

Corporal Punishment in Higher Secondary Schools: A Case Study

NABAK. MONDAL* AND SOHINI DAS**

Abstract

This case study was done in the district of Birbhum, West Bengal to know the status of corporal punishment in higher secondary schools. The study revealed that no teachers, parents or students in rural and urban areas are in favour of corporal punishment. A reverse relationship has been found between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for students in both rural and urban areas. A positive difference has been found in support of corporal punishment between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes; whereas a negative difference has been found against the corporal punishment between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes.

The American College Dictionary, 1953 edition, defines corporal punishment as "physical injury inflicted on the body of one convicted of a crime and including the death penalty, flogging, sentence to a term of years, etc." It can be used to refer to a wide spectrum of punishments ranging from forced labor to mutilating torture. It includes a wide variety of methods such as hitting, slapping, punching, kicking, pinching, shaking, choking, use of various objects (wooden paddles, belts, sticks, pins etc.), painful body postures, use of electric shock, use of excessive exercise drills, prevention of

urine or stool elimination. Some of these terms are generic, others are specific to the severity of the punishment or the instrument used to inflict it. The psychologists described that corporal punishment is the use of physical force intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort for discipline, correction and control, changing behaviour etc.

In the ancient world the teachers (*Guru Moshai*) were very strict and they frequently beat the pupils. In the Middle Ages discipline was also severe. Boys were beaten with rods or birch twigs. Discipline in schools was also savage.

* Department of Environmental Science, University of Burdwan

**Research Scholar, Department of Science Education, University of Burdwan, Burdwan, West Bengal

The teacher often had a stick with birch twigs attached to it. Boys were hit with the birch twigs on their bare buttocks. At the beginning of the 19th century two men— Joseph Lancaster and Andrew Bell— independently invented a new method of educating the working class. In the 20th century the cane was used in both primary and secondary schools. Meanwhile the ruler as a punishment tool was commonly used in primary schools in the 20th century. The teacher hit the child on the hand with a wooden ruler. In England in 1987 the cane was banned in state-funded secondary schools. It was banned in private schools in 1999. In the 20th century many parents are still using a wooden spoon to hit children. The school corporal punishment is the intentional infliction of physical pain for breaking school rules. The school students are frequently hit by teachers for minor reasons like forgetting homework, dress code violation or being late for school. Many of them are hit multiple times. There are various types of corporal punishment used in schools. These can be classified as physical punishment and emotional punishment. The physical punishment includes making children stand as a wall chair, keeping the school bag on the head, twisting the ears, holding the ears with hands passed under the legs, making children stand on the bench, making children stand for whole day in the sun, etc., whereas emotional punishment includes slapping by opposite sex, making children stand on the back of the class and to complete the work, suspending children for a couple of days from the school, labelling the child according to his/her misbehaviour

and send him/her around the school, pinning paper on the back and labelling 'I am fool', etc. The main justification of school corporal punishment has found from several empirical research work that crowded classrooms with inadequate infrastructure, insufficient learning tools contributes to increased stress among teachers and subsequently to the frequent use of corporal punishment.

The ill effects of corporal punishment include humiliation, loss of self respect, degradation, feeling of helplessness and lowering self-worth lead to aggressive behaviour or withdrawal (Sternberg et al., 1993; Straus, 1994). The regular spanking of children overtime makes them cheats/liars, disobedient, devoid of feelings and bullies (Straus, Sugarman and Giles-Sims, 1997). Children's cognitive development can also be affected by frequent punishment or spanking. This results in their poor academic performance in schools (Straus and Mathur, 1995; Straus and Paschall, 1998). The probability of children assaulting the parents in retaliation especially when they are grown up increases if they are subjected to corporal punishment when young (Brezina, 1998). Many researchers have argued that corporal punishment is harmful for children, as studies of its long term correlates have demonstrated that it predicts higher levels of aggression and social behaviour in childhood, adolescence and adulthood as well as depression and suicide (Durrant, 2000). A number of studies have supported the notion that corporal punishment contributes to aggressive behaviour of children and subsequent violence in adulthood. Since corporal

