Gender Based Discrimination in Punishments at Schools: A Study of Selected Schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

Jamil Ahmad Chitrali,
Noor Sanauddin, & Syed Owais

Abstract

This study explores the attitudes of students towards gender based discrimination in punishment at schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.A case study of selected districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa was carried out in districts Peshawar and Mardan with the purpose of eliciting the students' perception on violence/punishment. The study intends to find reasons of school violence through its perpetrators, in light of its manifestations on the basis of gender, ethnicity and class, by looking into the methodologies owned by the schools and suggesting policy recommendations. A sample size of 522 respondents was randomly selected on proportional allocation basis from Grade 10 students. Frequency and percentage distribution along with Chi-square test was carried out at uni-variate and bi-variate levels. Through this study five major issues are addressed to clear the image of students' perception of gender based violence/discriminations in punishments at school. These five indicators determining the variable includes students' economic status, sexual orientation, physical appearance, body or beauty or age, nature of school, and personal relationship with authorities or access to power. Results of the study are provided along with conclusions at the end.

Keywords: Gender based violence, economic status, sexual orientation, physical appearance, nature of school, access to power

1. Introduction

School, being the major agent of socialization in children, has lifelong effects on their behavior. However, literature as well as evidence supports that unlike parents, the personal assigned the duty of training treat students differently based on personal likesanddislikesand other biases. Resultantly, this may leave deeper impact on the personality development of the children. In this study,punishment is discussed as how gender based discrimination is practiced at schools in execution of punishment at various level. Financial position of students is one of the central factors affecting

not only access to resources at school but also adolescent's propensity to violence or his/her response in case of being victim of violence. Sexual orientation, physical appearance, body contours, beauty or age of students also expose and project them as receiver and/or perpetrators of violence at schools. The frequency and intensity of various forms of violence usually vary between public sector schools and private sector of schools. From the perspective of students, it is important to analyses as to how they view their school as spaces producing and consuming violence through punishments through structures in terms of school-size, number of students, number of teachers, overall response/feedback on study-material and assignments etc.

We tend to assume schools as neutral spaces, devoid of influences from larger social structure. But there exist clear-cut power-relations and power struggles (Dunne, Humphreys & Leach, and 2006:78). The formal and informal rules of conduct (norms) are influenced by and based on gender, ethnic, linguistic, disability, and socio-economic distinctions. These institutional rules give birth to institutional traditions which might not coincide with official and legislative code of conduct in schools but it does lead to the emergence of 'gender regime' (Kessler & McKenna, 1985). Understanding these institutional relations and traditions are central to understanding of children's experiences in schools and improving school environment.

2. Literature Review

Whether taken as an institution in itself or taken as part of the institution of education, a school's environment is characterized by transactions and interaction of students and teachers. It is has been usually believed that students who are in 'good books' of teachers get relaxation both at the time of rewards and punishment. Since teachers have the main say in what goes on in the class-room, students with different access to teachers are likely to perceive class-room and general school environment in different terms. Schools in any society will reflect the outside culture in terms of violence or security, and they are also likely to have reinforcing effects on the outsideculture (Davies, 2004, ;Harber, 2004). However, some schools may be atypical, being less or more violent than would be assumed from looking at rates of violence or criminality in wider society (Astor, Benbenishty, & Estrada, 2009).

If we ask as to how gender influences orientation towards and perpetuation of violence in various social contexts, Parker & Gagnon (1995) suggest that

researcher(s) should focus on the distribution of power between males and females in specific contexts, i.e., research should aim at understanding how power relations develop and get sustained in specific social and cultural settings (Vance, 1984). Cultural norms and values give birth to specific forms or regimes of gender inequality which could pave way for the establishment and perpetuation of gender based violence (Parker, Barbosa, & Aggleton, 2000). School environment usually give legitimacy to teachers' authority: whether it is regulation or control of students' behavior, teachers determine 'appropriate' behavior for students as gender-differentiated beings.

This is done through a system of reward, punishment, sanctions, time-distribution in class and attention span in class. The gender regime gets established and signified in two ways: firstly, by ignoring certain behavior traits and by punishing other acts. For instance, teacher may establish his/her authority by insisting on certain forms of address ('Sir' or 'Madam') from students for themselves but value no respect for the students in similar cases and, if boys while fight among themselves or intimidate the girls, and the complaint arrives, itusually get dismissed by the teachersdeclaring it as merely 'teasing' or as 'boys will be boys'. Through such forms of interaction, teachers help in normalizing certain behavior traits of students, but at largesymbolically contributing towards gender differentiation and a hierarchy in which males dominate (Jackson & Newman, 2004).

