “recommending civil prosecution by school governing body for learners found guilty of misconduct stops misbehaving” and “Peer mediation improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct” and are the least favoured strategies by the respondents. While 43.8% agree that recommending civil prosecution help, 33.9% are not sure of this strategy and it is this strategy that has the highest number of respondents who are not sure about it. This could be due to the fact that the role of the SGB as far as civil prosecution is concerned is not clear to the respondents and they thus don’t see the SGB fulfilling that role. When it comes to the alternative that talks about peer mediation, the respondents are somehow equally divided on it, as 35.1 % of the respondents agree, 36.6% are not sure, while 31.3% disagree with the alternative. So respondents don’t view peers as support structure to other peers when it comes to issues of discipline, as there is a possibility that most of the youth are exposed to crime and violence which might have a negative impact on discipline. To this end, the SACE
Report (2011: 10) concedes that “……the high rates of crime and violence within South African society means that there is a very high possibility that children and youth will be exposed to criminal and violent individuals/peers”.

The alternative that got most of the disagree from the respondents at 43.4% is that, which says “Learners found guilty of misconduct and who are suspended for 14 days change their behaviour. It is clear that respondents feel very strongly about the fact that the alternative is not effective. This is in line with the thinking that by just staying at home and not getting any help the learner cannot change his or her behaviour. Hence parental involvement is critical because at that time they should be able to help their children to deal with behavioural problems through professional help and other interventions that are available in their vicinity.

Table 4.3 shows the cross tabulations of all research items by demographic items. The decisions were based on the criteria that if calculated chi-square is greater than the tabled chi-square then reject the premise (claim made by the item), otherwise uphold the premise at 5% level of significance with the indicated degrees of freedom. The Pearson’s R statistic gave the strength of the established relationship.

Cross tabulations revealed significant differences in some of the items based on gender, age educational qualification while some were not. For the item detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers makes them to improve their behaviour, the calculated chi-square was 1.625 against the tabled chi-square of 9.488 for the gender demographic item. This means that the calculated chi-square is less than the tabled chi-square. Hence we uphold (accept) the claim detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers makes them to improve their behaviour, at 5% level of significance with 4 degrees of freedom. The relationship of these two items is deemed to be positive. The same decision was made for this item based on the Age demographic item where the calculated chi-square was 21.840 against the tabled chi-square of 26.296 with 16 degrees of freedom at 5% level of significance. However, the same cannot be said about the Education Category item. The decision to reject the
claim was based on the fact that he calculated chi-square was 21.438 which is greater than the tabled chi-square of 15.507 with 8 degrees of freedom at 5% level of significance. This means that detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers does not make them to improve their behaviour.

In summary, Table 4.2 indicates that most of the items are on the affirmative (accepted), which means that most of the strategies suggested here have a positive effect in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. This implies that detention is effective as viewed by respondents according to age and gender.

**Table 4.3 detention of Learners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chi-Square calculated</th>
<th>Chi-square tabled</th>
<th>Pearson's Correlation</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Demographic item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers makes them to improve their behaviour</td>
<td>1.625&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.840&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>0.141</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.438&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>0.161</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Educational category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, most of the alternatives 19 out of 31 were rated above 50% by the respondents, which implies that 61.3% of the alternatives to corporal punishment are deemed to be effective as they were rated positively by the respondents. This is against 38.7% of alternatives that were not deemed as effective by the respondents. We can conclude that alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary schools in King Cetshwayo district are effective.
4.4 PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATORS REGARDING THE ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

4.4.1 Additional work

The researcher wanted to find out if additional work such as cleaning toilets bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Additional work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most respondents (51.3%) agreed with this statement that additional work such as cleaning toilets bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct, encourages good behaviour. However, some of participants 16.8% are not sure, whilst 14.3% disagreed and 17.6% strongly disagreed, therefore, there is a slight difference between the opinions of those who agreed and those who disagreed. From the semi-structured interviews, it can be deduced that both CMs agreed that additional work helped to encourage good behaviour, but they also highlighted that it depends on factors like learners’ personality. CM1 said that it may not be effective as some learner view it as joke.

*Some take it as a joke, can do it and don’t change.*

While CM2 agreed, but cautioned that it could be viewed as an added responsibility upon educator and suggested that it must be properly done.
It has to be properly done. When this is done during or after school the supervision roles of the teachers become even more prominent as the teachers have added responsibilities.

However, the principals did not agree on this issue, while Principal 1 is of the view that learners enjoy this kind of punishment as they are free from the class, he had this to say

If a learner misbehaves, and you take him to a place, other students may do the same so they also join him as long as they will be kept outside the classroom environment.

Principal 2, was of the view that this alternative to corporal punishment does improve learners' behaviour in the sense that when teaching and learning are taking place in the class and other learners are outside the class, they may feel bad about their behaviour. He had this to say

......it is painful to see others learning.

Educators on the other hand agreed that this kind of an alternative is not effective educator 1 is of the opinion that it does not help:

Then I don't think you feel pain if you water the garden or clean some places, I don't think it can be effective.

Additionally, educator 2 agreed and said that this alternative was not effective.

It doesn’t help. If the learners are not interested in learning they will be happy to go and do gardening, and picking the papers will not be able to fit in academically.

However, learners agreed with Principal 2 in the sense that learner 1 viewed it as one of the common ways that is used by the schools to maintain discipline. In summary, it seems; there was an agreement from both from quantitative and qualitative data that additional work such as cleaning toilets bathrooms and classrooms by leaners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. Therefore, it seems that this
alternative is effective in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This is in line with the findings by Agega (2011) who concedes that manual punishment such as cleaning toilets, bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct is one of the effective alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools.

4.4.2 Demerit system

The researcher wanted to find out if Demerit system to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most of the respondents (47.1%) agreed with the statement with that demerit system to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. Whilst 29.0% of the respondent were not sure, 12.3% strongly disagreed and only 11.2% disagreed. Therefore, lesser percentage of the respondents supports this alternative. From the semi-structured interviews both CMs agreed that before it can help on condition that learners know how it works, they also highlighted the fact that for it to work it will need consistency on the part of the schools, however, they indicated that it is mostly used in former Model C schools. CM1, said that it is effective in former model and rural schools and township schools, but not rural schools, because of inconsistencies.
It’s mainly former model see and some township school but does not happen in rural school.

And CM 2 agreed that it may not be effective in some schools.

It is used effectively especially in the former Model C school, but has no effect in our school because of lack of consistency.

Whilst Principal1 is positive about this alternative especially when it comes to learners who are dedicated to their school work, principal 2 confirmed the view by CMs as he indicated that he has never used the system in his school, and he stated:

We have never used that system so far…. I don’t think we have applied it in my school. It has never come to that.

However, educators don’t agree on the issue, while educator 1 is of the view that it works but needs to be coupled with other systems for it to work effectively, educator 2 is of the view that it can work if coupled with detection.

It does not solve problems….

Learner 2 gives an answer to the other system that has been suggested by other respondents, which can be used with the demerit system

But, demerit can be effective if it used along with detention.

In essence, it looks like all data from the questionnaires and that from the semi-structured interviews agreed that the demerit system to learners found guilty of misconduct do not encourage good behaviour in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This finding seems to be consistent with Masitsa (2008) who asserts “demerits focus on what a child should not do and because, at times, there is no consistency in administering demerits, learners end up seeing them as a mockery”. To this effect; Moyo, Khewu and Bayaga (2014:11) echo “Taking away a mark after an offence has been committed connotes that a demerit is only an instrument or tool meant to police learners for wrong doing and then punish”.
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4.4.3 Verbal warning

The researcher wanted to find out if a verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good conduct by the learner. Results are presented in the Table 4.6.

**Table 4.6: Verbal warning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most respondents (53.6%) agreed with the statement that verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good conduct by the learner. Whilst (18.8%) respondents were not sure, 14.5% disagreed while lesser number (13.0%) strongly disagreed. In the semi-structured interviews, it emerged that both CMs agreed that verbal warning can help however, just like the demerit system they are of the view that it also needs to be coupled with something else for it to work. CM1 said it must couple with other alternative.

_Not verbal warning in isolation._

While CM2 agreed that it can work provided it’s coupled with harsh actions.

_If it is followed by something harsh, more than the words; it will be effective._

From the principals ‘side they view it as not that effective, principal 1 said that leaners feel something it is written so principal view it as not effective.

_It has no weight. Learners can feel something when it is written and signed._
While educators agreed that it a good thing they feel it needs to be done in a certain way and they agreed that it should not be done in front of other learners as that can trigger unwanted behaviour from a learner for whom it is intended for. Educator 1 said that this alternative provided its implemented in private.

*Verbal warning is good but should be given in the private.*

Educator 2 added that it can make sense for it to be done after the lesson. However, learners feel that it is not safe for educators. Learner 1 contended that learners are becoming bullies thus making this alternative less popular as some of the educators are afraid of learners.

*Yoo... I am not sure about that especially, when we have learners who can stab teachers, kill teachers.*

There is a slight divergence of views from the quantitative data and qualitative data source as half of the respondents in the qualitative data do not believe that verbal warning can be an effective way of encouraging good conduct by the learners. However, if you consider that the majority of the respondents from the quantitative data and half of the participants from the qualitative data agreed therefore the majority of the respondents agreed that this alternative to corporal punishment is effective. This in line with Maphosa and Shumba (2010) who concur that a verbal warning is one of the main practices suggested as an alternative to corporal punishment.

### 4.4.4 Verbal warning

The researcher wanted to find out if a verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages misconduct by other learners as they know they will not be punished for misconduct. Results are presented in Table 4.7.

Results show that most of the respondents (47.2%) agreed with this alternative, that verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages misconduct by other learners as they know they will not be punished for misconduct. Whilst 5.4% of
respondents are not sure, 14.9% disagreed as against lesser number of respondents 12.0% who strongly agreed.

**Table 4. 7: Verbal warning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the interviews CMs are of the view that learners need to be told about the next step after verbal warning so that they do not see it as the last step that can be taken to deal with their misconduct. CM1 said that it can be effective if learners are told what to expect and implications thereof.

*To some extent I think it can help. If learners are informed that after verbal warning this is the next step, and after that second step you will be sent away from school.*

While CM 2 agreed that learners sometimes do not take this seriously as this alternative involves talking and nothing more.

*Learners know you will just talk to them there will be nothing more you can do to them.*

On the other hand, Principal 1 does not believe that verbal warning helps. He remarked that based on his personal experience his alternative does not change leaner behaviour.

*I don’t see as a way of moulding a child. That has happened to me and it did not help to change my behaviour. So I don’t think so personally.*
Principal 2 was of the view that this alternative is better than nothing. He posited that it could be effective although in a minimal scale.

*But it has an effect rather than say nothing.*

Educator 1 viewed it as an important alternative, but suggested ways in which it can be done in an effective manner, such as avoiding punishment in front of the other learners, as some of the learners may react negatively thus embarrassing or even physically or verbally harassing the teacher in front of other learners.

*If you verbally warn him in front of other, he can make fun of you.*

While educator 2 is of the view that it only needs to be done in front of the whole class

*Unless the learner is making a noise or if it is a serious disturbance.*

Learners see it as an alternative that is not suitable for all the learners. Learner 2 had this to say *that it good and not fit for learners who are rude.*

*It’s not fit for some learners, who are rude and will not listen to anyone.*

In essence, there is a slight divergence of views from the quantitative data and qualitative data source, as most of the respondents from the qualitative data source agreed that verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages misconduct by other learners as they know they will not be punished for misconduct. A slight number from the quantitative data source disagreed. This is in line with Tozer (2010) who confirms that verbal warning is an effective disciplinary measure administered by the class educator on the spot but he warns that it can have negative connotations and can trigger fear thus exposing learners to verbal, physical, and psychological abuse.

**4.4.5 Excluding learners**

The researcher wanted to find out if excluding learners from participating in school activities after being found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8: Excluding learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the majority 43.8% of the respondents agreed that excluding learners from participating in school activities after being found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. However, 18.9% of respondents were not sure, 19.2% disagreed as against 18.1% strongly disagreed. It emerged from the semi-structured interviews that both CMs agreed that excluding learners from participating in school activities encourages good behaviour. CM2 was of the view that it helps and he said this alternative is effective.

*For example, if you say to a learner, you are not going to participate in rugby, music or any other sports. If they are not participating, because of their misconduct, I think it will help a lot.*

CM 1 agreed and remarked that it is also none of the effective ways in maintaining learner discipline.

*And if you don’t give them opportunities to participate, I think it can help.*

Principals had different opinions on this issue, for Principal 1 what matters most is whether the learner who is excluded from participating is interested in that activity and he gave an example of a learner that was prevented from participating in sport as he was not at school during the contact time. In order to emphasise this point he said

*He was absent from school and others were there preparing to play and we said to him, just you are not in a school today, you can’t play soccer, so he realised*
that for him to participate in a soccer, he must come to school to allow him to play soccer.

For Principal 2 excluding learners from participating in school activities does not help as he felt that learners can also be involved in other activities taking place in the community so it is not the school alone that afford learners with the opportunity to be involved in different activities. He remarked

No I don’t think so, because even after the school, learners can participate in some of the community activities.

Educators also have different views while educator 1 is not sure, educator 2 is for the idea that it can be effective. Learners unanimously agreed that excluding learners will not help as there are no activities that are done in schools that the learners can be deprived from. Learner 2 concluded by stating that this alternative it is effective.

When a learner is destructive in class, he can be abstained from having sports for like a month, then it would help to discipline.

There is divergence of views when it comes to this issue, and quantitative data shows that respondents disagreed with the perception that excluding learners from participation in school activities after being found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour alternative while the majority of the participants from the qualitative data agreed with the statement. This finding seems to corroborate Reyneke. (2013:236) who asserts that “It is also important that all the children involved in a situation be afforded an opportunity to participate and voice their opinions.”