punishment tends to produce both fear and anger, its continued use in the schools can hamper the learning process. In the late 20th century public opinion turned against corporal punishment. The most of the countries have banned the school corporal punishment given to its ill-effect. These countries are including Argentina (1817), Australia (1988), Austria (1974), China (1949), France (2008), Germany (1993), Greece (1998), Ireland (1982), Italy (1928), Japan (1947), Netherlands (1920), New Zealand (1990), Spain (1985), Sweden (1958), Thailand (2005), United Kingdom (1987), United States (1867), Uruguay (2008), etc. The Government of India has also made some legal provisions against school corporal punishment but these are usually too broad and are open to individual interpretation. Many of the laws are contradictory and enforcement is half-hearted. With few exceptions, teachers who have been found guilty of using corporal punishment in schools have been convicted. The Supreme Court of India banned corporal punishment in schools in 2002. According to press reports, corporal punishment were banned in Delhi (2002), Andhra Pradesh (2002) and Odisha and West Bengal (2004). Yet, often we get opportunity to read in the newspapers incidents of corporal punishment in schools. How to address this issue of corporal punishment? To address the issues of corporal punishment in schools we need to find out the nature and causes of corporal punishment, its impact on students behaviour and attitude and also to find out the possible ways of corporal punishment resolution mechanism.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of the study was to find out the attitudes of parents, teachers and students towards the corporal punishment used in secondary schools and to find out the possible ways to prohibit corporal punishment in schools.

Secondary Objectives

1. To compare the attitudes rural and urban teachers, parents and students towards the corporal punishment used in schools.
2. To find out the relationship between parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for the students in the urban and rural areas.
3. To recommend few alternative ways for the teachers to prohibit corporal punishment in schools.

Hypothesis

H_0^1 : There is no difference between rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for the students.

H_0^2 : There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the different types of corporal punishment used in schools for the students.

H_0^3 : There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the consequences of corporal punishment.

H_0^4 : There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the inter-personal relationship techniques for the students.

H_0^5 : There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the corporal punishment resolution mechanism for the students.

H_0^6 : There is no difference between rural and urban parents' attitudes towards the critical view of corporal punishment.

H_0^7 : There is no relationship between the attitudes of parents and teachers towards the disciplinary actions for the students in the urban areas.

H_0^8 : There is no relationship between the attitudes of parents and teachers towards the disciplinary actions for the students in the rural areas.

H_0^9 : There is no difference between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes towards the corporal punishment used in schools.

Data Collection and Methodology

The study was based on both primary and secondary data. The primary data had been collected from the rural and urban areas of Birbhum District, West Bengal. The survey was conducted in the months of January–May 2010. For these purpose close-ended questionnaires had been prepared to collect necessary information about the attitudes of the parents, teachers and students towards the corporal punishment used in schools. On the other hand, secondary data relating to literatures of school corporal punishment were collected from the internet, journals, magazines, news papers and books. In this study Stratified

Random Sampling Technique was used for the collection of primary data as well as for testing hypothesis. The samples had selected in two stages. The first stage was selection of schools, parents, teachers and students. The study had selected two schools each from urban (Sainthia High School and Sainthia Town High School) and rural (Mahjigram High School and Itagoria Hazi Mumtaz Begam High School) areas. Fifty students each of Class VIII of Sainthia Town High School and Majhigram High School had been selected randomly. The study had selected those parents whose children were studying in Class VIII of Sainthia Town High School and Majhigram High School. Thirty parents were selected from urban areas and 20 parents from rural areas. Similarly, the teachers were selected from two schools each in urban areas (Sainthia High School and Sainthia Town High School) and rural areas (Mahjigram High School and Itagoria Hazi Mumtaz Begam High School). Fifteen teachers of the Sainthia High School and 13 teachers of Sainthia Town High School had been selected randomly. On the other hand, nine teachers of the Mahjigram High School and 13 teachers of Itagoria Hazi Mumtaz Begam High School had been selected randomly.