The feminine and masculine identities also get entrenched through the hidden curricula and students' informal learning. For example, girls in many Asian schools are required to do cleaning while boys are required to do digging. Activities such as these are indicators of gender identities and practices within schools. These also reify sex-based relationships between men and women beyond schools. Hence, if gender based violence are learned and practices in schools, it would definitely be practiced in larger society. Physical masculinity is expressed through forms of violence which does two things: firstly, self-regulation is ensured when a boy abides by the modality of masculinity and secondly, it is also strategy to exhibit one's power. This exhibition of power occurs both formally and informally, e.g., separate queues for boys and girls and/or appointment of males as class representatives. Usually one of the organizing principles of school is compulsory heterosexuality. Through it the mapping of polarized positions occurs. This also helps in configuring gender and sexuality, e.g., by criticizing, ridiculing, and ostracizing homosexual relations (Epstein & Johnson, 1998). For compulsory heterosexuality coupled with age/authority

relationship between teachers and students strengthen and interact with gender/sexual regime.

Besides teacher-student interaction, peer-pressure is also a means for gender/sexual regulation in schools, especially with respect to constructing and perpetuating masculinity in schools (Skelton & Francis, 2005). Bypassing one's gender role could be corrected with punishment, i.e., ridicule, ostracism, intimidation, verbal abuse etc. (Kehily & Swann, 2003; Renold, 2002) For instance, across many cultures a girl who is outgoing, assertive and confident is usually referred to as promiscuous, which according to Bhana (2005) is a violent expression of masculinity. Similarly, if a girl rejects sexual advances, especially from teachers, she is harassed and humiliated. Sometimes, for girls, the only alternative to avoid physical punishment is to concede to sexual intercourse (Human Rights Watch, 2001). Some scholars use the terms hegemonic masculinity and emphasized femininity to describe the way media does gender (Connell, 1987) "Hegemonic masculinity today is a matter of the subordination of women, authority, aggression, and technical competence. Emphasized femininity is subordinate to and defined by hegemonic masculinity. [It is] organized around themes of dependence, sexual receptivity, and motherhood" (Cavender, Bond-Maupin, & Jurik, 1999). Similarly, masculinity is often characterized as "tough, professional, public, outdoor, and strong, whereas femininity is sensitive, domestic, private, indoor, and weak" (Cuklanz, 2000). Messner (1992) as cited by Finely (2007) explained how boys learn to define their gender identity: *"Indeed, boys learn early that if it is difficult to define masculinity in terms of what it is, it is at least clear what it is not. A boy is not considered a masculine if he is feminine"*(Finley, 2007: 35-36).

Martin (2001: 5) also found that teacher considered boys' sexual harassment of a 'slut' as normal. Moreover, if an incident of sexual harassment is reported, teachers first try to find out as what 'type' of girl has been harassed. Martin (2001) also confirmed the belief that teachers are themselves perpetrators of sexual harassment. In relation to the above, it should also be noted that teachers' differential use of disciplining strategies such as corporal punishment contributes towards reinforcement of gender identities (Antonowicz, 2010) and gender relations between boys and girls (Bisika, Ntata, & Konyani, 2009). Teachers usually justify using corporal punishment with respect to boys under the rationale that it would make them tough (Morrell, 2002). In such an environment it is least unlikely that boys and girls get socialized about their sex-based roles according to the

dictates of larger social structure. In addition to these demographic density and size of school as well as size of classrooms contribute towards violence. Schools often operate as factories where students are treated as products (Harber, 2002: 12). Resultantly, big-sized schools could lead to alienation from school and disconnection from education and drop-outs are high in big-sized schools (developed countries) (Meyer, 2010a, 2010b). It also introduces inadequacy in teachers' and managers' supervision of school environment (Plan, 2008: 39).

In another report titled State of Pakistan's Children (SPARC, 2004) violence by teachers is projected as the major reason for early dropouts. It claimsthat 40% of school going children leaves schools in the first five years of education because of corporal punishment (SPARC, 2004:149). Parental punishment is however not documented in this regard.A newsflash quoted in the same report says "a man killed son for failing in Secondary School Exams" (Daily DAWN, June 14, 2004 cited in SPARC, 2004). Mosque/madrassa and schools are the two places after automobile workshops most documented for violence against youth in Pakistan (SPARC, 2004:152). A more recent research(SPARC, 2009)shows that 89% of children had received some form of corporal punishment in school, rising to a figure of 93% in government schools. This was mainly baton beating or standing with arms raised above the head.

The Government of Pakistan issued a White Paper in 2007 on 'Education Status and Future Policy in Pakistan'. In response to that, various organizations initiated a debate on the new policy. In one such discussion Dr. Pervez A. Hoodbhoy, a well-known Pakistani educationist, is quoted as saying that 'this document was in stark contrast to the earlier education policies, which saw education as a tool for forcibly remaking children's minds…An official document, issued 11 years ago by the same ministry, had required that school be taught to 'make speeches on '*jihad*' (the holy war) and '*shahadat*' (martyrdom); be aware of "India's evil designs against Pakistan"; that they must "demonstrate by actions a belief in the fear of Allah"; go on field trips to "visit Police Stations"; and must "collect pictures of policemen, soldiers and National Guards" (SPARC, 2007: 53). Schools can themselves promote violence through curriculum as well as relationships. There has been an association of madrassa education with violent extremism. An American Policy Report on Education in Pakistan(Yusuf, 2009) claims that dysfunctional public education system has been abandoned by the elite and it serves now only students from the lower socio-economic class.