4.4.6 Final written warning

The researcher wanted to find out if a final written warning to learners guilty of misconduct improves learner discipline in class. Results are presented in Table 4.9.
### Table 4. 9: Final written warning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the majority (69.8%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement that a final written warning to learners guilty of misconduct improves learner discipline in class. Whilst (13.7%) respondents were not sure, 8.6% strongly agreed with a smaller number who disagreed (7.9%). In the semi-structured interviews that were conducted for the qualitative data, both CMs agreed that final written warning can help to deter bad behaviour, so they think it is an effective way of improving learner discipline in class. CM2 said that this alternative is viewed as effective ways of maintaining discipline.

*I think it can improve learners’ discipline.*

The principals also agreed with the CMs and Principal 1 had this to say that it can make learners behaviour change.

*Yes, it does. Because in most cases, those who are found guilty of misconduct if they are forced to sign written warning, in most cases they change.*

The principal added that he had seen learner behaviour through this alternative meaning it is effective.

*I have seen those learners who have signed final warning, they don’t want to commit the same offence again.*
Educators also agreed with CMS and principals that final written warning helps, educator 1 said the reason why she sees it as an effective way is because:

*They understand the final warning will send them out of the school.*

Learners also agreed that final written warning helps in improving learner discipline in class. An overwhelming majority, findings in both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews data sources; agreed that a final written warning to learners guilty of misconduct improves learner discipline in class in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District.

### 4.4.7 Performing duties

The researcher wanted to find out if performing duties that improve the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper way. Results are presented in Table 4.10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the majority (51.1%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that performing duties that improve the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper way. Whilst (20.1%) of the respondents were not sure, 19.0% disagreed and 9.9% strongly disagreed. From the qualitative data source, it transpired that, CM1 is of the view that it depends on the child while CM2 feels that nobody wants to be embarrassed but also highlighted the issue of supervision by the teacher which might be burdensome. CM2
remarked that if learners are not supervised they can be liable for damage thus making educators vulnerable.

   *If learners are not supervised and something happens to the learners, the parents can pick a case.*

Principal 1 felt like it is not helping, because learners do not want to learn so they will have an excuse not to be in class.

   *At the end of the day, you are accumulating a number of learners who wanted to go outside the classroom, to dig the hole, pick the papers, cut trees if you make them to cut trees outside the classroom. From my personal experience, this is what I have observed.*

While principal 2 agreed he cautioned that it has to be done within the law and those learners need to be monitored, he had this to say that monitoring of learners is important.

   *If a parent/official comes and sees that a learner is working, and others are in class, it is more dangerous if such learner is not monitored.*

Learners agreed that it is an effective way of punishment and learner 1 confirmed that it is one of the ways that is used in her school.

   *It is one of the means used in my school to discipline learners.*

Learner 2 added that it is viewed as effective in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District.

   *Yes, it does help. Most of the learners don’t enjoy doing chores, so whatever will make them be punished in that manner, they won’t repeat it. At least, it will stop many from misbehaving, but not all.*

However, both educators agreed that it won’t help and educator 2 asserted that it may not be effective to learners that are not interested in education.
It doesn’t help. If the learner is not interested in learning he will be happy to go gardening.

Educator 1 added:

Then I don’t think you feel pain if you water the garden or clean some places. I don’t think it can be effective.

There is a convergence of views between data from a questionnaire and that from semi-structured interviews, that perform duties that improving the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper way in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. For first offence, the learner is punished by cleaning the yard; for the second offence, the learner will be punished by cleaning the toilets, and lastly, if a learner still persists with same offence he/she will be sent to the principal for caning or to be sent home.

4.4.8 Written warning
The researcher wanted to find out Written warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourage learners to behave better. Results are presented in Table 4.11.

Table 4.11: Written warning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the majority 55.9% of the respondents agreed with the statement that a written warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encouraged learners to behave better. Whilst 24.6% of respondents were not sure, 10.8% disagreed while 8.6% of respondents strongly disagreed. From the qualitative data source, both CMs are of the
view that it helps and CM 1 had this to say that it is one of the effective ways of maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools.

*It helps since it’s the last report to deter bad behaviour.*

The principals also agreed with the CMs also highlighting that once the written warning is signed it brings sense to the learners affected. Principal 1 said alternative for punishment contracts can be signed by learners and they are not comfortable with that arrangement so that they would want to avoid it.

*Yes, it does. Because in most cases, those who are found guilty of misconduct if they made them sign written warning, in most cases they change. You won’t see those committing offenses in the future, it does help alone.*

The educators also agreed, Educator 1 stated that it is effective as they know that it may lead to expulsion.

*Yes, some of these kids can fear. Sometimes it can mould the conduct. They understand the final warning will send them out of the school.*

In essence, it seems like all data from the questionnaires and that from the interviews agreed that a written warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages learners to behave better. Therefore, this alternative is found to be effective in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary School in the King Cetshwayo District.

### 4.4.9 Referring learner

The researcher wanted to find out if Referring learner found guilty of misconduct to an outside agency like social workers or psychologist has been found to be effective. Results are present in able 4.12.
Table 4. 12: Referring learner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that majority (48.7%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that referring to learners found guilty of misconduct to an outside agency like social workers or psychologist has been found to be effective. However, a considerable number of respondents (30.1%) were not sure, (12.0%) disagreed with the statement with (9.1%) respondents who strongly disagreed. In the semi-structured interviews that were conducted with other participants amongst them CMs, they agreed with the referral system but cautioned that:

*It depends on the geographical positions of the schools. In deep rural areas, it will mean the parents will have to pay for the transport of the learners to go to such agencies, and mostly most parents are not employed. So it is practically not possible in some areas. But in areas there is enough transport, parents are able to pay school fees, parents are working, parents can pay for transport of learners. Outside agencies will be of good help to schools.*

Principals also agreed and Principal 1 highlighted the good job that is done by social workers in helping those learners who are in need, he stated

*So social workers, intervene and help much. They have enough experience and work hard, so working with the social workers does help and bring positive effect on the whole behaviour of the child.*

Teacher 1 agreed that it is one of the effective ways of maintaining discipline as agencies help in correcting bad behaviour.
Yes, I think it can be so helpful to send them to those who have been trained. Sometimes you find out that kids may be so affected mentally, or socially. We refer them to psychologists. These agencies help correct the misconduct.

Learners had no experience of anyone being referred to outside agencies; learner 1 stated

_We haven’t had a case where a learner is moved to outside agencies._

There were divergent of views as can be deduced from the quantitative data and qualitative data as most of the respondents in the quantitative data showed that they do not believe that it can be effective encouraging good conduct. Moreover, most of the participants from the qualitative data source believed that referring learners found guilty of misconduct to an outside agency like social workers or psychologist is an effective alternative to corporal punishment in the Secondary school in the King Cetshwayo District. This is supported by Tuckman (1992) who asserts that people like psychologists have the potential to induce a change in behaviour.

### 4.4.10 Applying school code of conduct

The researcher wanted to find out if applying school code of conduct to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results show that the majority (56.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement that applying the school code of conduct to learners guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour. Whilst 24.1% of respondents were not sure, 11.7% disagreed with a lesser number (7.5%) who disagreed. From the qualitative data source, both CMs agreed that applying the school code of conduct to learners guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour. The CMs however cautioned that all stakeholders need to be involved, which include learners and parents as that will result in the shared decision-making as everyone feel as part of the process and take ownership of the consequences that emanate from not abiding with the code of conduct. CM 2 stated that parental involvement is critical for this alternative to be effective but they agree that it is effective.

*Parents should be involved and they should be aware. It is the responsibility of the school governing body to develop code of conduct they can defend*.

Principals also agreed and Principal 1 stated that;

*A code of conduct is a useful instrument we use to execute learner discipline.*

While educators agreed that the code of conduct helps they were of the view that discussion platform should be created in schools where the code of conduct was discussed openly by parents, learners and teachers so that everyone would have a common understanding of what was entailed in the code of conduct of each school. Educator 2 stated that advocacy is one of the aspects that must considered for this alternative to be effective.

*Workshops about the code of conduct should be done for the parents and learners to know and discuss on what is expected.*

Learners also agreed and Learner 2 stated that it is one of the effective ways of maintaining discipline in schools.

*Hmmm!... I think it is effective for judging from the meeting we had with SGB, I think suspension is in the code of conduct, if a learner is suspended, and the parent comes here violently, the principal will show the code of conduct that the parent was shown when the learner was admitted to the school. The parents are*
very aware of the code of conduct. The code of conduct is discussed among the SGB first, and the parents if they agreed. It is displayed. I tried by all means to abide by the code of conduct. I believe I should live by example as Deputy Chairperson for students’ Representative Council.

An overwhelming majority, findings in both questionnaires and semi-structured interview data sources revealed that participants perceive that applying school code of conduct to learners guilty of misconduct improves learners’ behaviour in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This finding is in line with Schuck (2017) who states that utilising the learners’ conduct system rather than the criminal justice system to address minor offences is more likely to lead to learners ‘success’. This finding seems to corroborate Mestry and Khumalo (2012:104) who asserts:” ……..discipline policy or code of conduct can be an effective preventative disciplinary measure if it is properly enforced.” To this effect, Ntshangase and Narainsamy (2013:657) echo: “a code of conduct was introduced by the South African government as attempt to fill up the vacuum left by the banning of corporal punishment.”

4.4.11 Suspension of learners

The researcher wanted to find out if suspending learners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days' stops them from misbehaving. Results are presented in Table 4.14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that most of the respondents (51.9%) agreed that suspending learners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days’ stops them from misbehaving. However, 15.9% of respondents were not sure, 19.2% disagreed and only 13.0% of the respondents strongly disagreed. Therefore, findings suggest that majority of the respondents supported the effectiveness of this alternative. The findings from the semi-structured interviews show that while participants feel that this alternative is effective they however have many reasons why it cannot be effective. Both CMs agreed in essence that suspending learners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days’ stops them from misbehaving; they however warned that it was not an easy process as there are procedures that need to be followed. CM2 said that although it takes time, it has been found to be effective.

*It takes time for effect to make because we have to organise the tribunal and the learner must be found guilty.*

On the other hand, CM1 highlighted the role played by the parents and said that parents must be supportive in attending hearing processes and ensure that the teaching and learning activities that were supposed to be done at school are implemented and monitored at home. It is also important that parents make the learner understand the negative implication of suspension and that it can also lead to expulsion if behavior does not change.

*It doesn’t serve the purpose but if parents are there, and the learner is not going to school, they will be worried.*

The principals also raised the same issue as CMs that of the long process. Principal 1 remarked that you need to have the full sitting of the tribunal members which suggest that it may delay if the full complement is not committed to the sittings.

*To process a suspension needs a full bench of the tribunal before the case is being processed.*
While Principal 2 agreed that suspension helps just like the CM1, he is also worried about the role of parents, and he said *suspension is one of the best alternatives, but it needs to be supported by parents for it to be effective.*

*I have considered the suspending the best way. The only challenge is the parents.*

While educator 1 had is not for the idea of suspending learners and one of the reasons is that the learner needs supervision even at home for this alternative to be effective.

*It also depends on the home; he can be home doing nothing. He may be left all alone at home and that can lead him to other crime.*

Educator 2 put the effectiveness of this alternative squarely on the shoulders of the learner, and he had this to say

*You can suspend the learner and that particular learner will be worried. When he/she returns, he/she is disciplined.*

Both learners agreed that this is an effective way. They also touched on the issue of parental involvement in the process, and learner 2 stated that suspension assisted in disciplining and changing the learner behavior.

*The parents discipline the learners, so I think suspension assists in contributing to learners being well-disciplined.*

It seems; there is an agreement both from the quantitative and qualitative data source that suspending learners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days, stops them from misbehaving in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. Sheryl, Stephanie, Herrenkohl, Toumbourou and Catalano (2006) affirm that school suspension may be used to remove students in engaging in challenging behaviors from school for a period of time. Based on these findings, it becomes evident therefore; that suspension is favoured as an alternative that can be used in schools.
Results show that most respondents agreed with the statement (39.1%). Learners found guilty of misconduct and who were suspended for 14 days changed their behaviour. However, some respondents (17.5%) were not sure, whilst 22.6% respondents disagreed with the statement and 20.8% respondents strongly agreed with the alternative. A considerable number of respondents asserted that there is a problem with the alternative. The data from the semi-structured interviews also suggest that this alternative might not be effective as learners lose most of the content covered during the suspension period. CM 2 is of the view that, this alternative was not effective considering time for suspension of a learner which is shorter at times and too soft as compared to the offence committed by the learner.

*It does not assist, since the period of suspension does not assist the learner in improving the learners' behaviour. It does not have an immediate effect, and punishment has to be correctional and is too lenient for some cases done by learners.*

Additionally, CM 2 is of the view that it can only be effective if there are parents to support the learner and since child-headed families lack the adult support. If learners are living alone it may not be effective in maintaining learner discipline particularly in a Secondary School phase.

*For supportive parents it can work, not for child-headed households only.*

Principals also agreed that 14 days is too much as the learner loses on the content covered during that time. Principal 2 maintained that learners are affected in terms of teaching and learning as most of the time they are not in class when suspended whilst other continued with teaching and learning and were thus viewed as ineffective in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District.

*Yes, but I don’t want say actually exceeding fourteen days. Even if a learner is being suspended for four days, it is too much in terms of knowledge, teaching and learning taking place when the learner is not there.*
Furthermore, the educators echoed the same sentiments as above in not seeing this alternative as effective. Educator 1 had this to say about the effectiveness of the alternative.

*I don’t think the suspension of many days can assist. If the learner is sent home for so many days, he will be affected in so many subjects. I don’t think it helps, as the learners misses class.*

Contrary to the above views, both learners are of the view that suspension works, Learner 1 said that this alternative is effective in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary School.

