

Corporal Punishment in Private Schools: The Case of Kathmandu, Nepal

Jeevan Khanal* Sae-Hoon Park*

School of Education, Chonbuk National University

567 Baekje-daero, deokjin-gu, Jeonju-si, Jeollabuk-do, Jinsudang Education Research Building, Room 204 (2nd Floor), 54896 Republic of South Korea

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to elaborate the situation of corporal punishment which is being practiced in Nepalese schools going against new policies that promote the non-violence teaching. It was based on original qualitative study of one private school of Kathmandu (the capital city of Nepal) having more than 2000 students and 100 teachers. Results from FGD, observation of the classroom practice, situational interviews with parents, teachers and students indicated that most teachers as well as parents thought, the best way to discipline children is punishment because it creates fear in them and this prevents misbehavior, promotes obedience and help to perform high academically. Teachers and administrators were found ignoring the rights of child and about the principles of child psychology and development. Students had accepted the corporal punishment as a culture of school. This study is significant to know why teachers in private schools in Nepal often use the corporal punishment on students during teaching and learning periods. So this study is important for the government of Nepal, organization involving to child rights and stakeholders. The results showed the accepted and negated concept of social learning theory, power theory and choice theory by the parents, teachers, school principal and students.

Keywords: Corporal punishment, Private school, Teachers, Parents, Students, Discipline, Violence

1. Introduction

The use of punishment to maintain the discipline in school is a long- standing practice in Nepal. Teacher face an immense pressure from many parents and the school administrations to resort to corporal punishment (CP) to maintain strict “discipline” because it makes a favorable impression on parents and it helps the reputation of the school flourish (UNICEF/CVICT, 2004). Teachers, parents hold to traditional beliefs, such as to age five we must love the child, age five to sixteen is the time to get the punishment (*tadana*) for wrong behaviours or doing (Center for Victims of Torture, 2004). According to Hindu mythology teachers are equated to god. The Nepalese education system was also started from *Gurukul* system, in which student were sent to live with their teachers at young age giving the right to teacher to discipline their children. Gradually teachers gained the powerful status among the parents of *Gurukul* system of education. Although, the system is not in exist but the system left the strong belief in the society that education could only be earned under the strict teachers’ discipline (Raj, 2011). It is a kind of physical mistreatment of the children and is considered the most common and accepted type of child abuse (SRC, 2006). Even people who think corporal punishment is necessary often cannot avoid feeling slightly uneasy after meting it out. They do not feel good about it. The intension of corporal punishment is to teach/discipline. It is the just one of the wrong ways to discipline a child (Save the Children).

In the recent years, a number of reports of physical humiliation and abuse relating to CP have appeared in the Nepalese Media. Some of these reports are “A math teacher from a private school in Pokhara, Nepal, took 18 students of grade one to the school toilet and made them touch human excrement with the tip of their tongues for not memorising their mathematic multiplication table which was given as a home work”. (www.wavemag.com.np, 2006). Similarly a 10-year girl who was severely thrashed and hung upside down from the ceiling fan by the school principal because she was suspected to have a stolen fruit lying on the principal’s desk, is now suffering from problems of hallucinations, depression and nightmares, and has discontinued her studies (Mishra, N., Thakur, K et al., 2010). A 12-year boy Raju from Sindhupalchwok District living in the capital city of Nepal Kathmandu left his home since he did not like to go to school where he used get physical punishment from his school teacher (APC Nepal, 2011). It is a common phenomenon in the daily life of South Asian children in school and at home (UNICEF 2012). At various times different forms of corporal punishment have been adopted in private school of Nepal as disciplinary measures and yet, the deserved ends are usually achieved. Even the efforts from different INGOS like save the children, UNICEF, Plan Nepal, Child Workers in Nepal (CIWIN), the government and some stakeholders in the education industry towards controlling the corporal punishment have not yielded positive results in case of private schools.

Many teachers and parents were unaware of alternative to corporal punishment and knew little about physical and psychological impacts of harsh punishment (Centre for Victims of Torture, 2004). The same source shows that physical punishment is most commonly used against primary school students, while psychological punishment was more common against secondary level students. Both were frequently used against lower

secondary students. Many teachers and parents reported that they inflicted severe punishment on children because they were unaware of alternatives to corporal punishment and knew little about the physical and psychological impacts of harsh punishments.