The argument of associating violent extremism with madrassa education of Pakistan is largely rejected in current research discourse (Looney, 2004;Ladbury & Khan, 2008; Yusuf, 2009) as it contribute not more than 1% of the total student enrollment in the education system of Pakistan and the public and private sector school students have shown comparatively high level of support for violence in comparative researches (Khan, 2008).

In this scenario the existing study is very much important for Pakistan. As found by Plan International (Pereznieto et al., 2009), Pakistan is one of those few southern countries which has no specific laws to protect school-aged children from all forms of violence. This may represent different dimensions of school violence, for example, with the use of corporal punishment in school, with different histories of violence and conflicts among peers in school settings, and different sorts of inequalities which might trigger out frustration and violence due to various expected variable to be recorded. There is no study to date carried out in terms of analyzing the institutional structure of schools where violence is produced/experienced and the variation it may have based on nature of school i.e., the separate government schools for girls and boys, and the mostly co-education private schools. The United Nation Development Program (UNDP) through 'Peace and Development Program' intended to have outputs that were aimed towards improving community infrastructure and reducing vulnerability of youth towards extremism. According to the report for the first quarter of the year 2011, the program has helped rehabilitation of schools in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Province. However, both locally and globally very few studies exist that have documented various forms of violence in schools(Pereznieto et al., 2009).

The above review comprehensively spills over the importance upon the issue at hand with its application to different societies across the globe on the basis of situational perspectives. Pakistan is a developing country where a number of policies are not only framed but also implemented by the government in educational sectors with focus on many dimensions including punishment. Despite all these efforts, the literacy rate is still very low which has led to the consistent existence of ignorance. Keeping into these grim realities a number of NGOs havelanded into the arena for the purpose of addressing the issue. The main reason associated to this effect is the enhancement in literacy rate and containment of violence existing in all shapes and manifestations (SAHIL, 2008). To investigate the above mentioned situation, this study is specifically designed to investigate

gender discrimination in punishments at schools in two districts of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan.

3. Research objective

The main research objective of this study is to assess the extent and nature of gender based discrimination in punishment at schools in selected schools of Mardan and Peshawar districts, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

4. Methodology

This study investigated the gender based discrimination in punishment at school in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Using a survey design, a sample size of 522 respondents (54.6% boys and 45.4% girls) was randomly selected on proportional allocation basis from Grade 10 students in both public and private schools of the selected districts taking the schools having maximum number of students appeared in Grade 9 exams in a single year (2012). Frequency and percentage distribution was carried out at univariate and bi-variate levels. Moreover, chi-square test was used to determine the level of association between variables (both independent and dependent).

5. Data Analysis

The data collected was scrutinized, edited and labeled with codes to make it ready for classification and analysis. A soft data entry sheet was developed with the help of SPSS in a format given in its 16.0 version. The data entry was made throughthreedata entry operators.The entered data was examined through 10% verification by the researcher locating the missing punches or repeat entry or any other human error. Once the data set was ready on all standards, it was put for analysis using statistical parameters namely, associational procedures (univariate and bivariate).

5.1 Univariate and Bivariate analysis

For all demographic information and analysis of gender based distribution of respondents for their socio-economic standing, univariate analyses were carried out. For this section frequency distribution, percentages of the respondents and chi-square were used to monitor association pattern of these demographic indicators with gender of the respondents.Test of Association (bivariate analyses) were carried out to study the association amongst dependent and independent variables. This type of analyses has

shown the trend of the responses favoring or opposing one or other aspect of the variables under enquiry.

It is assumed that, the themes for each group are randomly and independently selected, the groups are independent, and each observation must qualify for one and only one category(Sprinthall & Fisk, 1990). In addition, the sample size must objectively be large such that no predictable frequency is less than 5, for r and c >2, or <10 if r=c=2. However, this supposition was dishonored several times in the data and therefore, Fisher Exact Test (also known as exact chi-square test) was used as an alternative of simple chi- square.

Age group distribution of respondents is given in Table 1. Majority of 53.45% respondents were of 16 years followed by 36.6% students having aged 15 or below at the time of data collection. A reasonable number of students 9.96% were aged 17 and above, among which most (6.13%) were male students.

Distribution of respondents in Public/Private Schools is given in Table 2. The data representation in this study shows that majority of 51.72% respondents werefrom private schools with remaining 48.27 from Public Sector Schools. Further,out of the total 522 respondentspicked up as part of the sample, majority were male representing 145students (27.78%) and 140 students (26.82%) in Private and Public Schools respectively.

6. Analysis of Findings

The analysis are based on variance in punishment based on four variable namely poverty/economic orientation; nature of School; Sexual Orientation; Physical appearance; and Personal Relationship with Authority (Teacher). Each category is discussed through statistical analysis in the light of related existing literature.

6.1 Poverty/Economic Orientation of Students as bias in punishment and gender based violence at Schools

The results given in table 3 at the end of this paper show a high level of association between poverty and exposure to punishment. The gender based violence is divided into four major categories and each reflect a relation for level of poverty with variance in exposure to gender based violence in punishment received as schools with Physical violence (p=0.036); psychological violence (p=0.036); and sexual violence (p=0.036).