*One learner was suspended in my class this year, and when he came back, he was doing things he was told to do, and stopped what he was doing wrong.*

While learner 2 also agreed by saying, that suspension is effective in maintaining discipline in Secondary Schools.

*I think suspension assists in discipline of the learners.*

Therefore, it seems; findings in both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews data sources agreed that learners found guilty of misconduct and who were suspended for 14 days do not change their behaviour, therefore this is not an effective alternative of maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools in King Cetshwayo District. This is in line with Skiba (2014) who asserts that this has to confirm that this alternative does not help.

The second objective of the study was to explore the perceptions of educators regarding the alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District. The qualitative explorations of the data were done to elucidate the perceptions of educators regarding the alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District. There were three themes that arose from this analysis. The first theme concerns the parental involvement. The second one relates to setting up supporting
structures for the effective implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment. The third theme is regarding lack of knowledge regarding some of the alternatives.

4.4.12: Setting clear expectations

The researcher wanted to find out if setting clear expectations to learners prevents bad behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.15.

Results show that the majority of respondents (57.9%) agreed with the statement that setting clear expectations to learners prevents bad behaviour. Whilst (17.9%) of respondents were not sure, 15.8% disagreed and 8.4% strongly disagreed. The majority of the respondents agreed that setting clear expectations to learners prevents bad behaviour.

Table 4.15 Setting clear expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, more than 50% respondents agreed that this alternative to corporal punishment is effective. This finding seems to be consistent with Torres (2014: 11), who asserts that there has to be “clear expectations for students (i.e. prescribing exactly what a student is expected to do and holding them accountable to it with consequences and rewards), and spending as much time as possible on instructions.”
4.4.13 Teacher learner parent meeting

The researcher wanted to find out if teacher-learner parents’ meetings encourage good behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Teacher learner parent meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that Majority of the respondents (75.7%) agree with the statement that Teacher learner parent meeting encourages good behaviour. However, a minimal number of respondents (11.4%) were not sure, (6.6%) strongly disagree and (6.3%) who disagree. In the semi structured interviews conducted, it emerged that both CMs agree on the importance of cooperation between teachers, learners and parents, CM2 had this to say that must be strong working relationship between the parents and educators for this alternative to be effective.

“and what there must be cooperation between the parents at home and the educators. The learners must understand what the school wants e parents want”.

Principals are very optimistic that the meeting has positive effects on encouraging good behaviour, Principal 2 had this to say that this alternative is effective.

“Yes it has...95% of it has positive effect because learners don’t want to be discipline in front of their parents…. “.

Educator 1 also added her voice and said there are workings relations between parents and educators thus improving working relationship between learners and parents.
“We do work together; we can also call on them if the kids are misbehaving.

The learners also unanimously agreed and learner 2 had this to say that this one of the alternative that is highly effective in disciplining the learner when misbehaving.

“I think and believe so, because our parents do have I wouldn’t say the most influential but they could influence us they could influence us by working with the teachers that they mean business, the teachers and the parents could cooperate together”.

With an overwhelming majority, findings in both questionnaires and semi structured interviews data sources, that participants perceive that teacher learner parent meeting encourages good behaviour. Therefore, we can conclude that this alternative is effective in encouraging good behaviour in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. This finding is in line with the findings of the study conducted by Singh, Mbokodi and Msila, (2004) which showed that parental involvement was critical in the education of their children, the authors further argued that” the parents who spent some quality time with their children each day tend to be good motivators to their children” (p305).

4.4.14 Inviting a parent to school
The researcher wanted to find out if inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behaviour when they are found guilty of misconduct has a positive influence on their behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.17

Table 4. 17: Inviting a parent to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results show that the majority of the respondents (70.4%) support this alternative that inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behaviour when they are found guilty of misconduct has a positive influence on their behaviour. Whilst (11.2%) of respondents were not sure, only (7.9%) disagreed as against (10.5%) who strongly disagreed. The responses of the participants from the semi-structured interviews suggest that while they agreed that this alternative helps, however it depends on factors such as active parental involvement, the relationship between teachers, parents and learners and strong discipline at home for this alternative to work. CM1 when asked if this was an effective way to deal with issues of learner behaviour responded by saying that it is one of the ways of maintaining discipline although some are afraid of their kids when hearings are undertaken.

 It does. You know there are so many factors involved in this. In some instances, you find that when you invite a parent, you can read from the parents ‘gestures, facial expressions that the parent is afraid of the learner, but in cases where there is strong discipline from home and the parent is playing his/her roles, this has a great impact.

CM 2 added that they had to make sure that they had all parents’ contact details at school. The principals also hammered on the important role played by parents, and principal 1 stated that it depends on the kind of parents as:

There are parents who are real parents to their kids. The second group of parents is one that is ruled and controlled by their kids.

Furthermore, principal 2 echoed the same sentiments by stating that this alternative was successful as 95% of it has a positive effect, because learners don’t want to be disciplined in front of their parents.

Both educators agreed on this statement and educator 2 said that it was the most effective way of maintaining learner discipline.

Yes, it does. I have experienced that many times. It has a positive influence on a child and also it minimises it a lot.
Additionally, learner 1 stated that sometimes it works and sometimes not effective as some parents do not recognize the importance of education.

*Well, that is tricky one. Sometimes it does sometimes it doesn’t. Some parents don’t care, and some parents don’t understand how important education is.*

In summary, it was found by the overwhelming majority, as gathered from findings in both questionnaires and semi-structured interview data sources that respondents perceived that inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behaviour when they are found guilty of misconduct has a positive influence on their behaviour in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. This is in line with the KZN Curriculum Management and Delivery Strategy (2012, p.23) acknowledged that this alternative is effective.

*Strong parent and community support [as] one of the key factors for effective teaching and learning.*

Furthermore, Ntshangase and Narainsamy (2013:657) echo that:” ….. the issue of discipline in schools should be dealt with as a collective effort with the families and community.”

**Theme 1: Active parental involvement**

The role of parents in the education of their learners have long being documented by various researchers. For instance, Nunes and Mota, (2017) concurs that parental support structures are associated with positive outcomes in learners whilst on the other hand parental rejection are associated with negative outcomes. The healthy relationship between teachers, parents and learners and strong discipline at home prove to work in maintaining learner discipline in schools. The involvement of the SGB is also seen as effective and so is the convening of the tribunal. It seems like all the alternatives whereby the parents are involved are taken as effective by the teachers. This finding is in line with the findings of the study conducted by Singh, Mbokodi and Msila, (2004) which showed that parental involvement was critical in the education of their children, the authors further argued that” the parents who spent some quality time with their children each day tend to be good motivators to their children” (p305). Both educators
agreed and they viewed inviting parents to come to school to discuss discipline matters of their children as the most effective way of maintaining learner discipline. One educator had this to say:

Yes, it does. I have experienced that many times. It has a positive influence on a child and also it minimizes it a lot.

This is in line with the KZN Curriculum Management and Delivery Strategy (2012, p.23) acknowledged that this alternative is effective.

Strong parent and community support [as] one of the key factors for effective teaching and learning.

The results from the quantitate data also suggested that this alternative is effective as the majority of the respondents (70.4 %) agreed that inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behaviour has a positive influence on their behaviour as postulated by Skinners behavioural theory . So there is an agreement between qualitative and quantitative data when it comes to the importance of parental involvement in maintaining learner discipline in school.

Theme 2: Setting up supporting structures for the effective implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment.

Educators were of the view that some of the alternatives are only effective when learners are supported either by parents or their teachers. Educators indicated that detention of learners found guilty of misconduct is only effective if the learners are supervised. The results show that most respondents agreed (61.1%) that detention applied to learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers, has a positive impact on learner behaviour. However, some respondents were not sure (15.0%). Only 9.6% disagreed compared to (14.3%) who strongly disagreed. Both quantitative and qualitative results show that detention improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct. During the interviews the two Circuit Managers (CMs), two educators and two learners agreed that detention is effective in improving learner behaviour. However, CM1 is of the opinion that it depends on different factors like location of the school and
parental involvement while CM 2 regard it as having an extra burden to educators who are supposed to supervise learners. The following remark by the circuit manager illustrates that alternative steps are effective, although they have some challenges when implementing it.

Yes, it is effective, however, there are challenges on the side of the teachers as they have to supervise detained learners, so it’s like punishment to educators as well.

One of the educators further argued that this alternative was more of a burden to educators in terms of supervision and liability during detention and afterwards in case anything goes wrong to the learner. Instead of disciplining the learner the educator is also punished, as a result educators do not view this alternative to corporal punishment as an effective way to improve learner behaviour.

You also need to take responsibility for learners’ safety after the detention; you also discover you end up giving yourself extra punishment.

Both learners also agree that it is effective. Learner 1 said that alternative was effective because learners like to play or to be involved in extra mural activities like playing soccer and netball and if they miss that chance they are disappointed and therefore they tend to avoid doing the same mistake again.

It is an effective way because spending your break-time quiet, talking to no one means a lot because during the class, you are not allowed to talk to anyone.

Furthermore, Learner 2 went as far as saying it is one of the key things that is used in schools especially in multiracial schools as compared to what the learner referred to as black schools. This learner further argued that the alternative works better in former model c schools as we know that there is commitment and collaboration between parents’ teacher and learners.

Of course, I have been to multi-racial schools, and in those schools you find that detention is one of the key things or one of the ways they use to instil discipline.
On the contrary principals hold a different view that detention is not effective as the learners are not allowed to attend classes during detention. Principal 2 is of the view that learners are exposed to health hazards, miss contact sessions and time thus they are losing in terms of teaching and learning, therefore they are seen not to be effective.

No it is not an effective way because the learner has to be there out of the dust, and it doesn’t attend the class, and it does not improve the discipline in the learner.

Furthermore, principal 1 agreed by saying:

A teacher is also punished because somebody must also supervise the learner, as we can’t leave a learner alone.

The findings in both questionnaires and interviews show that detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by teachers makes learners improve their behaviour in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo district. This finding seems to be consistent with Ngidi (2007) who asserts that teaching experience has a significant influence on educator’s usage of detention and that the teaching phase has a significant influence on their usage of demerits.

However, it should be noted that, educators hold an in loco parentis position, so they do have a responsibility to take care of learners under their supervision for safety purposes (Oosthuizen, Botha, Roos, Rossouw & Smit 2009: 62). Also when it comes to suspension of learners it is only effective when they receive support from parents, which means, teachers see the home environment as an important condition for this alternative to be effective. However, Reyneke and Pretorius (2017) view detention and, other alternatives to corporal punishment such as putting learners in being sent out of class, forced to do community service as unreasonable. The reason they put forward is that when that is done, the reasons for underlying reasons for the misconduct are not addressed.
4.4.15 Signing a contract

The researcher wanted to find out if signing a contract with the learner found guilty of misconduct makes the learner to behave well. Results are presented in Table 4.18

Signing a contract is also deemed effective only if the parents are involved. Verbal warning is also seen as effective but needs to be done in private and not in front of other kids, so other teachers need to be supportive to others when disciplining learners verbally. Teachers also are of the view that applying school code of conduct can be effective if only discussed openly with all the stakeholders. The study revealed that majority 61% (learners) of the respondents supports detention while 23% (which are educators) were not supporting it. Results are presented in Table 4.18

Results show that the majority of the respondents (56%) agreed with the statement that signing a contract with the learner found guilty of misconduct makes the learner to behave well.

Table 4.18: Signing a contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst 20.1% of the respondents were not sure, 13.2% disagreed with a lesser number (10.6%) who strongly disagreed. In the semi-structured interviews, it became apparent that while both CMs agreed that the signing of contract might help, they however, cautioned that parents needed to be part of the contract as most of the learners are
minors. If parents are not involved CM1 cautioned that this alternative may be taken to court and be reviewed and set aside.

*The parent may take the school to court and might win.*

CM2 agreed by saying that both learners and parents must be involved for this alternative to be effective.

*Learners and parents must be included in the contracts with the schools.*

Educators also agreed on that and also elaborated on the issue of parents being involved. Educator 1 said that this alternative must be implemented in the presence of parents

“Contracts signed in the presence of their parents, cause learners to realise that they may be expelled from school.

Educator 2 echoed the same sentiments by saying that they must know the consequences for it to be effective.

*Because they (learners) have signed and they know the consequence of what they sign.*

Furthermore, principal 1 extended the discussion by saying that the contract:

*will indicate the consequences of doing this act or that.*

It seems, with an overwhelming majority, findings in both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews data sources; agreed that signing a contract with the leaner found guilty of misconduct makes the learner to behave well in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This finding seems to be consistent with Enea and Dafinoiu (2009:188) who asserts “Behaviour contracts are one of the most efficient strategies for gaining cooperation and commitment to the client. The contract is necessarily in a written form, specifies the actions agreed by the client for the achievement of the goal and contains a description of the conditions accompanying these actions.”

*Theme 3: Lack of knowledge regarding some of the alternatives*
There are other alternatives that some the educators were not sure about in their response, the reasons could be that, they could not understand what that alternative means, how it is implemented and how effective it will be. Those alternatives include, recommending civil prosecution, withdrawal of privileges, peer mediation, daily report and repair of damage property. The lack of knowledge regarding the above is in line with what was expressed in the quantitate data where by peer mediation was rated as the least favoured strategies by the respondents. With the respondents rating it somehow equally, as 35.1 % of the respondents agree with it, 36.6% were not sure, while 31.3% disagree with the alternative.

4.4.16 Misconduct daily report

The researcher wanted to find out if a misconduct daily report for the learner found guilty of misconduct signed by all educators corrects learner behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.19.