Key risk factors for school corporal punishment in Nepal include bullying and making noise, attending grade three, four and five, memorising contents particularly in English, Computer Science and Mathematics, most of the graduate teachers have strong belief on Pavlov and Skinner S-R theory is also reason (Plan Nepal, 2011). The CWIN Helpline receives an average of 35-40 calls a day from children or individuals for help. They may be the large number of incidents which are unreported (Wave Magazine, July 2006).

2. Legality, the Nepalese Context

Article 7 of the Children Act (1992) states: "No child shall be subjected to torture or cruel treatment." About the legal defense, Article 4 of Chapter 9 of the *Muluki Ains* states that guardians and teachers shall not be held responsible for grievously hurting a child in the course of education or defense, and article 7 of the Children's Act exempts "the act of scolding and minor beating to the child by his father, mother, member of the family, guardian or teacher for the interests of the child" from the prohibition of cruel treatment. In 2005 Supreme Court of Nepal ruled that the restrictive clause in article 7 was unconstitutional and declared the clause "give him/her minor beating" (Supreme Court decision 6 January 2005). The near universal social acceptance of corporal punishment in childrearing necessitates clarity in law that no level of corporal punishment is acceptable. Article 7 of the children's Act and the relevant provision in the *Muluki Ain* should be repealed to reflect the Supreme Court ruling and the law should explicitly prohibit all corporal punishment and other cruel form of punishment (UNICEF, 2008). There is no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in the Education Regulation (2003), though severe punishment would be prohibited under article 7 of the Children's Act. In November 2010 as Education Bill was under consideration but still it is in processing.

The Government of Nepal made a commitment to prohibition of corporal punishment in all settings, including the home also at a meeting of the South Asia Forum on July 2006, following on the regional consultation in 2005 of the UN Secretary General's Study on Violence against Children.

The Interim constitution (2007) prohibits cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment (article 26). The Children's act, defining a child as under 16 (article 2), prohibits cruel treatment (article 7) and subjecting a child to handcuffs, fetters or solitary confinement (article 15) and does not provide sentencing to corporal punishment (article 11). Under the Act, children aged 14-15 are liable to receive sentences under criminal law (article 11) and older children face full sentences under criminal law. Criminal law (The *Muluki Ain* and other laws) does not provide for judicial corporal punishment. The policy states that only the hard and severe punishment applied on children are illegal however corporal punishment in school is not completely prohibited.

3. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate to what extent is corporal punishment widespread in Nepalese private schools in spite of to promote the non-violence teaching. The study investigates current situation exploring the perception of teachers, students and parents' on corporal punishment. It is an increasing phenomena that is being globally combated is worthy of being brought to the Nepalese educational leader, administrators and policy makers because for various reasons. The main reason is that the corporal punishment is still used in Nepalese private school in spite of its ban, and second it is necessary to show them a gap between the legislative context and actual practices.

4. Methodology

4.1 Theoretical Framework

To better understand these findings, we used several theoretical frameworks based on well-known theories that addressed the three themes. This study focused on current practices, reasons and facts of corporal punishment in Nepalese private school. We grounded this research in qualitative methods using a Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1963) explains that how social variables have an influence on behavior. This is suitable when examining the school context, as teachers are social variables that have influence over learner's behavior. The relevance of acquisition and imitation of behavior, especially when a social model is involved (Bandura & Mac Donald (1963).

Whereas the power theory has significantly influenced this study endeavor, According to French and Raven (1959), power must be distinguished from influence in the following way: A-B in such a way that A use power for A's desired changed in B more likely. So power is fundamentally relative. Following the wrong power exercise can have negative effects, including a reduction in teacher's own power.

We could not separate the relation between corporal punishment and choice theory. The assumption of this theory as first posited by William Glasser, according to Edwards (2000) is that students have the ability to make their own positive choices or become more responsible in a behavioral sense (p. 184). The Skinner model

takes the behaviorist approach to classroom management, according to Mc (2010) in which teachers train student behavior in order to achieve desired outcomes.