However, the relation could not beenestablished for the variable with economic violence (p=0.636).

This information shows the punishments effectsmore when it is clubbed with other vulnerabilities like gender and poverty. In another research (Akiba et al, 2002) the level of victimization is primarily reported to be based on ignorance with regard to gender. If magnified this could lead to the marginalization and social alienation of students especially among poor and girl students. These findings are in contrast to the functionalists' perspective where punishment has been considered positive for the growth and stability of the society (Graham and Gurr, 1969; and Dubet, 2003).

6.2   Nature of School as bias in punishment and gender based violence at Schools

The association results due to status of school with three out of all the four types of violence under study, i.e., physical, psychological, sexual and economic violence were significant as projected for details in Table 4 given. The statistical values for Physical Violence (p=0.036), socio-psychological (p=0.036) and sexual violence (p=0.036) were significant while economic violence (p=0.635) resulted into non-significant in relation to nature of school. The results are based on the assumption that school status does contribute to inflicting punishment in addition tothe mechanism prevalent in the system of the schooling. Moreover, structural basis of school with either mode (private or public) has an important effect to displaying any mode of punishment, due to coverage of both public and private schools with all its diversities the results clearly depicts the variation and level of significant relation in results also. It could also be adjudged that variation in violence in schools could be differentiated into various categories if further probing is done in this regard in future studies. This may help us establish reasons to ascertain the non-significant relation of economic violence.Plan International (2009) has reported various forms of violence at few occasions in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Punishment at school is a permanent part of a person's behavior and could continue for a longer period of time (Barker et al., 2011). The main belief of punishment at school is the continuation of socialization amongst children through powerful means of value transmission and reformation in attitude (Omaji, 1992; Jones, 1975; and Griffin, 1978).

6.3 Sexual Orientation as bias in punishment and gender based violence at Schools (Table 5)

The result shows that sexual orientation has no association with punishment given at school as for as physical violence (p=0.876), psychological violence (p=0.132) and sexual violence (p=0.051) are concerned, but has a strong association with economic violence (p=0.031). Sanderson (2003) has also spoken about a cultural milieu even in punishing the guilty students at school premises for behavioral reformation. Not different was the perception towards excessive punishment of healthy and stout children than unhealthy children. Morrison and Orlando (2004) were very close to the present findings while concluding it by relating violence to physical terms. However table 8shows that students believe that punishment at school has nothing to do with gender, physical structure or sexual orientation but according to them, it is given purely based on home work or disciplinary issues.

6.4 Personal Relationship with Authority (Teacher) as Bias in Punishment and Gender Based Violence at Schools (Table 6)

In response to question of discrimination, differential treatment by teachers of students based on being nearer and dearer to them were reported being punished less than other students for same misconduct. The association of this phenomenon with various forms of violence at school shows that the relation of the variable with gender based violence is extremely close as it shows physical violence (p=0.022), psychological violence (p=0.025), sexual violence (p=0.018) and economic violence (p=0.035). Equality in terms of provision of punishment was disclosed not to be around, as indicated by Holmes (1989) that the concept of good and bad is obligatory in the phenomena of inflicting punishment. The existence of favoritism in treatment ofstudents who were relatives to teachers as not been punished, could further influence annoyance among others students resulting in creation of violence at and around schools as shown in all four types of violence beingsignificant in this case. It was confirmation to the earlier results wherein punishments were recorded as biased on part of the teachers. Sometime, if division of pupils is detected, it could be unconscious in nature (Cavanagh, 2008).

6.5   Physical Appearance of Student as a Source of Bias in Punishment and Gender Based Violence at Schools (Table 7)

Respondents were asked in this set of questions regarding their opinion if students' physical appearance in terms of beauty, body or tenderness in age has any relation with or influence on the magnitude of punishment they receive at schools. The correlation of the set of responses received with manifestation of the four types of violence under discussion disclosed that a highly significant relation has been established with sexual violence (p=0.000), while for physical violence (p=0.124), psychological (p=0.144) and economic violence (p=0.660), the association is not significant. These findings are in confirmation to Kenway and Fitzclearence, (1997) that masculinity and poor physique were some of the differentials highly related with application to violence. It could be due to the mix environment as per demand of situation in variation to its relative applications at school level. However, in general the cultural conformity to ideal norms of maintaining balance and equilibrium were found to be the profound basis for school dynamics.

7.   Conclusion

The study was designed with a conceptual framework of independent variable namely discriminations in punishment at school with dependent variable of school related gender based dynamics of exposure toviolence. The study disclosed a link of schools based disciplinary punishments, both formal and informal. The concept of punishment and socialization at school having lifelong effects is the most contested issue in violence discourse. Besides learning, the child receives his social role and status here. In order to prepare a future generation to take over the society forward,a child is trainedwithdefined and pre-determined "do's and don'ts"according to the society or prevalent culture. This been remained for centuries the primary task of family institution but in recent past (1860s with introduction of formal schooling) is taken over by Schools. This transition is recent and needs close coordination of both education and families as institutions of social and cultural stability to get the most fruitful output for the society. The social control mechanisms inside school in the forms of sanctions may help to mold and predict child's behavior but at the same time, if family does not remain in loop, may result in the physical, social or psychological suffering of the child. School if single out to deal with students may risk of harm student's personality for the rest of his or her life. The experience of and exposure to punishment differently of students based on their economic

profile create hate and may result into production of a class of criminals at later stage of life instead of conformist citizens. Schools as agency of socialization, based on its public and private status is uneven in delivering its role to various social strata's of society. the poor segment of society have low access of education and are deprived from quality teachings of private schools, they rather are obliged to study in government schools with negligible facilities and intercepted education. Moreover, the environment of violence is at rise in government schools, comparably to private schools.This is in submission to cultural superiority which embodies respect and dignity to either gender even in punishment considerations.