The attitudes of the teachers and parents towards the different attributes of school corporal punishment (such as, disciplinary action, types of corporal punishment, consequences of corporal punishment, inter-personal relationship techniques, corporal punishment resolution mechanism, critical view of

corporal punishment, etc.) had been measured on the basis of three points scale (Always, Sometimes and Never). Similarly dummy variables (Yes and No) were used to measure the behavioural attitudes of the students towards school corporal punishment. The collected data were summarized in a *Master Sheet*, in such a systematical manner that can fulfill the objectives of the study. However the summarized data had been analysed with the help of few statistical tools like Mean, Standard Deviation (S.D.), Coefficient of Variation (C.V.), Pearson Correlation Coefficient, T-test (Paired Two Samples for Means), etc. by using the software's (SPSS 17.00). Beside these, the alternative ways for the teachers to prohibit corporal punishment have been recommended on the basis of literature survey method.

Results and Discussion

1. *Rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for the students*

The urban teachers' opinion varies highly from the rural teachers in favour of all scales regarding the disciplinary actions for the students (such as, punishment is necessary to improve students academic performance, punishment is only way to rectify students, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high. The positive differences have been found in favour of Always and Sometimes scale between the rural and urban teachers attitudes towards the above disciplinary actions for the students. But negative difference has been found in favour of never scale between the rural and urban teachers

Table 1

Scale	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Always	20.5	14.15	70.73	17.00	14.67	86.29
Sometimes	38.5	16.86	43.79	35.0	22.32	63.77
Never	41.0	25.55	62.32	48.0	36.14	75.29
Paired Two Samples for Means						
Scale	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis	
Always	3.5	4.43	1.578	0.213	Rejected and Significant	
Sometimes	3.5	11.82	.592	0.595	Rejected and Significant	
Never	(-) 7.0	12.91	(-) 1.084	0.358	Rejected and Significant	
Significance Level: 5 %						

attitudes. So the null hypothesis has been rejected in favour of all scales and the significant results have been found at 5% significance level.

From Table 1 it is clear that few rural teachers are always or sometimes in favour of punishment to improve students' academic performance or to rectify the students. On the other hand, few urban teachers did not agree with the opinions of rural teachers. But the major portion of rural and urban teachers are of the opinion that punishment is not only way to improve academic performance of the students or to rectify students. Although there are mixed opinions between the rural and urban teachers about the disciplinary actions for the students but major portion of both rural and urban teachers are not in favour of corporal punishment.

2. *Rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the different types of corporal punishment used in schools for the students*

A portion of rural and urban teachers are always against different types of corporal punishments used in schools for the students (such as, keeping school bag on the head and stand whole day under the sun, kneel down on the sand, suspend from the school for couple of days, give TC from the school, etc.). On the other side, rural teachers' opinion varies highly from the urban teachers in favour of Sometimes and Never scales regarding the above types of corporal punishment for the students, since coefficient of variation is high.

There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the above types of corporal

Table 2

Scale	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Always	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	-
Sometimes	11.25	17.04	151.47	7.25	8.85	122.07
Never	88.75	17.04	19.2	92.75	8.85	9.54
Paired Two Samples for Means						
Scale	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis	
Always	-	-	-	-	Accepted and Insignificant	
Sometimes	4.0	9.38	0.853	0.456	Rejected and Significant	
Never	(-) 4.0	9.38	(-) 0.853	0.456	Rejected and Significant	
Significance Level: 5 %						

punishments in favour of Always scale. So the null hypothesis has been accepted and insignificant result has been found at 5% significance level. On the other hand, the positive difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the different types of corporal punishments used in school for the students. But negative difference has been found in favour of Never scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes. So the null hypothesis has been rejected in both Sometimes and Never scales and significant results have been found at 5% significance level.

From Table 2, it is clear that the few rural teachers are interested to give sometimes these types of punishments to have control over the indisciplined

students, whereas few urban teachers have reverse attitudes to prohibit these types of corporal punishments. However, the major portions of both rural and urban teachers are against using the above types of corporal punishments in schools for the students.

3. *Rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the consequences of corporal punishment*

The rural teachers' opinions varies highly from the urban teachers regarding the consequences of corporal punishment (such as punishment leads to increase the rate of suicide, punishment leads to increase the rate of depression, punishment incites students to violence, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high.