Results show that the majority (54.3%) of respondents agreed with the statement that a misconduct daily report for the learner found guilty of misconduct signed by all educators corrects learner behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. 19: Misconduct daily report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst 22.8% of respondents are not sure, (11.2%) disagreed and (11.6%) strongly disagreed. On the issue of misconduct daily report CM2 argued that the daily report will
be impossible on the side of the principal to do and suggested the quarterly report on learners behaviour be delivered in parents meeting,

It has to be the comprehensive report delivered in the presence of the parents in the meeting.

The educators echoed the same sentiments, educator 1 said that this alternative improved learner behaviour.

Yes, it will improve……

In essence there is a convergence of views on the data collected from the questionnaire and it is proffered as collected from the semi-structured interviews that a misconduct daily report for the learner found guilty of misconduct signed by all educators corrects learner behaviour. However, Circuit managers suggest that misconduct reports should be done on a quarterly basis. This finding seems to corroborate Riley-Tillman, Chafouleas, and Briesch and Eckert (2008:80) who assert:" …… teachers also rated the Daily Behaviour Report Card DBRC as a highly acceptable way to measure behaviour “. The authors further “suggest that the use of a DBRC might best be used in low-stakes cases (e.g., monitoring the effect of a pre-referral intervention) and as a supplement rather than a wholesale replacement, to more established methods such as systematic direct observation (SDO).”

4.4.17 Views of learners in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in their schools.

Table 4.4.18 Depriving learners

The researcher wanted to find out if depriving learners from participation in extra- mural activities as form of punishment deters learners from misbehaving at school.
Table 4. 20: Depriving learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most respondents (40%) agreed with the finding that depriving learners from participation in extra-curricular activities as form of punishment deters learners from misbehaving at school. However, a considerable number of respondents (29.9%) are not sure, (15.8 %) and some of the respondents disagreed and a minimal number of (14.4%) strongly disagreed with the statement. A considerable number of respondents were not decisive which suggests that there could be a problem with this alternative. The participants from the semi-structured interviews show that there are differences when it comes to this alternative as both CMs agreed that extra mural activities could really help in deterring bad behaviour. CM1 had this to say that learners enjoyed extra-mural activities and if they are deprived that opportunity they changed their behaviour so as to participate again, so that this alternative is seen to be effective.

> I think yes. You know by nature, learners like to participate in extra-curricular activities. And if you don’t give them opportunities to participate, I think it can help.

Additionally, CM 2 echoed the sentiments of his colleague and said it could help in changing learner behaviour.

> I think firstly Yes, a definite yes. For learners to grow and become somebody in life, he/she will need to play.

However, whilst principal 1 was of the view that the alternative can help, he warns that it can only help those who are serious about sports,
So it does help for those who take sports as their career and we are using that to punish them. But, for those who do not care about that, they will not feel any pain. And from that experience that I have, it shows that preventing those who loved to play soccer from doing it made them to change.

Educator 2, agreed with CM1 and Principal 1 that depriving learners from participation in extra-mural activities as form of punishment deters learners from misbehaving at school. However, on the other hand learners indicated that they do not think that this kind of alternative helps.

In our school or black schools, we don’t do much sports. For example, here in our school, we only do sports if there are competitions.

In this instance, it seems; there is divergence of views between the quantitative and qualitative data sources when it comes to this alternative of depriving learners from participation in extra-mural activities as a form of punishment that deters learners from misbehaving in Secondary Schools. However, most of the participants from the qualitative data source agreed that this is an effective alternative to corporal punishment in King Cetshwayo District. This finding is consistent with Le Roux, and Mokhele (2011:329) who assert that: “Extramural activities should be provided and participation encouraged. Schools that do not have the internal capacity to provide such activities could seek community involvement, which in turn would strengthen bonds between the school and the community”.

Both learners who were interviewed agreed that detention is an effective strategy. Learner 1 said that alternative was effective because learners like to play or to be involved in extra mural activities like playing soccer and netball and if they miss that chance because they are in detention they are disappointed and therefore they tend to avoid doing the same mistake again. So Learner 1 had this to say:
It is an effective way because spending your break-time quiet, talking to no one means a lot because during the class, you are not allowed to talk to anyone.

Furthermore, Learner 2 remarked that it is one of the key things that is used in schools especially in multiracial schools as compared to what the learner referred to as black schools. This learner further argued that the alternative works better in former model C schools as there is commitment and collaboration between parents’ teacher and learners. Learner 2 had this to say:

Of course, I have been to multi-racial schools, and in those schools you find that detention is one of the key things or one of the ways they use to instil discipline.

The finding is in line with the results of the study undertaken by Belle (2016) in Mauritius whereby detention was regarded as the most effective reactive and punitive disciplinary strategy that is implemented by principals in state secondary schools. All the participants in the study confirmed that this strategy is effective. On the contrary teachers in this study hold a different view that detention is not effective as the learners are not allowed to attend classes during detention.

Learners also view suspension and final written warnings as effective strategies in dealing with learner discipline. Both learners are of the view that suspension works, Learner 1 said that this alternative is effective in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary School. She had this to say

One learners were suspended in my class this year, and when he came back, he was doing things he was told to do, and stopped what he was doing wrong.

While learner 2 also agreed by saying, that suspension is effective in maintaining discipline in Secondary Schools.

I think suspension assists in discipline of the learners.

This is also contrary to what educators believe, educator 1 had this to say about the effectiveness of the alternative.
I don’t think the suspension of many days can assist. If the learner is sent home for so many days, he will be affected in so many subjects. I don’t think it helps, as the learners misses class.

Performing duties to improve the school environment is also seen as effective alternative by learners. Both learners interviewed agreed that it is an effective way of punishing ill-disciplined learners. Learner 1 confirmed that it is one of the ways that is used in her school.

It Is one of the means used in my school to discipline learners.

Learner 2 added that it is viewed as effective in maintaining learner discipline.

Yes, it does help. Most of the learners don’t enjoy doing chores, so whatever will make them be punished in that manner, they won’t repeat it. At least, it will stop many from misbehaving, but not all.

However, both educators agreed that it won’t help and educator 2 asserted that it may not be effective to learners that are not interested in education.

It doesn’t help. If the learner is not interested in learning he will be happy to go gardening.

Educator 1 added:

Then I don’t think you feel pain if you water the garden or clean some places. I don’t think it can be effective.

The other alternatives that aligned to the theme as they take learners out of class include, rendering community, learners found guilty of misconduct and suspended for 14 days, additional work learners, depriving learners from participation in extra-mural activities.

This is in line with May, Stokes, Oliver and Mclure (2015), who assert that implementing community service programmes works as a viable alternative in school and has the potential to improve academic performance and conduct within public school settings.

The learners support these alternative and further give alternatives that can be considered in the implementation of rendering community services as alternative to
corporal punishment so as to stop learners found guilty of misconduct from misbehaving. For example, learner 2 had this to say:

I think beside cleaning the school they can do gardening and they can do cleaning. Furthermore, they can sweep the offices or maybe as an alternative, they can also help in places like old age homes. They can also become involved in places where orphans live, in the orphanages. They may help in those places.

The study reveals that the alternatives that are deemed as most effective by the learners are not taken as such by educators. So it shows that the two groups view or perceive the alternatives to corporal punishment from different angles and hence the divergent views.

For instance, when it comes to verbal warnings, as learners felt that educators are not safe.

There are also other alternatives whereby learners felt that as much as they are effective they must be administered under certain conditions. These alternatives include expulsion of learners, was also considered effective, but it was highlighted that it has negative consequences on the learners which is the same view that was held by teachers. As much as learners agreed that the demerit system is effective they suggested that it should be done with detention.

Learner 2 gives an added information on how demerit system can be effective in dealing with learner discipline. She had this to say:

But, demerit can be effective if it used along with detention.

In essence, it looks like all data from the questionnaires and that from the semi-structured interviews agreed that the demerit system to learners found guilty of misconduct do not encourage good behaviour in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This finding seems to be consistent with Masitsa (2008) who asserts that demerits focus on what a child should not do and because, at times, there is no consistency in administering demerits, learners end up seeing them as a mockery”. To this effect; Moyo, Khewu and Bayaga (2014:11) echo “Taking away a
mark after an offence has been committed connotes that a demerit is only an instrument or tool meant to police learners for wrong doing and then punish”.

Like the teachers who could not express themselves clear on certain alternatives, learners could not express clear views on these alternatives namely convening tribunal,

**4.4.19 Convening tribunal**

The researcher wanted to find out if convening tribunals for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good discipline. Results are presented in Table 4.21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that majority (43%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that convening tribunals for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good discipline. However, (29.4%) of the respondents are not sure. A small number of respondents (12.6%) disagreed and (14.1%) strongly disagreed. From the qualitative data it emerged that both CMs disagreed as they are of the view that in some of the schools’ tribunals are not properly convened for a number of reasons. CM2, further argues that most of these tribunals are not well-administered and it also depends on the functionality of the governing body.

*Not really, I will say 90% of these tribunals they are not well administered for a number of reasons. It depends on the functionality of the school governing body as well as the participation of the parents.*
CM1 agreed and remarked that most governing bodies don’t do it by the book which makes this alternative to fall short.

*I have a strong feeling they don’t do it according to the paper if I should use that expression.*

Principal 1 agreed with the CMs as he viewed that the process is not always done procedurally, he had this to say some schools run processes correctly and others do not.

*And in some school, they do follow the tribunals for the disciplinary hearings. So I can say yes and again in some no. Because sometimes, others can simply set up a tribunal of disciplinary hearing, and take all the decisions all by themselves without involving the structure of education……It depends on the school, some do follow the proper procedure in administering those cases, some do not.*

Both educators on the other hand view the convening of tribunals as effective as the learners view their misconduct seriously if there are other people involved other than their teachers and parents. Educator 2 remarked that this alternative is effective in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools.

*Yes, because whenever you are talking to learners alone, but in a disciplinary, some people will be involved and the learner will see it as serious, because different people with different perspectives on the learners’ misconduct will make him understand better.*

There is divergence of views from the quantitative data and qualitative data as most of the respondents in the quantitative data showed that they do not believe that convening tribunals for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good discipline and that it can be effective in encouraging good conduct. On the other hand, the qualitative data sources believed that the process is effective in the Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District.
4.4.20 Recommending civil prosecution

The researcher wanted to find out if recommending civil prosecution by school governing body for learners found guilty of misconduct stops misbehaving. Results are presented in Table 4.22.

**Table 4.22: Recommending civil prosecution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the majority of the respondents (43.8%) agreed with the statement that recommending civil prosecution by school governing body for learners found guilty of misconduct stops misbehaving. About 33.9% of the respondents were uncertain. While (11.7%) strongly disagreed with lesser number (10.9%) disagreed. The majority of the respondents agreed with the statement that recommending civil prosecution by the governing body for learners found guilty of misconduct stops misbehaviour. Therefore, in summary there seems to be consensus that this statement is effective as an alternative to corporal punishment in improving learner discipline in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. As much as the findings do not agree that civil prosecution might help, however, SACE report (2011:34) is of the view that the “SACE should use its position as teachers’ council to galvanize and mobilize all the community structures to address the problem of violence in our communities.”
4.4.21 Withdrawal of privileges

The researcher wanted to find out if withdrawal of privileges in the school for learners found guilty of ill-discipline encourages good behaviour to all learners in the school. Results is presented in Table 4.23.

Table 4. 23: Withdrawal of privileges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most of the respondents (43.2%) agreed with the statement that withdrawal of privileges in the school for learners found guilty of poor discipline encourages good behaviour by all learners in the school. Whilst 23.2% of respondents were not sure 20.3% of respondents disagreed and a smaller number strongly disagreed (13.3%). The majority of the respondents do not agree with the statement that withdrawal of privileges in the school for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. This finding seems to be consistent with Reyneke (2018:136) who is of the view that, “To refuse learners permission to, for instance, use the bathroom, or eat or drink, or instruct learners to sit in an uncomfortable position as punishment impacts on learners’ ability to control their own bodies and reduces their bodily security.” It is of course wise to note that it might be challenging to justify such instructions. The humiliation which a learner undergoes e.g. when refused to go to the bathroom is unacceptable.
Table 4.4.22: Peer mediation

The researcher wanted to find out if peer mediation improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct. Results are presented in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24: Peer mediation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most respondents (35.1%) agreed that Peer mediation improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct. However, (33.6%) of respondents were not sure, while (17.7%) respondents disagreed with the statement with a smaller number (13.6%) who strongly disagreed. Majority of respondents agreed that peer mediation improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct. Therefore, this alternative is effective as an alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. Based on the findings it is evident that peer mediation is not supported as an alternative that can help to improve behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct. Consistent with this conclusion, SACE Report (2011: 10) argues that “……the high rates of crime and violence within South African society means that there is a very high possibility that children and youth will be exposed to criminal and violent individuals/peers".
Table 4.4.23: Repair of damage property

The researcher wanted to find out if repair of damaged property such as graffiti on walls by learners found guilty of misconduct corrects misbehaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.25.

Table 4. 25: Repair of damage property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most respondents (46%) agreed with the statement that repair of damaged property such as graffiti on walls by learners guilty of misconduct corrects misbehaviour. However, 23.6% of respondents were not sure, 16.3% strongly disagreed with few (14.1%) who disagreed. A bigger number of respondents suggested that this alternative is effective Therefore, in summary there is an agreement when studying the responses of the majority of respondents that this alternative to corporal punishment to maintain discipline can be very useful. This finding is consistent with Rogers (2003) who reveals that learners were highly in favour of manual labour whereas teachers were in favour of behavioural management programmes as alternative to corporal punishment. The learners were positive about manual labour as a punishment, because it is usually done in groups and they may do it without taking it seriously as a punishment. This may suggest that learners may not be understanding the implication and the impact in improving the learner behaviour in secondary schools.
Table 4.4.24 Providing guidance and counselling.

The researcher wanted to find out if providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour in school. Results are presented in Table 4.26.