Annexure

Data sources

Table 1: Frequency and percentage distribution of respondents on Age			
Gender	**Age of Respondents**		
	15 and below	16 years	17 and above
Male	99(18.97 %)	154(29.5 %)	32(6.13%)
Female	92(17.6%)	125(23.95%)	20(3.83%)
Total	191(36.6%)	279(53.45%)	52(9.96%)

Chi-Square 1.640 (0.440); Source: Field Data

Table 2: Gender Based Distribution of Respondents in Public/Private Schools			
Gender	**Status of School (Government/Private)**		
	Private	Public	Total
Male	145(27.78%)	140(26.82%)	285(54.6%)
Female	125(23.95%)	112(21.45%)	237(45.4%)
Total	270(51.72%)	252(48.27%)	522(100%)

Chi-Square 0.0180 (0.725), Source: Field Data

Table 3: Punishment Based on Poverty/Economic Orientation

Violence Type	Exposure	Sexual Orientation Influence nature and Magnitude of Violence?			Statistical Test
		Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	
Physical	Never	97 (18.58%)	131 (25.1%)	28 (5.36%)	Chi-Square 6.649 (0.036)
	Exposed	130 (24.9%)	115 (22.03%)	21 (4.02%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	
Psychological	Never	76 (14.56%)	93 (17.82%)	26 (4.98%)	Chi-Square 6.643 (0.036)
	Exposed	151 (28.93%)	153 (29.31%)	23 (4.41%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	
Sexual	Never	164 (31.42%)	38 (7.28%)	337 (64.56%)	Chi-Square 6.660 (0.036)
	Exposed	82 (15.71%)	11 (2.11%)	185 (35.44%)	
	Total	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	522 (100%)	
Economic	Never	74 (14.18%)	90 (17.24%)	18 (3.45%)	Chi-Square 0.909 (0.636)
	Exposed	153 (29.31%)	156 (29.89%)	31 (5.94%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	

Source: Field Data collected for PhD research titled Gender Based Violence in Pakistani Schools.

Table 4. Variance in Punishment based on Nature of School

Violence Type	Exposure	Government School Punish more Physically and Private Schools more through fine			Statistical Test
		Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	
Physical	Never	97 (18.58%)	131 (25.09%)	28 (5.36%)	Chi-Square 6.649 (0.036)
	Exposed	130 (24.90%)	115 (22.03%)	21 (4.02%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	
Psychological	Never	76 (14.56%)	93 (17.82%)	26 (4.98%)	Chi-Square 6.643 (0.036)

	Exposed	151 (28.93%)	153 (29.31%)	23 (4.41%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	
Sexual	Never	135 (25.86%)	164 (31.42%)	38 (7.28%)	Chi-Square 6.660 (0.036)
	Exposed	92 (17.62%)	82 (15.71%)	11 (2.11%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	
Economic	Never	74 (14.18%)	90 (17.24%)	18 (3.45%)	Chi-Square 0.909 (0.635)
	Exposed	153 (29.31%)	156 (29.89%)	31 (5.939%)	
	Total	227 (43.49%)	246 (47.13%)	49 (9.39%)	

Source: Field Data collected for PhD research titled Gender Based Violence in Pakistani Schools.

Table 5.Variance in Punishment Based on Sexual Orientation				
Violence Type	Exposure	Sexual Orientation Influence nature and Magnitude of Punishment			Statistical Test
		Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	
Physical	Never	232 (44.44%)	17 (3.26%)	7 (1.34%)	Chi-Square 0.264 (0.876)
	Exposed	240 (45.98%)	20 (3.83%)	6 (1.15%)	
	Total	472 (90.42%)	37 (7.09%)	13 (2.49%)	
Psychological	Never	171 (32.76%)	16 (3.06%)	8 (1.53%)	Chi-Square 4.053 (0.132)
	Exposed	301 (57.66%)	21 (4.02%)	5 (0.96%)	
	Total	472 (90.42%)	37 (7.09%)	13 (2.49%)	
Sexual	Never	298 (57.09%)	27 (5.17%)	12 (2.3%)	Chi-Square 5.938 (0.051)
	Exposed	174 (33.33%)	10 (1.91%)	1 (0.19%)	
	Total	472 (90.42%)	37 (7.09%)	13 (2.49%)	
Economic	Never	160 (30.651%)	13 (2.49%)	9 (1.72%)	Chi-Square 6.956 (0.031)
	Exposed	312 (59.77%)	24 (4.60%)	4 (0.77%)	
	Total	472 (90.42%)	37 (7.09%)	13 (2.49%)	

Source: Field Data collected for PhD research titled Gender Based Violence in Pakistani Schools.