4.2 Description of Study Site

The only one private high school which is well known in the country was selected as suitable sites of data collection. This high school is situated in the middle of the capital city of Nepal. It is co-educational school with a total enrolment of 2000 students and it employs 100 teachers (from grade 1 to 10). School which we have selected had a large number of teachers, parents as well as students with diverse economic, cultural, social, ethnic and geographical backgrounds. In order to determine the sites to be included in this study, influential selection characteristics were chosen for determining participating school. These selection characteristics were our convenience, the familiarity with the principal and teachers, willingness by the teachers participate in the school and the ease of access to the school by researchers.

4.3 Sample

The sample consisted with the targeted group of people practicing corporal punishment: teachers, parents and children. Teachers are the practitioners of the different methods to mold child's misbehavior. Parents' attitudes or views on the corporal punishment must be highly considered to see how much corporal punishment in school they are accepting or rejecting. Children are the most important elements in this study because they are directly affected by corporal punishment. So these three parties' action and opinions play the important role to reach a broader image of the topic. Thus, within the relatively small sample as a well-known private school from the capital city Kathmandu, there are the teachers, students and parents from all over the country.

4.4 Data Collection and Presentation

Data collection lasted 6 months. Data were collected ourselves in English language (researcher). All personal views were carefully recorded, and it was noted in note copy. Teachers as well as school administration activities inside the classroom were observed indirectly. The classes were observed from the outside. Qualitative information related to classroom practice about the real situation of corporal punishment was taken from the school. The discussion had done many times in staff room (a room where all teachers sit in their off class time) to explore the perceptions of teachers. Situational questions were raised to get their experiences and views. Thus the collected information is mostly based on human behavior, feelings, expression, and action. Collecting person's feelings, expressions and inner interest is not a simple job. Interviews were focused on acquiring their perception and knowledge with their daily experiences with children, parents and school leaders.

The second source of data was collected from student observations and discussions. Almost all the data collection days' the situation was watched from different places of school so that we were able to collect the all action clearly. Students as well as teachers were totally unknown about our purpose. Indirect and situational questions were raised for the students to get their experiences and view. All the children were under 18 years and however, due to the varying ages of the students and their inexperience in being interviewed as part of an academic research process, we used the indirect and situational question due to ethical restrictions, and for fear that information communicated by them lacks the accuracy required. Their responses were noted on note book.

The third source of data was collected from parents. Parents' action, reaction, suggestion and comment about school teachers, their child and school administration were collected in different event and noted carefully. The parents had to pay tuition fee from the account section, and at the same time they were found visiting those teachers teaching their child. Their views, responses and complains were listened indirectly sitting in different corners of account section.

The school usually had three mid terminal written examinations and three terminal written examinations for the students from primary level to secondary level (grade 1 to 10). After finishing the examination, the progress report cards with marks and were distributed to the children in the presence of their parents. The distribution day was known as *progress report card distribution day*. Data were collected sitting with the teachers of grade ten, so that parents were completely unknown of our purpose; and many parents thought we were a teacher of the same school. Situational questions were raised to them about corporal punishment. During that period teacher's answers, reactions and opinions were noted.

4.5 Type of Research

The study is qualitative study. All collected qualitative data were presented and analysis by separating them into three themes as teachers, parents and students. The qualitative method consisted in-depth; open ended interviews, direct observation and written documents (Patton, 1990; p.12). The qualitative data analysis is organizing data, breaking data into manageable units, synthesizing data, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned and deciding what to tell others (Bogdan & Bikelen, 1982: p.145). Almost in all cases, we were in close contact with teachers and no hesitation and awkwardness were shown by the teachers during data

collection. In order to maintain ethical confidentiality, the names of the observed schools and the participant teachers, students and parents were not mentioned in this study. Deontological philosophies emphasize moral obligation or commitments that should be binding or necessary for proper conducts (Ferrell & Dubinsky, 1998). To put it quite simply, a deontological approach means that we should not harm participant in any way no matter what the potential benefit.