Table 4.26 Providing guidance and counselling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that the majority of the respondents (65.6%) agreed with the statement that providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour in school. Seventeen comma nine percent (17.9%) of respondents were not sure, (9.2%) disagreed and a smaller number strongly disagreed (7.3%). From the semi-structured interviews, it emerged that CMs agreed that providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour in school. CM 2 remarked that it does assist in improving having found guilty of misconduct.

......do help to change learners.

The principals also support the idea of providing counselling as endeavour that the problems that learners are faced with not only come from school, but also from the communities where learners come from as a result other people other than teachers need to play their role in helping learners improve their behaviour in schools. Principal 1 stated that social workers do intervene and where is always noticeable change of behaviour.
So social workers, they intervene do work a lot. They have enough experience and work hard, so working with the social workers does help and bring positive effect on the whole behaviour of the child.

Both educators agreed that this alternative worked and is effective, and they also acknowledged the fact that as educators are not trained as counsellor’s educator 2 said that this alternative is effective in maintaining in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District.

*It will assist learner to see people who can assist in dealing with particular misconducts.*

With an overwhelming majority, findings in both questionnaires and semi-structured interviews data sources, reveal that participants perceive that providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This is consistent with the findings by Denis and Frances (2014) which suggested that alternatives such as professional support, which includes counselling and guidance should be employed as alternatives to corporal punishment. Additionally, SACE Report (2011: 34) states that it “is important that counselling services are made available for learners in dealing with causes and effects of ill-discipline. This will help in reducing teachers’ workload as currently teachers are expected to occupy multiple roles of being counsellors and teachers at the same time”.

### 4.4.25 Reward system

Reward systems like giving star charts, badges or classroom awards to learners that conducting themselves well encourages good behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.27.

Results show that majority of the respondents strongly agreed with the statement and 72.3% like giving star charts, badges or classroom awards to learners that conduct
themselves well which encourages good behaviour. Whilst 11.9% respondents were not sure, (8.6%) strongly disagreed as against the lesser number (7.2%). who disagreed.

**Table 4.27 Reward system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents strongly agreed that the reward system like giving star charts, badges or classroom awards to learners that conduct themselves well encourages good behaviour. Therefore, more than 50% respondents agreed that this alternative to corporal punishment can be effective. This is line with Ladislaus, Semali, Philbert and Vumilia (2016) and with more focus on reward systems like giving star charts, badges or classroom award. Carter (2011), further confirms that rewarding desirable behaviour is more beneficial and effective than punishment of undesirable behaviour. Skinner further argues that rewarding and punishing is implemented in the learning process by an educator according to the learners behaviour, which directly links to this alternative.

**4.4.26 Time-out strategy**

The researcher wanted to find out if the time-out strategy, which involves removal of the learners from the situation in which they are unable to exercise self-discipline to a cooling down place for learners found guilty encourages good behaviour. Results are presented in Table 4.28.
Results show that the majority of the respondents (60.2%) agreed with the statement of a time-out strategy, which involves removal of the learners from the situation in which they are unable to exercise self-discipline to a cooling down place for naughty learners. Twenty-two comma eight percent (22.8%) of the respondents were not sure, (8.7%) strongly disagreed and (8.3%) disagreed

Table 4. 28: Time-out strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary the findings indicate that the majority of the respondents suggested that time-out for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour. Therefore, the majority of the respondents agreed with the alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline can be effective. This finding seems to be consistent with Ferreira, et al. (2009) whose findings from the study that was done in Lesotho revealed that (31.49%) of the respondents who were teachers in this instance agreed that they use isolation outside the classroom as a disciplinary measure.

Cross tabulations revealed significant differences on items marked accepted for age, gender and educational category in relation to the effects of alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. Results are presented in Table 4.29
Table 4.29 Inferential statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chi-Square calculated</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Chi-square tabled</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Demographic item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rendering community services as alternative to corporal punishment stops learners found guilty of misconduct from misbehaving</td>
<td>3.859&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners found guilty of misconduct and suspended for 14 days change their behaviour</td>
<td>2.877&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work such as cleaning toilets, bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct encourages learners to behave better</td>
<td>2.217&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depriving learner’s</td>
<td>6.184&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *chi-square values with a superscript 'a' indicate significance at the .05 level.
participation in extra-mural activities as a form of punishment deters them from misbehaving while at school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p Value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suspending</td>
<td>4.778</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days stops them from misbehaving</td>
<td>16.946</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>Accept Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behaviour after they are found guilty of misconduct has a positive influence on their behaviour</td>
<td>20.717</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>Reject Educational Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demerit system to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour</td>
<td>13.633</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>0.132</td>
<td>Accept Educational Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct</td>
<td>5.794</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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misconduct encourages good conduct by that learner.

Verbal warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourages misconduct by other learners as they know they won’t be punished for misconduct.

Excluding learners from participation in school activities after being found guilty of misconduct encourages good behaviour.

Final written warning to learners guilty of misconduct improves learner discipline in class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Educational category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal warning</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners found guilty of</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misconduct</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding learners from</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation in school activities</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guilty of misconduct</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final written warning to</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learners guilty of misconduct</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing contract with the</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaner found guilty of</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misconduct</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
misconduct make the learner to behave well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>F-value</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct daily report for the learner found guilty of misconduct signed by all educators corrects learner behaviour</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing duties that improve the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper manner</td>
<td>1.577</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourage learner to behave better</td>
<td>3.910</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referring learner found guilty of misconduct to an</td>
<td>15.133</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>Accept Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.577</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>Accept Educational category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outside agency, like social workers or psychologist, has been found to be effective at improving learners' behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>Degrees of freedom</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applying School code of conduct to learners found guilty of misconduct</td>
<td>5.750&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal of privileges in the school for learners found guilty of ill-discipline</td>
<td>2.347&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer mediation improves behaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct</td>
<td>3.352&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily report enforces learners to behave well</td>
<td>4.478&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>Accept Gender</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender and age are significant factors in these outcomes.

Educational category is also significant in some cases.
Teacher learner meeting encourages good behaviour

Providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behaviour

Rewarding system like giving star charts, badges or classroom award to learners that are conducting themselves well encourages good behaviour

Time-out strategy, which involves removal of the learner from the situation in which he or she is unable to exercise self-discipline to a cooling down place for learners
found guilty encourages good behaviour

Setting clear expectations to learners prevents bad behaviour

Repair of damaged property such as graffiti on walls by learners found guilty of misconduct corrects misbehaviour

4.4.27 Challenges encountered by secondary school principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment

The fourth objective was to establish the challenges encountered by secondary school principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment. There were three themes that emerged from this objective. The first one regards the extra burden carried by teachers in the application of the alternatives within the school, the second theme are the inconsistencies in the application of alternatives by the teachers, the third one is the lack of training when it comes to the implementation of the alternatives, fourthly is the lack of parental involvement and the location of the school.
4.4.28 School governing body

The researcher wanted to find out if the School governing body members assisting in disciplining learner found guilty of misconduct has a positive effect on learner discipline. Results are presented in Table 4.30.

Table 4. 30: School governing body

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that majority (53.1%) of the respondents agreed with the statement that school governing body members assisting in disciplining learner found guilty of misconduct has a positive effect on learner discipline. Whilst 22.3% of the respondents were not sure, 13.9% disagreed with the statement with lesser number of 10.6% who strongly disagreed.

In the qualitative data it transpired that, while CM agreed that SGB members might help in assisting in disciplining learners found guilty of misconduct, however CM2 highlight that it depends on the functionality of the governing body for it to be functional.

“*It depends on the functionality of the school governing body*”.

The principals agreed that it helps if the SGB is fully involved, principal 2 had this to say about the effectiveness of alternative measures.

*We sit with the SGB and follow the procedures in terms of the discipline (need more information from learners and teachers).*
From the above statements it seems that as much as there are SGBs in all schools, but they have to be functional and know what it is that they are supposed to do. SGBs also need to understand all the procedures and processes that need to be followed in which circumstances contribute to improvement of behaviour.

It seems like all data from the questionnaires and that from the interviews agreed that the SGB members’ assistance in disciplining learners were found guilty of misconduct has a positive effect on learner discipline. Therefore, this alternative is effective in maintaining learner discipline in the Secondary School in the King Cetshwayo District. This finding though contradicts what Joubert and Prinsloo (2000) hold. They maintain that it is the responsibility of the educators to maintain discipline in school at all times. The above-mentioned researchers have a strong view that the South African Schools Act (RSA, 1996) gives more powers to the SGBs to deal with matters that relate to learner discipline. This is the same act that introduced the abolishing of corporal punishment in relation to schools. This finding seems to be consistent with the South African Schools Act of (Republic of South Africa, 1996a) (both Section 8 and Section 20) which makes it mandatory for all SGBs to develop and to adopt a code of conduct for learners. This code must be aimed at establishing a disciplined and purposeful school environment dedicated to improving the quality of the learning process.

4.4.29 Rendering community services

The researcher wanted to find-out if rendering community services as alternative to corporal punishment has been used to stop learners found guilty of misconduct from misbehaving. Results are presented in Table 4.31.


Table 4.31: Rendering community services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results show that most of the respondents (45%) agreed that this alternative to corporal punishment had been used and were found to be effective. They also asserted that rendering community services as alternative to corporal punishment had been used to stop learners found guilty of misconduct because of misbehaving. However, some respondents were not sure (25.0%), only 11.6% disagreed and 14.5% strongly disagreed. Circuit managers and learners from the semi-structured interviews agreed that the community service could help only if the contact time was taken care of. Rendering community services as alternative to corporal punishment was significant for gender, age and educational factors. This means that rendering community services as an alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining secondary schools is effective.

CM 1 cautioned that, when implementing this alternative we must drive it in the spirit of the South African Schools Act no 84 of 1996 to be effective.

*We need to be in line with the SA schools Act and don’t do something outside.*

While on the other hand both principals and educators disagreed with this alternative. The respondents further give alternatives that can be considered in the implementation of this alternative, for example, learner 2 said:

*I think beside cleaning the school they can do gardening and they can do cleaning. Furthermore, they can sweep the offices or maybe as an alternative,*
they can also help in places like old age homes. They can also become involved in places where orphans live, in the orphanages. They may help in those places.

However, the principal 2 held a view that rendering community service to learners found guilty of misconduct is a waste of time and thus cannot be used to stop learners found guilty of misconduct from misbehaving.

*I don’t think we can use that form of discipline. It is because the kid is within the school and working for the community is like a waste of time.*

Whilst both principals agreed on the effectiveness of this alternative, they however, had different reasons for that, for instance, Principal 1 was of the view that learners do not take this alternative seriously, since to them it is just a way to relax and thus this principal does not see it as an effective way of maintaining learner discipline. There is contact time that is lost which has a negative effect on the implementation of the Annual Teaching Plan (ATP) which results in poor curriculum coverage. Learners enjoy spending their time outside the classroom, which means this alternative does not stop learners found guilty of misconduct, because of misbehavior.

*Learners simply enjoy anything outside the classroom environment as long as they were not being taught. I think that is enjoyable to them.*

The educators also agreed with the principals in saying that this is not an effective alternative to corporal punishment. Educator 2 is of the view that this affects time paid to task as it interferes with teaching time, thus not improving learner behaviour in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary Schools in King Cetshwayo District.

*No, I don’t think so. Because when we are sending them to do community work, what about teaching and learning in the classroom. It means they will miss what they are supposed to learn.*

Both quantitative and qualitative findings do not agree, when it comes to this alternative as respondents held different views, however the majority of the participants especially from the qualitative data source agreed with the fact that rendering community services
as alternative to corporal punishment stops learners to be found guilty of misconduct in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. This is in line with May, Stokes, Oliver and Mclure (2015) who assert that implementing community service programmes works as a viable alternative in school and has the potential to improve academic performance and conduct within public school settings.

4.4.30 Expulsion of learners

The researcher wanted to find out if expulsion of learners found guilty of misconduct makes learners behave well at school because of fear of being expelled. Results are presented in Table 4.32

Table 4. 32: Expulsion of learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results show that the majority of the respondents (54.7%) agreed with the statement that expulsion of learners found guilty of misconduct makes learners behave well at school because of fear of being expelled. Also noting that (23.6%) respondents were not sure. The respondents who strongly disagreed were 11.1% with 10.7% who disagreed. From the semi-structured interviews all the respondents agreed that expulsion does not help in making learners behave well, because of the fear of being expelled. One of the issues highlighted by CM2 is that there is lengthy procedure that needs to be followed when recommending the expulsion of the learner as a result it takes long to see the positive effects of this alternative thus making learners not to behave well.

There is no immediate effect as it takes long to process.
Principal 1 also agreed with the CM2 and looked at it from the society’s point of view, that implementing this alternative might lead to acts of criminal behaviour like gangsterism which exacerbates misbehaviour of learners found guilty of misconduct.

*Because expelling a learner from school, you are also creating havoc in the society. Those people who were expelled engaged in gangsterism, and they could also do things that make criminal activities expand within the society. So I don’t think expulsion is something recommendable.*

Furthermore, Educator 2 commented on the negative impact of the teaching and learning process, including assessment which means the learner will be disadvantaged in participating in formative or summative assessment, which assists in measuring learner performance with an intention help learner progression.

*To me I don’t think it helps. Apart from learners missing from the classroom teaching, it does affect his academic assessment.*

Learner 2 is of the view that suspending learners is not effective as it has negative consequences for the suspended learner, who is viewed as a learner with a disruptive behaviour and thus it becomes difficult for that learner to be admitted to the other school.