Table 6. Punishment based on Personal Relationship with Authority (Teacher)					
Violence Type	**Exposure**	**Relation with Authority and Nature of Punishment**			**Statistical Test**
		Agree	**Disagree**	**Don't Know**	
Physical	Never	118 (22.6%)	124 (23.75%)	14 (2.68%)	Chi-Square 7.606 (0.022)
	Exposed	154(29.5%)	103 (19.73%)	9 (1.72%)	
	Total	272 (52.11%)	227 (43.49%)	23 (4.41%)	
Psychological	Never	89 (17.05%)	93 (17.82%)	13 (2.49%)	Chi-Square 7.374 (0.025)
	Exposed	183 (35.06%)	134 (25.67%)	10 (1.91%)	
	Total	272 (52.11%)	227 (43.49%)	23 (4.41%)	
Sexual	Never	164 (31.418%)	153 (29.31%)	20 (3.83%)	Chi-Square 8.006 (0.018)
	Exposed	108 (20.69%)	74 (14.18%)	3 (0.57%)	
	Total	272 (52.11%)	227 (43.49%)	23 (4.41%)	
Economic	Never	83 (15.9%)	87 (16.67%)	12 (2.3%)	Chi-Square 6.701 (0.035)
	Exposed	189 (36.21%)	140 (26.82%)	11 (2.11%)	
	Total	272 (52.11%)	227 (43.49%)	23 (4.41%)	

Source: Field Data collected for PhD research titled Gender Based Violence in Pakistani Schools.

Table 07. Physical Appearance, Punishment and Gender Based School Violence					
Violence Type	**Exposure**	**Beauty, Soft Physical Appearance, Tender Age May attract favors of teachers and reduce Physical Punishment**			**Statistical Test**
		Agree	**Disagree**	**Don't Know**	
Physical	Never	173 (33.14%)	74 (14.18%)	9 (1.72%)	Chi-Square 4.171 (0.124)
	Exposed	201 (38.51%)	57 (10.92%)	8 (1.53%)	
	Total	374 (71.65%)	131 (25.1%)	17 (3.26%)	
Psychological	Never	130 (24.9%)	57 (10.92%)	8 (1.53%)	Chi-Square 3.883 (0.144)
	Exposed	244 (46.74%)	74 (14.18%)	9 (1.72%)	

	Total	374 (71.65%)	131 (25.1%)	17 (3.26%)	
Sexual	Never	224 (42.91%)	97 (18.58%)	16 (3.07%)	Chi-Square 15.203 (0.000)
	Exposed	150 (28.74%)	34 (6.51%)	1 (0.19%)	
	Total	374 (71.65%)	131 (25.1%)	17 (3.26%)	
Economic	Never	133 (25.48%)	42 (8.05%)	7 (1.34%)	Chi-Square 0.832 (0.660)
	Exposed	241 (46.17%)	89 (17.05%)	10 (1.92%)	
	Total	374 (71.65%)	131 (25.1%)	17 (3.26%)	

Source: Field Data collected for PhD research titled Gender Based Violence in Pakistani Schools.

References

Antonowicz, L. (2010). Too often in silence: A report on school-based violence in West and Central Africa. *UNICEF, Plan West Africa, Save the Children Sweden West Africa and ActionAid*.

Astor, R. A., Benbenishty, R., & Estrada, J. N. (2009). School violence and theoretically atypical schools: The principal's centrality in orchestrating safe schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 46*(2), 423-461.

Altbach, P. G., & Kelly, G. P. (1978). *Education and colonialism*: Longman New York.

Baker, J. E., & Myles, B. S. (2003). *Social skills training for children and adolescents with Asperger syndrome and social-communication problems*: Autism Asperger Pub.

Bazan, C. (2009). *Plan' Global Campaign To END VIOLENCE IN SCHOOLS*. Woking, UK: Plan International. (Plan o. Document Number)

Bhana, D. (2005). Violence and the gendered negotiation of masculinity among young black school boys in South Africa. *African Masculinities. New York: Palgrave Macmillan*.

Bisika, T., Ntata, P., & Konyani, S. (2009). Gender-violence and education in Malawi: a study of violence against girls as an obstruction to

universal primary school education. *Journal of Gender Studies, 18*(3), 287-294.

Breivik, K., Olweus, D., & Endresen, I. (2009). Does the quality of parent-child relationships mediate the increased risk for antisocial behavior and substance use among adolescents in single-mother and single-father families? *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage, 50*(6), 400-426.

Cavender, G., Bond-Maupin, L., & Jurik, N. C. (1999). The construction of gender in reality crime TV. *Gender & Society, 13*(5), 643-663.

Chandras, K. V. (2001). Prevention Strategies. *105p.; Published annually. For the 2000 issue, see ED 456*, 65.

Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power: Society, the person and sexual politics*: Polity Press Cambridge.