5. Findings

5.1 Teachers and Administrators Responses

Teachers' perception towards the corporal punishment is related to the school discipline and school violence. As it was the purpose of this study to gain insight into the reasons why teachers in private school of Nepal often use the corporal punishment during teaching and learning periods. Teachers' reactions on their daily task were noted and situational questions were asked to gain deeper understanding and reasons.

However, within the limitation of this article, it is not possible to present the data obtained from each and every teacher. Hence, the common view which is supported by all most all teachers were presented here.

Respondents found sharing their child behavior and their reaction. The corporal punishment was perceived an ideal practice for molding children. It was accepted by respondents that beating and slapping was highly desirable as an instrument of child molding.

In the words of teacher:

Yesterday I had given the written work of 14 pages to my son who is studying in grade two but he didn't start it, so I gave him a big slap on his face.

Interviewer: What is the age of your son?

Respondent: 8 years.

Interviewer: Does your child know the Importance of writing the 14 pages?

Respondent: Without learning formula, without knowing the scientific terms how students can get good scores in the examination? When we were in school, we used to memories all Mathematics formulas and scientific terms.

Teachers want strong concentration to their work from the students. Teachers exerted legitimate power through inflicting punishment and controlling students' behavior. Overall the behavior of students in class room as turning back, talking with friends were perceived as negative, limiting the practices to create a classroom as the *we* space. The outcomes of *we* space suggest that teachers should be better prepared to work in creating inclusive, participatory learning environments in which students are able to utilize, experiment, synthesize and evaluate knowledge (Valls, F. R. and Ponce, G.A. 2013).

In the words of another Teacher:

Today when I was writing on the board, a student watched outside through the window. Then I gave slap to him.

Interviewer: Did he stop to watch outside.

Respondent: Yes.

Another respondent added:

In an examination time we should keep the children quiet in the class for more than one and half hour without any work. If children makes noise the principal of the school sought to them saying why there is noise, I can hear you children.... Her (School principal) query insulted us to be the teacher. So we always give the hard slap to the one or two children then only the rest of the students keep their mouths shut.

Interviewer: What about the student's reaction at that time?

Respondent: They keep silence.

Teachers do not want to open the subject for debate and let the students freely express their views. They were found not caring much about students' participation. Knowing the attitude of respondents, we gave a book *Divaswapna* to the teachers. The book was about the experienced of a teacher who promote the non- violence teaching in India and it is Nepalese language. The book was against the corporal punishment of the children. Many ways of participatory learning and non- violence teaching were explained in book. They were seen interested to read the book. After few days, a majority of respondents said, book is good but difficult to apply the idea in the class room. In the words of an interviewee:

Interviewer: Did you read the book?

Respondent: Yes, it took four days to complete.

Interviewer: How was it?

Respondent: It is nice but I tried to follow the instruction given by the book in my class. But it was useless. The class became very noisy.

Respondents used their consciousness regarding wrong and right based on their background and past experiences. The principal of social learning states that individuals are more likely to adopt a modeled behavior if it results in

outcomes they value. All respondents agreed that they were beaten by the teachers in school: A teacher expressed his personal dissatisfaction:

We were beaten by the teachers when we were in school, never felt bitter and got educated in a strict and commanding environment". We used to be afraid of teachers, even we could not see straight to teachers face. We used to respect them very much. But we did not get such facility which the children are getting now a-days. But we motivated ourselves and studied well. There was no one to say us study hard. If someone was there to force us for the study; we may do much better. But now a-days we have to force the children to make them study.

The similarity in the responses of informants reflected same in their classroom context and circumstances. Teachers were seen particularly more autocrat than democrat in the classroom to acquiring respectful attitudes and behaviors from the students. A majority of the respondent preferred only one way communication that is from teacher to the student and opposed these two ways of communication: communication from student to the teacher and from students to the students.

Another respondent added:

Children of schools are manner less and they don't study. They don't respect the teachers. When we were students, we used to keep quiet in the class ...the teachers. When we were in front of the teachers, we used to be speech less....

A reaction of the student of grade ten who got the bad slap from teachers:

"My hand was broken and the doctor took out plaster just one day before, teacher caught my hand and I felt pain so I took out my hand fast from his hand, he felt insulting him and he slapped on my face.

In the words of teacher:

He didn't pay the attention in class while teaching, he was very irritating".