*Most schools do not …. amm...admit learners that have been expelled from the schools, because at the back of their minds they reason that truly this child is troublesome.*

The same learner concluded by comparing suspension to expulsion and in that comparison the former won and the learner had this to say

*I think suspension assists in discipline of the learners. But, I think suspension is better than expulsion.*

There is divergence of views between the quantitative and qualitative data sources, while the majority of respondents agreed from quantitative data source, however, all the participants from the semi-structured interviews disagreed that expulsion of learners...
found guilty of misconduct makes learners behave well at school because of fear of being expelled in Secondary Schools in the King Cetshwayo District. Consistent with this conclusion, Reyneke and Pretorius (2017:118) argue that: “Despite strict procedural prescriptions regarding the suspension and expulsion of learners, there are no provisions as to what should happen to the learner while he or she is suspended or awaiting expulsion.”

The authors further argue that the learners “are out of school for some time, and then where applicable, return to school, the same school or to another school without any obligatory intervention to address the underlying problems or to enhance their best interest.”

Theme 1 is on the burden carried by educators when implementing alternatives to corporal punishment.

The challenges that emanate within the school, entails the teacher carrying extra burden in implementing the alternatives to corporal punishment. Detention is one of the alternatives that is considered to be effective, however the problem with it is that the teachers have to supervise the learners especially those detained to remain behind after school. Teachers take that as punishment to themselves thereby not implementing this strategy fearing that they also have to remain behind and supervise them.

The following remark by the circuit manager illustrates that detention is effective, although they have some challenges when implementing it.

Yes, it is effective, however, there are challenges on the side of the teachers as they have to supervise detained learners, so it’s like punishment to educators as well.

Furthermore, principal 1 agreed by saying:

A teacher is also punished because somebody must also supervise the learner, as we can’t leave a learner alone.

This finding is in line with Zaslaw (2010) who claims that some learners consider out-of-school detention and suspension as a vacation, hence the teachers have to be there to
supervise the learners. Additionally, Chen (2008:3) states that detention is the supervised retention of a learner beyond the regular school schedule...

*Theme 2 deals with inconsistencies in the application of alternatives by the teachers.*

The demerit system is one of the alternatives, which gives problems as it is not applied consistently by the teachers. Both Circuit Managers agreed that before it can help on condition that learners know how it works, they also highlighted the fact that for it to work it will need consistency on the part of the schools. However, they indicated that it is mostly used in former Model C schools but not necessarily in rural schools. CM1 had this to say:

*It’s mainly former model see and some township school but does not happen in rural school.*

CM 2 agreed that it may not be effective in some schools.

*It is used effectively especially in the former Model C school, but has no effect in our school because of lack of consistency.*

The other inconsistency is found in the failure of the School Governing Body (SGB) to follow proper procedures and processes when it comes to implementing the alternatives to corporal punishment such as suspension and expulsion. This fact also talks to the fact that in some of the instances the members of the SGB are not literate and thus do not have knowledge and skills to execute some of their duties that are expected of them especially in relation to discipline issues. The case in point is that designing and implementing are effective codes of conduct. Mestry and Khumalo, (2012), argue that it is the SGB delegates that play a prominent role in the implement the code of conduct on a daily basis to ensure effective teaching and learning.

In the qualitative data it transpired that, while CM agreed that SGB members might help in assisting in disciplining learners found guilty of misconduct, however CM2 highlight that it depends on the functionality of the governing body for it to be functional.

*It depends on the functionality of the school governing body.*
The principals agreed that it helps if the SGB is fully involved, principal 2 had this to say about the effectiveness of alternative measures.

*We sit with the SGB and follow the procedures in terms of the discipline*

From the above statements it seems that as much as there are SGBs in all schools, but they have to be functional and know what it is that they are supposed to do. SGBs also need to understand all the procedures and processes that need to be followed in which circumstances contribute to improvement of learners' behaviour.

Verbal warning is seen by principals and circuit managers as ineffective and they feel it has to be followed by something harsher. The principals and circuit managers see it as a challenge to do daily reporting on learners' behaviour as that is too much for the teachers as they suggest rather a quarterly report.

The third theme is the lack of training of educators on how to use alternatives to corporal punishment. The CMs and principals indicated that in the past there were workshops which were held for teachers, but the teachers who joined the system had no training and are frustrated by the ill-disciplined learners who do not have skills of how to handle them.

Lack of parental involvement is one of the issues that were raised by principals and Circuit managers as a challenge; because they think that some of the alternatives can only be effective, if the parents are actively involved. Those alternatives are like signing a contract, which the parent had to know the details of and understanding the contract they are getting themselves into.

CM1 when asked if the involvement of parents was an effective way to deal with issues of learner behaviour, he responded by saying that it is one of the ways of maintaining discipline although some are afraid of their kids when hearings are undertaken.

*It does. You know there are so many factors involved in this. In some instances, you find that when you invite a parent, you can read from the parents ‘gestures, facial expressions that the parent is afraid of the learner, but in cases where*
there is strong discipline from home and the parent is playing his/her roles, this has a great impact.

CM 2 added that they had to make sure that they had all parents’ contact details at school. The principals also hammered on the important role played by parents, and principal 1 stated that it depends on the kind of parents as:

There are parents who are real parents to their kids. The second group of parents is one that is ruled and controlled by their kids.

The other alternative that can only be effective when parents are involved is that of a 14-day suspension period. Principals and circuit managers feel that it is only effective if parents are going to support the child and try and use this time to offer guidance and counselling to their learners.

CM 2 is of the view that, this alternative was not effective considering time for suspension of a learner which is shorter at times and too soft as compared to the offence committed by the learner.

It does not assist, since the period of suspension does not assist the learner in improving the learners’ behaviour. It does not have an immediate effect, and punishment has to be correctional and is too lenient for some cases done by learners.

Additionally, CM 2 is of the view that it can only be effective if there are parents to support the learner and since child-headed families lack the adult support. If learners are living alone it may not be effective in maintaining learner discipline particularly in a Secondary School phase.

For supportive parents it can work, not for child-headed households only.

Principals also agreed that 14 days is too much as the learner loses on the content covered during that time. Principal 2 maintained that learners are affected in terms of teaching and learning as most of the time they are not in class when suspended whilst other continued with teaching and learning.
The calibre of parents was also seen as challenge, because other parents are physically there, but they do not have the knowledge and skills of how to handle their own children when it comes to discipline issues. Other parents do not come to school when they are called in to discuss misbehaviour displayed by their children in schools. In other school there are no shared decision-making between the stakeholders involved such as parents.

Lack of support from the KZN Provincial Department of Education, principals and CMs are of the view that the HOD is not helping when it comes to issues of discipline. The principal can only recommend expulsion, but it is only the HOD who can expel the learner. So the waiting period becomes too long while the damage continues.

The challenge is that principals and Circuit managers view that the other challenge that prevents teachers to implement the alternatives to corporal punishment is the background of the teachers, their cultural beliefs, the exposure to corporal punishment at a young age and not knowing any alternative. Skinner (1976) confirm this when he argues that behaviourism learning theory has to do with measurement of results, testing analysing and observation. Repetition and training used so that the envisaged behaviour can become a norm.

The last theme is the location of the school, other alternatives cannot work effectively in rural school, because of issues such as transport especially when it comes to the referral of learners to outside agencies. Community service is one of the alternatives that principals and circuit managers had a challenge with as they are of the view that the kind of work that learners are given has nothing to do with their school activities. They further indicated that those activities border on child labour. Results are presented in Table 4.33
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Chi-Square calculated</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Chi square tabled</th>
<th>Pearson's R</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Demographic item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of learners found guilty of misconduct makes learners behave well at school out of fear of being expelled</td>
<td>1.892&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School governing body members assisting in disciplining learner found guilty of misconduct has a positive effect on learner behaviour</td>
<td>3.927&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convening Tribunals for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good discipline</td>
<td>1.396&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommending civil prosecution by school governing body for learners</td>
<td>8.173&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.488</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.626&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.271&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Educational category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.886&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.299&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Educational category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.377&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.029&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Educational category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.458&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.296</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.235&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.507</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Educational category</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
found guilty of
misconduct stops
misbehaving

4.5. CONCLUSION

This chapter dealt with the findings in relation to four research questions, which are: To what extent are alternatives to corporal punishment affecting maintenance of learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District? How do educators perceive ATCP in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District? What are the views of learners in the implementation of ATCP in their schools? What are the challenges encountered by Secondary School principals and circuit managers in the implementation of Alternatives to Corporal Punishment ATCP? This chapter further revealed the majority view of the respondent, those who are not sure and those who disagree with the effectiveness of alternative to corporal punishment as way of maintaining discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District.
CHAPTER 5:

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the findings, recommendations and conclusions based on the research findings presented and discussed in Chapter 4. As mentioned in Chapter 1, the purpose of this study was to establish the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. As mentioned previously, this study aimed to answer the subsequent research questions:

This study was guided by the following research questions:

- To what extent are alternatives to corporal punishment affecting maintenance of learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
- How do educators perceive ATCP in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
- What are the views of learners in the implementation of ATCP in their schools?
- What are the challenges encountered by Secondary School principals and circuit managers in the implementation of Alternatives to Corporal Punishment ATCP?

The current study was guided by four (4) research-questions in the research field. Subsequently, in Chapter 4, research findings were presented and discussed according to research questions. The main aim of the study was to establish the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. The subsequent conclusions and recommendations are based on the research findings of the current study, as presented and discussed in Chapter 4:
5.2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Research question 1: To what extent are alternatives to corporal punishment affecting maintenance of learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?

In establishing the extent, the descriptive statistics was used and according to table 4.1, which indicate that, most of the alternatives 19 out of 31 were rated above 50% by the respondents, which means 61.3% of the alternatives to corporal punishment are deemed to be effective as they were rated positively by the respondents. This is against 38.7% of alternatives that were not deemed as effective by the respondents. We can conclude that alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in Secondary schools in King Cetshwayo district are effective. This is in line with Reyneke and Pretorius (2017) assertion that discipline should be understood as part of a teaching and learning process in the school educational setting as it creates an orderly environment conducive to teaching and learning while teaching learners to behave in a socially responsible manner.

Table 4.2 also indicates that most of the alternatives used for corporal punishment are effective as most of the items were found to be on the affirmative (accepted) when they were cross tabulated with all the three demographic items which are gender, age and educational category were accepted.

Research question 2: How do educators perceive alternatives to corporal punishment (ATCP) in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?

Teachers perceptions in using alternatives to corporal punishment (ATCP) in maintaining discipline in secondary schools were found to be positive. They highlighted the importance of active parental involvement on discipline issues. They also indicated that healthy relationship between teachers, parents and learners and strong discipline at
home prove to work in maintaining learner discipline in schools. The research by Rigby (2011) confirms that community and parental involvement are important in attending to the ill-discipline learners in schools. On the other hand Carr and Chearra (2004) warns that it is also of critical importance that principals and teachers ensure that the school takes responsibility of creating a welcoming atmosphere which encourages parental involvement in the school so as to be able to deal with matters concerning their children and be involved at an early stage. They also believed that they need to be supported in making sure that they implement the alternatives effectively so as to maintain discipline and order in schools. Okeke (2014) also believes that principals and SGBs should play a major role in supporting the teaching staff with regard to the implementation of the alternatives to corporal punishment. However, the results also reveal that educators do not understand all the alternatives as they did not express any view with regards to their effectiveness.

**Research question 3: What are the views of learners in the implementation of ATCP in their schools?**

The views of learners with regards to the implementation of ATCP in their schools highlighted that they viewed those alternatives that have to do with the removal of misbehaving learners from the class. For instance, learners view detention as the most effective strategy, followed by suspension and final written warnings. This is in line with the study conducted by Belle (2016) in Mauritius where it revealed that corporal punishment and detention are two such techniques which principals in state secondary schools are currently adopting to maintain learner discipline. As much as they are seen as reactive approaches to discipline, suspension and expulsion are still used mostly in secondary schools of many countries (Sprick 2009). The study also revealed that an alternative such as “Performing duties to improve the school environment” was also seen as effective alternative by learners as it takes the disturbing learner out of the classroom. The study further revealed that the alternatives that are deemed as most effective by the learners are not taken as such by educators. So it shows that the two
groups view or perceive the alternatives to corporal punishment from different angles and hence the divergent views.

For instance, while educators view verbal warning as an effective strategy, learners felt that it was not effective and can lead to educators being harmed by the learners.

**Research question 4: What are the challenges encountered by Secondary School principals and circuit managers in the implementation of Alternatives to Corporal Punishment ATCP?**

With regards to the challenges encountered by Secondary School principals and circuit managers in the implementation of Alternatives to Corporal Punishment ATCP. Both principals and circuit managers view the application of the alternatives within the school as exerting extra burden in the load carried by teachers. This is in line with Chen (2008:3) who is of the view that detention is the supervised retention of a learner beyond the regular school schedule.....". The implication is that teachers do need to supervise students on detention. They also highlighted the inconsistencies in the application of alternatives by the teachers, and that causes a problem in the effective implementation of the alternatives. Lack of training was also seen to be the challenge by both the principals and circuit managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal. Lack of parental involvement as well as the location of the school were some of the challenges identified. Belle (2016: 326) is that principals themselves need to undergo professional training in effective learner discipline management, so as to responding to individual needs which could be that of teachers or learners.

5.3. **RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY**

During the apartheid era, the administering of corporal punishment was unacceptable. The use of corporal punishment was abolished post 1994 after the National elections and alternatives to corporal punishment were introduced. The abolishment of corporal punishment is supported by education prescripts such South African Schools Act and National Education Policy Act, but cases of corporal punishment are still reported. This
study was conducted to establish the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in the King Cetshwayo District. The study reveals that some of these alternatives are effective and some are not. So that a detailed situation analysis should be done as to ascertain the challenges faced by teachers in understanding and implementing some of the alternatives. What is remarkable is the fact that where you have strong partnership between learners, educators and parents these alternatives are working. The assumptions have been that educators know their roles and responsibilities when it comes to the discipline of learners, however results of this study indicate that some do not understand it. Even SGBs indicate that there are many challenges in effecting alternatives to corporal punishment and that is why there is strong recommendations of workshopping governing bodies, educators and learners on their roles and responsibilities.