Cuklanz, L. M. (2000). *Rape on prime time: Television, masculinity, and sexual violence*: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Davies, L. (2004). *Education and conflict: Complexity and chaos*. London: Routledge.

Dashiff, C., DiMicco, W., Myers, B., & Sheppard, K. (2009). Poverty and adolescent mental health. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 22*(1), 23-32.

De Wet, C. (2007). Free State educators' perceptions and observations of learner-on-learner, learner-on-educator and educator-on-learner school violence. *Education as Change, 11*(1), 59-85.

Diprose, R. (2008). "Where'your people from, girl": Belonging to Race, Gender, and Place Beneath Clouds. *differences, 19*(3), 28-58.

Dillon, N. (2012). The Effect of School Community Setting on Children Living in Poverty: A Survey of School Social Workers.

Dubet, F. (2003). Juvenile and Urban Violence. *International handbook of violence research, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers*, 937-952.

Dunne, M., Humphreys, S., & Leach, F. (2006). Gender violence in schools in the developing world. *Gender and Education, 18*(1), 75-98.

Durkheim, E. (1970). Suicide London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1998). *Schooling sexualities*: Open University Press Buckingham.

Evans, S. E., Davies, C., & DiLillo, D. (2008). Exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent outcomes. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*(2), 131-140.

Eacute, J., & Esteve, M. (2000). The transformation of the teachers' role at the end of the twentieth century: New challenges for the future. *Educational Review, 52*(2), 197-207.

Esteve, J. M. (2000). at the End of the Twentieth Century. *Educational Review, 52*(2).

Everett, S. A., & Price, J. H. (1995). Students' perceptions of violence in the public schools: the MetLife survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 17*(6), 345-352.

Finley, L. L. (2007). Encyclopedia of juvenile violence. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Fry, P. S., & Debats, D. L. (2010). Sources of human life-strengths, resilience, and health. *New frontiers in resilient aging: Life-strengths and well-being in late life*, 15-59.

Garver, N. (1968). What violence is. *The Nation, 209*(24), 819-822.

George, E. (2004). Instructions in Inequality: Development, Human Rights, Capabilities, and Gender Violence in Schools. *Mich. J. Int'l L., 26*, 1139.

Gurr, T. R. (1979). *On the history of violent crime in Europe and America*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications,

Grosvenor, I., Lawn, M., & Rousmaniere, K. (2000). Imaging past schooling: the necessity for montage. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural studies, 22*(1), 71-85.

Harber, C. (1998). Markets, equity and democracy'structural adjustment and the tensions of educational change in South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development, 18*(3), 247-254.

Harber, C. (2002). Schooling as Violence: An exploratory overview. *Educational Review, 54*(1), 7-16.

Holmes, J. (1993). Attachment theory: a biological basis for psychotherapy? *The British Journal of Psychiatry, 163*(4), 430-438.

Human Rights, W. (2001). *Unequal Protection: the state response to violent crime on South African farms*: Human Rights Watch.

Jackson, R. A., & Newman, M. A. (2004). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace revisited: Influences on sexual harassment by gender. *Public Administration Review, 64*(6), 705-717.

Karstedt, S., & Eisner, M. (2009). Introduction: Is a General Theory of Violence Possible? *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 3*(1), 4-8.

Kehily, M. J., & Swann, J. (2003). *Children's cultural worlds* (Vol. 3): John Wiley in association with the Open University.

Kenway, J., & Fitzclarence, L. (1997). Masculinity, violence and schooling: challenging 'poisonous pedagogies'. *Gender and Education, 9*(1), 117-134.

Kessler, S. J., & McKenna, W. (1985). *Gender: An ethno methodological approach*: University of Chicago Press.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Acierno, R., Saunders, B., Resnick, H. S., Best, C. L., & Schnurr, P. P. (2000). Risk factors for adolescent substance abuse and dependence: data from a national sample. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 68*(1), 19.

Kim, J. H., & McGee Bailey, S. (2003). Unsafe Schools: A Literature Review of School-Related Gender-Based Violence in Developing Countries. *Washington DC: USAID. Available at: http://www.USAid.gov/our_work/cross-cutting_programs/wid/pubs/unsafe_schools_literature_review. pdf In the Painful lessons report*.

Koch, J., & Irby, B. J. (2005). *Gender and schooling in the early years*: Information Age Pub Incorporated.

Lovegrove, P. J., Henry, K. L., & Slater, M. D. (2012). Examination of the predictors of latent class typologies of bullying involvement among middle school students. *Journal of School Violence, 11*(1), 75-93.

Mallet, P., & Paty, B. (1999). How French counsellors treat school violence: An adult-centered approach. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counselling, 21*(4), 279-300.

Meyer, E. J. (2010a). *Gender and sexual diversity in schools* (Vol. 10): Springer.

Meyer, E. J. (2010b). Introduction: Why Learn About Gender and Sexual Diversity in Schools? In *Gender and Sexual Diversity in Schools* (pp. 3-26): Springer.