Non participatory teaching learning process was another factor of leading corporal punishment. Teachers were taken by the students as an authority. Students on the other hand are presumed to be copious recipients of knowledge from teacher. Some students were found standing outside even more than a week regularly for not memorizing the name of 75 district of the Nepal. Teachers were found punishing the students who felt sleepy in the classroom and not giving the correct answer. The conversation of two respondents:

First Respondent: From today onwards I can't give you my stick. Whenever I need it, you can't provide me. You should manage your own.

Second respondent: Without stick they don't study. I am asking the same questions to them for many days. Whatever questions I asked them yesterday, I asked the same questions today. But still they didn't answer. Those students who did not answer properly are getting beaten by stick.

All respondents were very positive to talk down to students or lecturing them about their inadequacies. They were more direct in criticism, pointing that student's weak point. Offering positive reinforcement, being consistent, smiling and listening to their concerns was greatly ignored. This culture, it was seen, nurtures the practice of dominating the children and continued, like any other ritual, from generation to generation.

We asked the question to a respondent standing in front of the students.

Interviewer: How are the students of this class?

Respondent: If I correct their answer sheet no one will pass in examination; the students of this class are very weak in study.

Some of the respondent belief that when teacher act as a friends with the students, students start to misbehave with them

There was a pressure on the teacher to give the best result or to make pass to all the students (even students is not at that level). A faith on punishment for best results led teachers to use punishment. Some of the teachers indicated their upcoming role:

"Trouble maker" (weak student) ... again come to school and "our principal enrolled trouble making students then how can we make him pass in S.L.C. examination".... From today we will start to be very hard to him that's why he will study at home as well as in class.

Tiredness of the teachers was affecting their mobility. We found that high rate of given punishment in the weak when teachers came to school for 14 days regularly including the Saturday and Sunday. Due to that all teachers seem tired and it was reflected in classroom teaching also. Students were also seems restless. And the teachers were found reacting aggressively with the students in a class even for minor case.

Contrary to the above case we got another experience, on that day we could not see low rate of punishment to the children. We had seen the children and teacher all were happy and fresh. The two cases above made us understood that time factor of school was also the causes of several violence in the school.

Teachers had their own understanding on corporal punishment and discipline which is differ from the international understanding. Corporal punishment is "Any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light" (UN committee on the Rights of Childs,

2001) but teachers were found considering hard punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause large degree of pain or injuries only (Khanal, Jeevan 2015). In the words of school discipline in charge (DI)

We are not giving the corporal punishment to them, just keeping them outside.... Sometimes teachers can make them to stand on the bench of the class. This is not corporal punishment. We are not beating them with hand, duster, stick and belt.

Others teachers who were around the DI added:

These types' of minor punishments... are needed for them to make them study and make them to obey us. Our society is not developed as western society. These are ...minor punishment and are not corporal punishment.

School discipline is the system of rules, punishments and behavioral strategies appropriate to the regulation of children and the maintenance of order in schools. It aims are to create a safe and conducive learning environment in the classrooms (Dr. Sears, 2011). School discipline has two main goals: 1) to ensure the safety of staff and students, and 2) create an environment conducive to learning. Principal showed concern about her own perception for disciplined that discipline involves a high level of control in the class.

We heard the announcement of school principal several times as:

If you do not want to follow our rules and regulations, you may leave the school, I do not want to make my school fish market... Our school is famous for discipline and.... To maintain the discipline, you must follow these rules. I requested all the teachers to send those children outside the office that you found not following our rules and regulations (Announcement from loudspeaker).

The principal by the virtue of her/his position in the school has a great deal of influence over the attitudes and behaviors of the faculty, staff, and students. As a role model, the principal's responsibility is, through his/ her behaviors to lead by example (Pepper, K. 2010). The school principal was found announcing frequently ones a day that:

I request all the teachers to send to the playground to those children who have long hair and misbehaving with teachers.

5.2 Students' Response on Corporal Punishment

Considering the purpose of study, it was important to obtain the students' responses concerning why they are punished and how they felt about it.