**Develop the training project strategy.**

This study found that some of the circulars are not aligned with legislations, which creates a challenge in implementing discipline according to education legislative prescripts. It therefore means that circulars and legislation must be aligned and a capacity built to educators who must implement alternatives to corporal punishment. This will be achieved through:

- Training of educators in the use of alternatives to corporal punishment, which is crucial. The training will include but not be limited to detention, the demerit system, assigning learners to do manual work, written and verbal warnings. The study found that educators are battling in implementing these alternatives;
- Mentors must be identified to help new teachers in dealing with poor discipline amongst learners. Mentors must also assist teachers to implement effective ACPs. The school management team and school governing bodies must take a lead in training RCLs on their roles and responsibilities. The district officials must workshop School Governing Bodies on how to effectively convene tribunals and deal with suspension and expulsion;
- Teachers buy in into the use of alternatives to corporal punishment, which is crucial, since the use of corporal punishment was abolished. Departmental officials who trained teachers must ensure the training is of high quality and monitor the implementation thereof;
- Tertiary institutions have to empower students with alternative methods to corporal punishment. A module on learner discipline should be introduced in tertiary institutions that train educators to address the gap identified in terms of learner discipline. The training must be conducted in students’ final year;
- The School Management Team (SMT) should establish a close corporation between the school and all stakeholders with interest in education. The stakeholders include ‘Amakhosi,’ parents and councillors. ‘Amakhosi’ are highly influential in rural areas.

Empower stakeholders through training.

The main challenge identified relates to the discipline of learners in Secondary Schools and the effective use of alternatives to corporal punishment as a way of maintaining discipline in the King Cetshwayo district. This project will benefit learners, educators and parents, traditional leadership councillors, religious fraternity, non-governmental structure and other government departments. This training project will empower stakeholders including educators on how to handle issues of discipline. Institutions of Higher Education should introduce a module on school as an organisation particularly final year students at the University. The Institutions of Higher learning, will also be expected to train educators, learners and SGBs as they deal with discipline on a daily basis. In the district office the sub-directorate Governance and management must train the SGBs to find ACPs with special emphasis on suspension and expulsion. Subject advisor, as they are workshopping educators and learners should emphasise discipline among learners.
Develop the monitoring and evaluation framework.

Alternatives to corporal punishment should be implemented, monitored for execution and evaluation as its impact in improving learner discipline in schools is crucial. The line function managers should design a monitoring system that will inform evaluation processes, which must preferable be done by an independent body.

5.4 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The following topics are suggested for further research

- Learners' perception on ill-discipline in schools;
- The relationship between the location of the school and learners' discipline; and
- The impact of the School Governing Body on school discipline.
- The effects of Labour Relation sanctions given to educators as a way of dealing with corporal punishment in schools.
CHAPTER 6

RECOMMENDATION BASED ON STUDY FINDINGS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter presented the recommendations of the study and this chapter presents the proposed model to address challenges in terms of alternatives to corporal punishment.

6.2 PROPOSED MODEL TO ADDRESS CHALLENGES IN TERMS OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

The study reveals that majority of the alternatives are effective and some are not. What is remarkable is the fact that where you have strong partnership between learners, educators and parents these alternatives are working.

This study found that the turnaround in terms of protocols as provided for in some of the circulars are not aligned with legislations, which creates a challenge in implementing discipline according to education legislative prescripts. It therefore means that circulars and legislation must be aligned to the sensitivity of the cases to be dealt with and a capacity built to educators who must implement alternatives to corporal punishment. This will be achieved through this proposed model.
1. Step one: Input

This phase presents the resource document to be used in addressing challenges as raised in the finding in terms of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. Constitution will serve as the bases for these challenges as it indicates the abolishing of corporal punishment particularly chapter (Bill of Rights). This piece of legislation gives rise to National Education Policy Act which empowers the National Minister to promulgate South African Schools Act which led to the banning of corporal punishment in schools. School code of conduct is generated on the basis of this which guides the schools on how to formulate...
their school policies with specific reference to discipline in schools. These policies address the issue of financial management at the school level in terms public finance management act. These acts are a necessary input in addressing matters that relates to discipline as they provide the framework learners, educators principals and circuit managers to operate. The role that needs to be played by parents as the study reveals that most schools are successful it parents play a meaningful role, together with councillors, Traditional leadership, social workers, psychologists and institutions of higher learning.

2. Step two: Process

This phase involves circuit and district officials, as they will be expected to train educators, learners and SGBs as they deal with discipline on a daily basis. In the district, office the sub-directorate Governance and management must train the SGBs to find ATCPs with special emphasis on suspension and expulsion. Subject advisor, as they are to workshop educators and learners should emphasise discipline among learners.

- Training of educators in the use of alternatives to corporal punishment, which is crucial. The training will include but not be limited to detention, suspension, expulsion the demerit system, assigning learners to do manual work, written and verbal warnings. The study found that educators are battling in implementing these alternatives;
- Mentors must be identified to help new teachers in dealing with poor discipline amongst learners. Mentors must also assist teachers to implement effective ATCPs. The school management team and school governing bodies must take a lead in training RCLs on their roles and responsibilities. The district officials must workshop School Governing Bodies on how to effectively convene tribunals and deal with suspension and expulsion;
- Teachers buy in into the use of alternatives to corporal punishment, which is crucial, since the use of corporal punishment was abolished. Departmental
officials who trained teachers must ensure the training is of high quality and monitor the implementation thereof.

- Tertiary institutions have to empower students with alternative methods to corporal punishment. A module on learner discipline should be introduced in tertiary institutions that train educators to address the gap identified in terms of learner discipline. The training must be conducted in students’ final year;
- The School Management Team (SMT) should establish a close corporation between the school and all stakeholders with interest in education. The stakeholders include ‘Amakhosi,’ parents and councillors. ‘Amakhosi’ are highly influential in rural areas.
- Strong partnership between life orientation educators, Life orientation Advisors and Guidance and Counselling Advisors must be maintained so as to empower educators on how to handle cases of learners who are misbehaving.
- Recommending to Head of Department for reviewed of protocols as it take long to process matters of suspension and expulsion.
- Recommendation to the Head of Department of education for the appointment of social workers and Psychologists in school or circuit so that they are closer to provide relevant support.
- Institutions of Higher learning train educators on how to effect alternatives to corporal as a way of maintaining discipline in secondary schools.

3. **Step three: Output**

- Training of learners, RCLs, educators on how to implement alternatives to corporal punishment conducted.
- Workshop on the roles and responsibilities of parents and school governing bodies in supporting implementation of alternative to corporal punishment conducted.
- Full participation of local councillors and traditional leadership in supporting schools and disciplining of learners and ensuring that parents participating on matters that affect their learner discipline.
• Appointment of the Social workers and Psychologists at school level or circuit so as to be closer to schools so to provide support.
• District directors delegated to approve the expulsion of learners by SGBs so as to improve turn-around.
• Institutions of Higher learning introduces a module on alternatives to corporal punishment to student teachers.

4. **Step four: Outcome**

The main challenge identified relates to the discipline of learners in Secondary Schools and the effective use of alternatives to corporal punishment as a way of maintaining discipline in the King Cetshwayo district. This project will benefit learners, educators and parents, traditional leadership, councillors, religious fraternity, non-governmental structure and other government departments. This training project will empower stakeholders including educators on how to handle issues of discipline. Institutions of Higher Education should introduce a module on school as an organisation particularly final year students at the University with special emphasis on issues that relate to effects of alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools. Reduction on the number cases reported to District office in relation to the administration of corporal punishment. Improvement in learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District.
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ANNEXURE A: Questionnaire

EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools. It is an opportunity for you to reflect on what you are doing and the extent to which the alternatives to corporal punishment are being implemented.

1. Gender

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years old and below</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30 years old</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50 years old</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 60 years old</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 years and older</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the following statements regarding your knowledge in relation to alternatives to corporal punishment indicate, by making a mark in the appropriate block, what applies to you.

To what extent do you Agree or Disagree with each of the followings statements about your knowledge regarding alternatives to corporal punishment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge regarding effects of alternatives to corporal punishment</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Detention of learners found guilty of misconduct by</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge regarding effects of alternatives to corporal punishment</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendering community services as alternative to corporal punishment stops learners found guilty of misconduct from misbehaving.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners found guilty of misconduct and suspended for 14 days makes them to change their behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work such as cleaning toilets, bathrooms and classrooms by learners found guilty of misconduct encourages learners to behave better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depriving learners participation in extra-mural activities as a form of punishment motivate learners to behave well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspending learners found guilty of misconduct from school for few days stops misbehaving.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inviting a parent to school to discuss learner behavior after they are found guilty of misconduct has stop learners from repeating the offence.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion of learners found guilty of misconduct makes learners behave out of fear of being expelled.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demerit system to leaners found guilty of misconduct encourages good behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal warning to leaners found guilty of misconduct encourages good conduct by that learner.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal warning to leaners found guilty of misconduct encourages misconduct by other learners as they know they won’t be punished for misconduct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding learners from participation in sporting activities, excursions, social events (civvies day) after being found guilty misconduct encourages good behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final written warning to learners guilty of misconduct improves learner discipline in class.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signing contract with the leaner found guilty of misconduct make the learner to behave well.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct daily report for the learner found guilty of misconduct signed by all educators corrects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge regarding effects of alternatives to corporal punishment</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learner behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Performing duties that improve the school environment as punishment to learners found guilty of misconduct stops learners from behaving in an improper manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Written warning to learners found guilty of misconduct encourage learner to behave better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Referring learner found guilty of misconduct to an outside agency like social workers or psychologist has been found to be effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Applying School code of conduct to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. School governing body members assist in disciplining learner found guilty of misconduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Convening Tribunals for learners found guilty of misconduct encourages good discipline.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Recommending civil prosecution by school governing body for learners found guilty of misconduct stops misbehaving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Withdrawal of privileges in the school for learners found guilty of ill-discipline encourages good behavior to all learners in the school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Peer mediation improves behavior of learners found guilty of misconduct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Daily report enforces learners to behave well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Teacher learner parent meeting encourages good behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Providing guidance and counselling to learners found guilty of misconduct improves their behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Rewarding system like giving star charts, badges or classroom award to learners that are conducting themselves well encourages good behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Time-out strategy, which involves removal of the learner from the situation in which he or she is unable to exercise self-discipline to a cooling down place for learners found guilty encourages good behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Knowledge regarding effects of alternatives to corporal punishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Setting clear expectations to learners prevents bad behavior.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Repair or replacement of damaged property such as window panes, scrubbing graffiti from walls, doors and desks by learners found guilty of misconduct corrects misbehaving.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEXURE B: Interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR LEARNERS (RCL), EDUCATORS, PRINCIPALS AND CIRCUIT MANAGERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The purpose of this study is to investigate the effects of alternative to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District. It is an opportunity for you to reflect on what you are doing and the extent to which your alternatives to corporal punishment is implemented.

1. Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 years old and below</th>
<th>21 to 30 years old</th>
<th>31 to 40 years old</th>
<th>41 to 50 years old</th>
<th>51 to 60 years old</th>
<th>61 years and older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Representative Council (LRCs)</th>
<th>Educator</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Circuit managers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Answer each of the following questions regarding your knowledge in relation to the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in King Cetshwayo District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 How do educators discipline learners when found guilty of misconduct in your school?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Is detention an effective way of maintaining discipline in schools? Do you think it should be continued in our schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 What challenges do you have in processing suspension and expulsion for learners found guilty of misconduct in school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Does community service for learners found guilty of misconduct assist in improving learner discipline?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.22 | What is the perception of educators on alternatives to corporal punishment?  
|      | Is it effective?  
| 4.23 | What challenges do you have in implementing alternative to corporal punishment? |
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<table>
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2. Proposed Research Title

The effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools in the King Cetshwayo District.

3. Have you applied for permission to conduct this research or any other research within the KZNDoE institutions?  
   ✓ Yes  No
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5. Briefly state the Research Background

This study seeks to establish the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment that were introduced in the education system after South Africa became independent. Corporal punishment was a 'world phenomenon' based on the belief that for learners to behave correctly, they need to be punished through pain inflicting means. Poland was the first country to abolish corporal punishment in 1783. Many countries realized that there are other means of disciplining learners and started to introduce alternatives to corporal punishment. These countries include the United States of America, Canada, China, India, Italy, Kenya, Norway, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand.

Pre-1994 corporal punishment in South Africa was a sole means of enforcing learner discipline. Hayman and Perone, (1998) also confirms this when stating that corporal punishment was historically accepted and tolerated as one of the disciplinary methods used by South African teachers. When the Democratic government was elected in 1994, a constitution inclusive of all races was promulgated. This led SA to follow trends in countries that eliminated corporal punishment in schools. Section 12 of the South African Constitution declares that everyone has the right not to be treated or punished in cane, inhumane or degrading ways (Republic of South Africa, 1996b). This clause minimized the use of corporal punishment which was further restricted by SASA where it states that no person may administer corporal punishment at a school to a learner; any person who contravenes subsection one (1) is guilty of an offence, and liable for conviction to sentence which be imposed for assault. In order to entrench anti corporal punishment behavior, the state promulgated the National Education Policy Act (1996) which states that no person shall administer corporal punishment or subject a student to psychological or physical abuse at any educational institution.

6. What is the main research question(s):

1. To what extent are alternatives to corporal punishment affecting maintenance of learner discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
2. How do educators perceive alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in secondary schools within the King Cetshwayo District?
3. What are the views of learners in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in their schools?
4. What are the challenges encountered by secondary school principals in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment?
7. Methodology including sampling procedures and the people to be included in the sample:

This study will follow a pragmatic paradigm. The researcher will use an empirical survey following a mixed method approach using both quantitative and qualitative research approaches in collecting data through a questionnaire and an interview schedule.