Milligan, S., Thomson, K., & Council, A. E. (1992). *Listening to Girls: A Report of the Consultancy Undertaken for the Review of the National Policy for the Education for Girls, Conducted by the Australian Education Council, 1991*: Asherden & Associates [for the Australian Education Council's Committee to Review the National Policy for the Education of Girls in Australian Schools].

Mills, M. (2001). *Challenging violence in schools*: Open University Press Buckingham.

Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: a developmental taxonomy. *Psychological review, 100*(4), 674.

Morrell, R. (2002). Men, movements, and gender transformation in South Africa. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 10*(3), 309-327.

Morrison, A., & Orlando, M. B. (2004). The costs and impacts of gender-based violence in developing countries: Methodological considerations and new evidence. *Retrieved March, 5*, 2007.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Harney, P. A., & Jones, J. M. (1992). From 'victim-precipitated rap- to-date rap': How far have we come? *Annual Review of Sex Research, 3*(1), 219-253.

Mynard, H., Joseph, S., & Alexander, J. (2000). Peer-victimization and posttraumatic stress in adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29*(5), 815-821.

Naz, A., Khan, W., Daraz, U., Hussain, M., & Khan, Q. (2011). The Impacts of Corporal Punishment on Students Academic Performance/Career and Personality Development Up-To Secondary Level Education in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(12).

Neubarth, F., & Rennison, J. R. (1999). An x-bar theory of Government Phonology. *Ms., University of Vienna*.

Ngakane, M. V., Muthukrishna, N., & Ngcobo, J. E. (2012). Experiencing Violence in Schools: Voices of Learners in the Lesotho Context. *Anthropologist, 14*(1), 39-48.

Ngale, I. F. (2009). Family structure and juvenile delinquency [Electronic Version]. *Internet Journal of Criminology*, from www.internetjournalofcriminology.com

Parker, R., Barbosa, R. M., & Aggleton, P. (2000). Framing the sexual subject: the politics of gender, sexuality, and power. Berkeley: CA: University of California Press.

Piotrowski, D., & Hoot, J. (2008). Bullying and violence in schools: What teachers should know and do. *Childhood Education, 84*(6), 357-363.

Renold, E. (2002). Presumed Innocence (Hetero) Sexual, Heterosexist and Homophobic Harassment among Primary School Girls and Boys. *Childhood, 9*(4), 415-434.

SAHIL. (2008). Cruel numbers 2008: Letting you know the reality [Electronic Version]. *Cruel Number*,

Salmi, V., Smolej, M., & Kivivuori, J. (2007). Crime victimization, exposure to crime news and social trust among adolescents. *Young, 15*(3), 255-272.

Secretariat, C. (2002). *Gender mainstreaming in HIV/AIDS: Taking a multisector approach*: Commonwealth Secretariat.

Skelton, C., & Francis, B. (2005). *A feminist critique of education: 15 years of gender education*: Routledge Falmer.

Sen, A. (1999). Critical Reflection. Health and Development. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization, 77*(8).

SPARC. (2004). *State of Children in Pakistan*. Islamabad: SPARC. (SPARC o. Document Number)

SPARC. (2009). *State of Children in Pakistan*. Islamabad, Pakistan: SPARCo. Document Number)

Sprinthall, R. C., & Fisk, S. T. (1990). *Basic statistical analysis*: Prentice Hall Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53*(1), 81-105.

Sullivan, C., & Bash, S. (1967). Current programs for delinquency prevention. *Delinquency Prevention: Theory and Practice*, 51-72.

Tamutiene, I. (2008). School violence: experiences of absentee students. *Journal of School Violence, 7*(1), 115-130.

Tunley, R. (1962). *Kids, crime and chaos*: Harper & Row

Unterhalter, E. (2003). Crossing Disciplinary Boundaries: the potential of Sen's capability approach for sociologists of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 24*(5), 665-669.

Vance, C. S. (1984). *Pleasure and danger: Exploring female sexuality*: Routledge & Kegan Paul Books.

Vetten, L., & Bhana, K. (2001). Violence, vengeance and gender: a preliminary investigation into the links between HIV/AIDS and violence against women in South Africa. *Johannesburg, The Centre for the Study of Violence & Reconciliation*.

Watts, C., & Zimmerman, C. (2002). Violence against women: global scope and magnitude. *The lancet, 359*(9313), 1232-1237.

White, L. A. (1949). *The science of culture: A study of man and civilization*: Grove Press New York.

Windham, C. (2005). *The student's perspective*: Edu cause.

Yusuf, M. (2009). Prospects of Youth Radicalization in Pakistan: Implications for US Policy

Yerin-Guneri, O., Erdur Baker, O., & Akbaba Altun, S. (2006). *School violence among urban Turkish students: A qualitative investigation.* Paper presented at the European Conference on Educational Research.

About the Authors

Dr. Jamil Ahmad Chitrali is the Director Institute of Peace & Conflict Studies,University of Peshawar, Pakistan. He can be reached at jamilchitrali@hotmail.com, jamilchitrali@upesh.edu.pk

Dr. Noor Sanauddin is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan. He can be reached at noor.sanauddin@upesh.edu.pk

Dr. Syed Owais is an Assistant Professor at the Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, Pakistan. He can be reached at owais@upesh.edu.pk