It is possible that the school principal is regarded by the students as central part of the educational system and in a sense she/he is expected to be, in advance, prejudiced in favour of the teacher. On the other hand, adolescent probably try to protect their independence and autonomy by defining their own boundaries against adult power which seems to be represented and use by school principal, teachers, and their parents, as former research has confirmed (Laupa & Tse, 2005; Murray & Thompson, 1985; Smentana & Bitz,1996).

Their common expression was:

Interviewer: Do teachers in this school cane students during teaching and learning periods?

Respondents: It is a normal feature of our school.

Interviewer: So what do you think of teachers?

Respondents: we do not like the teachers who beat us, who scolded us. We do not like the teachers who punished us for minor reasons.

Interviewer: Did you ever report to the principal.

Respondents: No, we cannot say it to the principal because she always says that teachers are always right.

They have accepted the punishment system as taken for granted. This means students have been habituated of such traditional practice (UNICEF ROSA, 2000).

A student who was low achiever found frequently beaten by many teachers in the class. In the words of student:

There was no one who did not beat me.

Students did not react to a teacher's unfair use of power because a teacher is a position of traditional authority which is widely regarded as legitimate within Nepalese culture. Student who was standing outside the class room was asked:

Interviewer: Why are you standing outside?

Respondent: My friend was laughing in the class and the teacher thought that it was me". If I said it was not me, he did not believe me. So I have to obey him to prevent me from his slap. He said go out. I came out to save me from his slap.

We found that when high achiever students felt shier they stand outside as a punishment and low achiever students enjoy punishment when teachers were not there around them. We were unable to find any serious effect on them. They were enjoying outside. When teachers came near to them, immediately they started to be serious.

5.3 Parents' Response to the Corporal Punishment

Considering the purpose of study, it was important to know to what extent do parents' perceived the use of

corporal punishment as a child molding process in private school of Nepal.

Parents were found giving a type of permission to punish their children. Next day of report card distribution day when we asked to the children, who failed in the examination about their parent's reaction at home, majority of them said "their parents scold them and some of the parents of children were not talking with them.

Parents could not tolerate the hard punishment like bad slap, kicking to their children or other severe case. A teacher teaching in class nine had given hard slap and punch to one of the children. Next day his parents came to the account office of the school which was beside the main gate of the school and he requested the authorized person to call the teacher. As soon as Teacher came to him parent gave one slap on teacher face, and the teacher felt pain and said *aiya* (A sound when a person felt severe pain) and we stopped him from another slap.

Another message given by case three was that parents were supporting the punishment. They also believed that punishment can make their children learn at home. Interviews with the parents in progress report (results) card distribution day:

Respondents: I know my son is lazy. Teachers please beat him if he doesn't study well.

Interviewer: Can we correct him by beating?

Respondent: Not that type of beating which he got in class two of this school.

Interviewer: What type of beating did he experience in grade two?

Respondent: That time his leg was swollen and he became ill.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

The central idea behind social learning theory is that only model and observation learning are worthy. The findings of this study indicated that the teachers' parents and students negated the concept of social learning theory that only external reinforces play a role in action and individual performs because they were found believing that internal aspects such as attitudes, beliefs and thoughts also determined their action. The rate of punishment was high against lower achiever and rare for high achiever also proved it.

The findings also revealed that teachers, school administrators, parents and students accepted the concept of power theories that in school teachers have the power (human ability) to influence and change the environments individuals have constructed through their discursive practice. Teachers may deny the power of students through resistance (Selfe, 1996: p.275). But found negated the concept that if students do not have opportunity to meet their need for power in these healthy, productive, and responsible ways, they will most likely chose power over. It may make the students to show the behaviors like bullying the junior students, cheating, disturbing a classroom, or engaging in vandalism or violence.

Choice theory (William Glasser, 2000) offered seven caring habits supporting, encouraging listening, accepting, trusting, respecting and negotiating differences to replace external control. As well as it also offered seven deadly habits as criticizing, blaming, complaining, nagging threatening, punishing and bribing or rewarding to control. Findings showed that almost all teachers and most of parents were found unknowingly taking these deadly habits as caring habits.