8. What contribution will the proposed study make to the education, health, safety, welfare of the learners and to the education system as a whole?:

The findings of this study may assist the Department of Basic Education in analysing and coming up with strategies that may help in maintaining discipline in Secondary schools. It may also assist when conducting workshops that relate to learner discipline. It may contribute to the knowledge about corporal punishment. The study will make educators aware of issues relating to corporal punishment. It will help to determine the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools, to assess the perspective of educators in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in schools, to establish the problems encountered by school managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment and to establish the views of learners in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in their schools.

KZN Department of Education Schools or Institutions from which sample will be drawn – If the list is long please attach at the end of the form

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________

________________________
9. Research data collection instruments: (Note: a list and only a brief description is required here - the actual instruments must be attached):

The questionnaire and interviews will be used as research instruments for this study. The questionnaire will have both closed and open-ended questions. The questionnaire will have five sections A-E; section A which will focus on demographic and general information, section B will focus on knowledge of alternatives to corporal punishment and sections C, D, and E will focus more on the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment and compliance. This quantitative methodology is chosen in the light of the purpose of the study, the kind of information that is required and the available resources. As McMillan, Schumacher (2006) and Kumar (2010) maintain questionnaires permit anonymity, preclude possible interviewer biases and permit a respondent sufficient time to consider answers before actually answering. Data provided by questionnaires can be more easily analysed and interpreted than data obtained from verbal responses and lastly, questionnaires can elicit information that cannot be obtained by other methods.

10. Procedure for obtaining consent of participants and where appropriate parents or guardians:

The researcher will first ask permission from the District, Circuit, school and the participants to conduct interviews and assure them of their rights to participate or to withdrew at any time when they uncomfortable.

There will be adherence to all ethical considerations when collecting data in a manner that shows respect in terms of the language to be used, the values, culture, social background and religion of participants and care will be exercised in not imposing nor influencing their responses. The researcher will record the responses received from the participants and transcribe them verbatim.
11. Procedure to maintain confidentiality (if applicable)

- Participants will be given the right to partake or withdraw from the research at anytime and the researcher will inform them of this right.
- Cultural sensitivity will not extend to excluding the individuals concerned from making their own informed decision to take part in the research.
- A voluntary informed consent form will be given to participants before undertaking the research.
- Due to his position, the researcher will try to avoid the conflict of interest that might arise during the study.
- The researcher will not be engaged in any falsification or plagiarism. Sources and publications of authors will be acknowledged.
- Data collected will be solely used for the purposes of this study.
- The participants will be clearly informed that their participation and interactions are being monitored and analysed for research.
- The researcher will take the necessary steps to ensure that all participants in the research understand the process in which they are to be engaged, including why their participation is necessary, how data will be used and to whom it will be reported.
- The researcher will comply with article 3 and 12 of the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the Child which requires that in all actions concerning children, the best interests of the child must be the primary consideration including the full consent of the child which must be sourced.
- Ministerial consent will also be filled in as the study uses learners as participants who are minors.

12. Questions or issues with the potential to be intrusive, upsetting or incriminating to participants (if applicable):

Nil
13. Additional support available to participants in the event of disturbance resulting from intrusive questions or issues (if applicable):

15. Declaration

I hereby agree to comply with the relevant ethical conduct to ensure participants’ privacy and the confidentiality of records and other critical information.

I, David Sbonakalo So Chonco, declare that the above information is true and correct.

Signature of Applicant

29/01/2018

Date

14. Research Timelines

16. Agreement to provide and to grant the KwaZulu Natal Department of Education the right to publish a summary of the report.

I agree to provide the KwaZulu Natal Department of Education with a copy of any report or dissertation written on the basis of information gained through the research activities described in this application.

I grant the KwaZulu Natal Department of Education the right to publish an edited summary of this report or dissertation using the print or electronic media.

Signature of Applicant(s)

29/01/2018

Date
ANNEXURE E: Permission to conduct research from Province

PERMISSION TO CONDUCT RESEARCH IN THE KZN DoE INSTITUTIONS

Your application to conduct research entitled: "THE EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN MAINTAINING LEARNER DISCIPLINE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE KING CETSHWAYO DISTRICT", in the KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education Institutions has been approved. The conditions of the approval are as follows:

1. The researcher will make all the arrangements concerning the research and interviews.
2. The researcher must ensure that Educator and learning programmes are not interrupted.
3. Interviews are not conducted during the time of writing examinations in schools.
4. Learners, Educators, Schools and Institutions are not identifiable in any way from the results of the research.
5. A copy of this letter is submitted to District Managers, Principals and Heads of Institutions where the intended research and interviews are to be conducted.
6. The period of investigation is limited to the period from 26 January 2018 to 09 July 2020.
7. Your research and interviews will be limited to the schools you have proposed and approved by the Head of Department. Please note that Principals, Educators, Departmental Officials and Learners are under no obligation to participate or assist you in your investigation.
8. Should you wish to extend the period of your survey at the school(s), please contact Miss Phindile Duma at the contact numbers below.
9. Upon completion of the research, a brief summary of the findings, recommendations or a full report/dissertation/thesis must be submitted to the research office of the Department. Please address it to The Office of the HOD, Private Bag X9137, Pietermaritzburg, 3200.
10. Please note that your research and interviews will be limited to schools and Institutions in KwaZulu-Natal Department of Education.

King Cetshwayo District

Dr. EV Nkasa
Head of Department: Education
Date: 29 January 2018
ANNEXURE F: Request from permission from principal

The Principal

I David Sbonakaliso Chonco, a part time PhD student from the University of Zululand, student number: 19950181 and permanent post level 13 District Director King Cetshwayo District in Empangeni, persal number: 61219266, request permission to conduct a study in the schools in King Cetshwayo District, here is the research topic: The effect of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools.

It will be highly appreciated if my request will be taken into consideration.

Thanking you in advance,

Mr D.S. Chonco

083 275 3429
ANNEXURE G: Request for permission from educator

P.O. Box 10335
Empangeni
3880

The Educator

I David Sbonakaliso Chonco a part time PhD student from the University of Zululand student number: 19950181 and permanent post level 13 District Director King Cetshwayo District in Empangeni persal number: 61219266 request permission to conduct study in the schools in King Cetshwayo District, here is the research topic: The effect of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools.

It will be highly appreciated if my request will be taken into consideration.

Thanking you in advance.

[Signature]

Mr D.S. Chonco

083 275 3429
ANNEXURE H: Request for permission from learner

The Learner

I am David Sbonakaliso Chonco, a part-time PhD student from the University of Zululand. My student number is 19950181 and my permanent post level is 13. I am the District Director of King Cetshwayo District in Empangeni. My personal number is 61219266. I am requesting permission to conduct a study in the schools in King Cetshwayo District. The study is focused on the research topic: the effect of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools.

I would highly appreciate it if my request is considered.

Thanking you in advance.

Mr D.S. Chonco

083 275 3429
ANNEXURE I: Application for ministerial consent

FORM A

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

APPLICATION FOR MINISTERIAL CONSENT FOR NON-THERAPEUTIC RESEARCH WITH MINORS

1. INSTRUCTIONS

1.1 This application form must be completed for all protocols that are classified as "non-therapeutic" and involve the participation of minors.

*Non therapeutic research is defined in the regulations relating to research on human participants as "research that does not hold out the prospect of direct benefit but holds out the prospect of generalizable knowledge." Minors are defined as person under the age of 18 by Section 17 of the Children's Act, 2005 (Act No. 38 of 2005).*

1.2 This application form should be submitted with a copy of the protocol and supporting documents.

1.3 This application should be submitted to the Minister of Health or the delegated authority in terms of Section 92(a) of the Act.

1.4 This application form should describe how "non-therapeutic" research protocols with minors meet the conditions set out in Section 71(3)(b) of the Act of the Act (described below).

1.5 All sections of the form must be completed in full.

1.6 Ministerial Consent may be granted for non-therapeutic health research with minors when certain conditions set out in Section 71(3) of the Act are met and these conditions are:

a) The research objectives cannot be achieved except by the enrolment of minors;

b) The research is likely to lead to an improved scientific understanding of conditions, or disorders affecting children;

c) Any consent given to the research must be in line with public policy; and

d) The research does not pose a significant risk to minors, and if there is some risk, the benefit of the research outweighs the risk.
2. INVESTIGATOR'S DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of principal investigator</th>
<th>David Sbonakaliso Chonco</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of research protocol</td>
<td>The effects of alternatives to corporal punishment to maintain learner discipline in King Cetshwayo District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional affiliation</td>
<td>University of Zululand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address</td>
<td>P.O. Box 10335, Empangeni, 3880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Address</td>
<td>13 Willow Way Grantham Park, Empangeni, 3880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david.chonco@gmail.com">david.chonco@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>david.chonco@kzn doe.gov.za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Application</td>
<td>12 March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of Application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. APPLICATION

3.1 Condition 1: The research objectives cannot be achieved except by the participation of minors

Describe the scientific justification for the enrolment of minors. Explain why this research must be done with minors as participants:

To establish the views of learners in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in their schools.

3.2 Condition 2: The research is likely to lead to an improved scientific understanding of certain conditions, diseases or disorders affecting minors.

Describe how the research might, or aims to, advance knowledge affecting the health and welfare of minors as a class. Note that 'condition' is defined in the Regulations as 'physical and psychosocial characteristics understood to affect health' allowing that this research does not only involve children with an illness.

The study will make educators aware of issues relating to corporal punishment. It will help to determine the effects of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining learner discipline in secondary schools, to assess the perspective of educators in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment in maintaining discipline in schools, to establish the problems encountered by school managers in the implementation of alternatives to corporal punishment and to establish the views of learners in the implementation of alternative to corporal punishment in their schools.
3.3 Condition 3: Any consent given to the research is in line with public policy

Consent given by authorized persons must be in line with public policy considerations. Describe how consent to the research will be in line with public policy or would be acceptable, for example, show how the research poses acceptable risks and promotes the rights of minors:

The researcher will first ask permission from the District, Circuit, school and the participant to conduct interviews. Assuring the participant of his rights to participate or to withdraw at any time when he/she feels uncomfortable.

Adherence to all ethical considerations when collecting data in a manner that shows respect in terms of the language used, values and culture, the way questions will be asked including social background of this area also observing religion of the participant and not imposing nor influencing the responses. The researcher will do the recording and transcribe verbatim in terms of the responses received from the participants.

3.4 Condition 4: The research does not pose a significant risk to minors; and if there is some risk, the benefit of the research outweighs the risk.

Describe how the potential risks from the research procedures and/or intervention to minor participants will be minimized and describe any possible benefits from the research to society in the form of knowledge:

- Participants will be treated fairly, sensitivity and with dignity.
- The study will be done within an ethic of respect and freedom of prejudice regardless of sexuality, race, disability, gender, nationality, cultural diversity, age, ethnicity, class, political belief or any other related difference.
- Participants will be given the right to partake or withdraw from the research at anytime and he will inform them of this right.
- Cultural sensitivity will not extend to excluding the individuals concerned from making their own informed decision to take part in research.
- Voluntary informed consent form will be given to participants before undertaking the research.
- Due to his position, the researcher will try to avoid the conflict of interest that might arise during the study.
- The researcher will not be engaged to any falsification or plagiarism. Sources and publications of authors will be acknowledged.
- Data collected will be solely used for the purposes of this study.
• The participants will be clearly informed that their participation and interactions are being monitored and analysed for research.

• The researcher will take necessary steps to ensure that all participants in the research understand the process in which they are to be engaged, including why their participation is necessary, how data will be used and to whom it will be reported.

• The researcher will comply with article 3 and 12 of the United Nations Conventions on the Rights of the child which requires that in all actions concerning children, the best interests of the child must be the primary consideration including the full consent of the child which must be sourced.
ANNEXURE J: Ethical clearance

UNIVERSITY OF ZULULAND
RESEARCH ETHICS COMMITTEE
(Reg No: UZREC 171110-030)

RESEARCH & INNOVATION
Website: http://www.unizulu.ac.za
Private Reg X1001
Kwadlangezwa 3986
Tel: 035 902 6731
Fax: 035 902 6222
Email: admin@unizulu.ac.za

ETHICAL CLEARANCE CERTIFICATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate Number</th>
<th>UZREC 171110-030 PGD 2018/220</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>THE EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN MAINTAINING LEARNER DISCIPLINE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE KING CETSHWAYO DISTRICT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Researcher/Investigator</td>
<td>DS Chonco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor and Co-supervisor</td>
<td>Prof AP Kutama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Educational Foundations and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Risk</td>
<td>Med Risk– Data collection from people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Project</td>
<td>Honours/4th Year x Master's</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Zululand's Research Ethics Committee (UZREC) hereby gives ethical approval in respect of the undertakings contained in the above-mentioned project. The Researcher may therefore commence with data collection as from the date of this Certificate, using the certificate number indicated above.

Special conditions:

1. This certificate is valid for 3 years from the date of issue.
2. Principal researcher must provide an annual report to the UZREC in the prescribed format [due date-29 May 2019]
3. Principal researcher must submit a report at the end of project in respect of ethical compliance.
4. The UZREC must be informed immediately of any material change in the conditions or undertakings mentioned in the documents that were presented to the meeting.

The UZREC wishes the researcher well in conducting research.

Professor Gideon De Wet
Chairperson: University Research Ethics Committee
Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Research & Innovation
28 May 2018
ANNEXURE K: Edit certificate

Certificate of editing

This is to certify that the following document has been language edited:

THE EFFECTS OF ALTERNATIVES TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT TO MAINTAIN LEARNER DISCIPLINE IN THE KING CETSHWAYO DISTRICT

Nature of document: Doctoral Thesis
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