The findings of this study indicated that the motives behind the use of corporal punishment in the schools were to motivate students to learn at school and home, make the students to respect the teachers, maintain the silence in school and intend to control the mass. The understanding difference on corporal punishment and discipline, faith on best results, and non-participatory teaching learning process, tiredness of teachers also contributes the violence teaching. Students prefer not to react to a teacher's principal's and DI's excessive or unfair use of power due to fear of possible consequences. Aggressively when a teacher's principal's and DI's power is regarded as excessively or positively when relations of trust and acceptance have been established between the teacher and the student (Koutrouba, K., Baxevanou, E., & Koutroumpas, A. 2012). Conversely, the finding supported that only severe cases of corporal punishment creates a grudge against teachers and the school, and causes parents to challenge teachers. This ideology symbolizes the relationship between traditional pedagogy of *Gurukul*. Although the *Gurukul* pedagogy was oppressive and was dominated by power relation. Almost all teachers accepted without hesitation that they punish children physically, and argued that children cannot be disciplined without punishment. They also hold the belief that unpunished children will develop unruly and uncontrollable behavior (Ibid). Teachers of private school of Nepal preferred to exert the legitimated power in class. Teachers mainly exert didactic power and legitimate power in class room. They use didactic power by exhibiting profound knowledge and applying teaching and assessment methods, while they use legitimate power through implementing rules, inflicting punishment and controlling students' behavior (Koutrouba, K., Baxevanou, E., & Koutroumpas, A. 2012).

6. Recommendations

The existence of such cruel practice towards children in 21st century is attributed to the insufficient and weak national policy, exam oriented and traditional teaching learning process and hierarchical social structure. It has

been recommended that policies must be enforced by applying sanctions on practitioners. Government organization, national and international organization for child rights and human rights watch should be more involved in reforming the teachers and school activities; and that teachers' need training on alternative disciplinary techniques. The punishment system in Nepal is very sensitive but social concern about it is very limited. It has been suggested that government organization like MOE and media could help in raising people awareness of the necessity to remove corporal punishment from all type of school as well as home, specifying legal action against it and negative effect of corporal punishment on children. An integrated effort from all sectors of the society, institution and concerned authority as well as country such as MOE must provide a conducive environment where the children can develop themselves at their best. There is urgent need of national level training institute for school principal and teachers on alternative strategies to promote non-violence teaching. However, further study is required to more adequately understand the situation and reasons for corporal punishment in private as well as public schools of Nepal. For instance, what are the perceptions of stakeholders on corporal punishment in Nepalese school? What are reasons that school principal, teachers and parents are using corporal punishment? These are presently only some of the many research questions waiting to be addressed in the upcoming days.

References

- Association for the Protection of Children Nepal. Retrieved from http://apc-nepal.org/enews/APC-Nepal_enews_2011
- Bandura, A. (1963). *Social learning and personality development*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Bhattarai A. & Yadav P., (2012). We can..... without corporal punishment. Nelta Chautari Nepal. Retrieved from <https://neltachoutari.wordpress.com/2012/07/01/we-can-without-corporal-punishment>
- Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S.K. (1982). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Central Bureau of Statistics (2012), *Nepal Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2010, Mid-and FarWestern Regions, Final Report*. Kathmandu: Central Bureau of Statistics & UNICEF Nepal.
- Centre for Victims of Torture (2004). Existing Systems of Discipline in Schools.
- CVICT/UNICEF. (2004). Violence against children in Nepal. A Study of the System of School Discipline in Nepal. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/nepal/Voience_Against_Children_series_2.pdf. Published 2004. Accessed February 4, 2010.
- Save the Children and UNISEF. Educate, don't punish. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/lac/spbarbados/Implementation/CP/Global/Educate_donthit_SaveManual.pdf
- Social Research Center (2006). Towards Policies for child protection: A field study to assess child abuse in deprived communities in Cairo and Alexandria.
- French, J.R., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander. *Group Dynamics*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Glasser, W. (2000). Choice theory Retrieved from <http://wglasser.com/the-glasser-approach/choice-theory>
- Koutrouba, K., Baxevanou, E., & Koutroumpas, A. (2012). High school students' perceptions of and attitudes towards teacher. *International Education Studies*, 5(5), 185-198. doi:10.5539/ies.v5n5p185
- Jehle, C. (2004): "Treatment of Corporal Punishment Acceptability in Public Schools" Khanal, J. (2015). Corporal punishment in Nepalese private schools: Perception of teachers. *Journal of American Academic Research*, 3(7) San-Francisco, CA, USA.
- Laupa, M., & Tse, P. (2005). Authority concepts among children and adolescents in the island of Macao. *Social Development*, 14 (4,) 652-663. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2005.00322.x\
- Michaell, D. & Murray, A. (2005). *Corporal punishment of children in theoretical perspective*. London: Yale University Press New Haven.
- Mishra, N., Thakur, K. Koirala, R., Shrestha, D., & Poudel, R. (2010). *Corporal punishment in Nepalese school children: Facts, legalities and implications*. Nepal: Patan Hospital.
- Murray, C., & Thompson, F. (1985). The representation of authority: an adolescent view point. *Journal of Adolescence*, 8(3), 217-229. Doi:10.1016/s0140-1971(85)80054-3
- NASW. <http://www.socialworkers.org/resources/abstracts/abstracts/physical.asp>
- Pepper, K. (2010). Effective principal skillfully balance leadership styles to facilitate students success: A focus for the reauthorization of ESEA. *Planning and Changing*, 41,42-56.
- Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.
- Pinheiro, P., (2007). *Children are sick of being called 'the future. They want to enjoy their childhoods, free of violence, now*. UN General Assembly.
- Politic.co.uk. Retrieved from <http://www.politics.co.uk/reference/corporal-punishment>
- Racovita, M., Murray, R. Sharma, S. (2013). *In search of lasting security: An assessment of armed violence in Nepal*. Geneva: Small Arms Survey Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies.

- Raj, L. (2011). Understanding corporal punishment in India. *Career Educator: An Interdisciplinary Education Journal*, 1(1), 3-18.
- Robinson, D. H., Funk, D. C., Beth, A. M. (2005). *Changing beliefs about corporal punishment: Increasing knowledge about informational beliefs*. *Informational beliefs. Journal of Behavioral Education*, (2005) 14, 117-139
- Rodriguez, C. (2003). Parental Discipline and Abuse Potential Affects on Child Depression, Anxiety, and Attributions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 65(4), 809-817. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3599892>.
- Save the Children. "Educate, don't punish"? Straus, M. A. (2001). *Beating the devil out of them: Corporal punishment in American families and its effects on children* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- UNICEF. (2012). Violence against Children in south Asia. Retrieved from http://www.unicef.org/rosa/protection_7735.htm
- UNICEF. (2009). *Nepal country report*. Kathmandu: Author. Encyclopedia. Retrieved from <http://www.Encyclopedia.com>
- Valls, F. R. and Ponce, G.A. (2013). Classroom, the we space: Developing student-centered practices for second language learner. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21(55). www.Wavemag.com.np, 2006
- Wasef, N. H. (2011). *Corporal punishment in schools* (Master thesis). The American University in Cairo.

About the Authors

Jeevan Khanal is pursuing Doctoral degree in education from Chonbuk National University from 2014. He spent 15 plus years as a mathematics teacher in private school of Nepal. He is an author of the Mathematics text book series "Master Maths" for grade one to ten which is approved by Curriculum development center of Nepal in 2010. He has completed Master in educational planning and Management (2009) as well Master of Philosophy in Leadership study from Tribhuban University Nepa (2013). He has been active in research on educational administration, educational leadership, teacher education, classroom teaching and non-violent teaching strategies. His publication includes research articles such as Corporal Punishment in Nepalese Private Schools: Perception of Teachers, Eastern Way of Finding Truth, and Impact of School Principal Leadership in the *Journal of American Academic Research*.

Sae Hoon Park, Ph.D., is a Professor in the Department of Education at Chonbuk National University, South Korea. He has held a number of administrative and faculty positions, including Vice-president for academic affairs at Chonbuk National University, President of Korean Educational Administration Society and many more. He has been active in research on educational administration, educational leadership, teacher education and development of professional expertise in the field of school and universities teaching. His publications include articles and books in Korean as well as English language. He holds Ph.D. in education policy and administration from University of Minnesota, USA.