There is no difference in favour of Always scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the

Table 3

Scale	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Always	21.5	22.07	102.65	21.5	19.54	90.88
Sometimes	35.25	18.66	52.94	35.75	17.02	47.61
Never	43.25	37.16	85.92	42.75	35.72	83.56
Paired Two Samples for Means						
Scale	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis	
Always	0.00	5.10	0.000	1.000	Accepted and Insignificant	
Sometimes	(-) 0.50	4.20	(-) 0.238	0.827	Rejected and Significant	
Never	0.50	2.52	0.397	0.718	Rejected and Significant	
Significance Level: 5%						

consequences of corporal punishment. So the null hypothesis has been accepted in favour of always scale and insignificant result has been found at 5% significant level. On the other side, negative difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the consequences of corporal punishment. But a positive difference has been found in favour of Never scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes. So the null hypothesis has been rejected in favour of both Sometimes and Never scales and significant results have been found at 5% significant level.

From Table 3, it is clear that few portions of both rural and urban teachers are always aware about the consequences of corporal punishment. On the other hand, portions of rural and urban teachers are of opinion that sometimes corporal punishment may lead to increase the rate of suicide/depression or incites students to violence. But a major portion of rural and urban teachers believe that corporal punishment never leads to increase the rate of suicide/depression or incites students to violence. That means there is mixed opinion between the rural and urban teachers about the consequences of corporal punishment.

4. *Rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards inter-personal relationship techniques for the students*

The urban teachers' opinions highly vary from the rural teachers in favour of Always scale regarding the inter-personal relationship techniques for the students (such as, students feel free to tell their problems, students fear to see

those teachers in the classroom who give maximum punishment, other than education students get help from teachers in their social lives, punishment created distance between teachers and students, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high. On the other side, the rural teachers' opinions vary highly from the urban teachers in favour of Sometimes and Never scale regarding the inter-personal relationship techniques, since coefficient of variation is high.

The positive difference has been found in favour of both Always and Never scales between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the inter-personal relationship techniques for the students, whereas, a negative difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale. So the null hypothesis has been rejected and significant results have been found at 5% significant level.

From Table 4, it is clear that few rural teachers are always interested to make inter-personal relationship with the students or never, but few urban teachers are of opinion that it is sometimes possible. However during the field survey a portion of both rural and urban teachers are of opinion that punishment is sometimes needed to maintain the peaceful academic environment in the schools but inter-personal relationship techniques are one of the ways to minimize the distance between teachers and students. It is not true that students always feel fear to see them inside or outside school campus. They are always tried to help students outside the campus in their social lives. Maximum students feel free to tell their problems. This is the outcome of inter-personal relationship techniques.

Table 4

Scale	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Always	50.00	37.69	75.38	47.25	36.62	77.5
Sometimes	19.25	12.01	62.39	23.25	12.58	54.11
Never	30.75	40.90	133.01	29.50	38.45	130.34

Paired Two Samples for Means

Scale	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis
Always	2.75	2.22	2.48	0.089	Rejected and Significant
Sometimes	(-) 4.00	1.41	(-) 5.657	0.011	Rejected and Significant
Never	1.25	2.25	1.00	0.391	Rejected and Significant

Significance Level: 5%

5. *Rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the corporal punishment resolution mechanism*

The urban teachers' opinions vary highly from the rural teachers in favour of always scale regarding the corporal punishment resolution mechanism (such as, punishment should be unbiased, punishment should be on the basis of verbal and non-verbal response, teacher being a role model for empathy, kindness, cooperation, patience, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high. On the other side, the rural teachers' opinions vary highly from the urban teachers in favour of Sometimes scale regarding the corporal punishment resolution mechanism, since coefficient

of variation is high. Interestingly, no teachers are against of above corporal punishment resolution mechanism. That's why no variation has been found in Never scale between the rural and urban teachers' opinion.

The positive difference have been found in favour of Always scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the corporal punishment resolution mechanism, whereas negative difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes. So the null hypothesis has been rejected in Always and Sometimes scales and the significant results have been found at 5% significance level. There is no difference between the rural and urban

Table 5

Scale	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Always	88.5	9.61	10.86	87.5	10.28	11.75
Sometimes	11.5	9.61	83.57	12.5	10.28	82.24
Never	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	0.00	-

Paired Two Samples for Means

Scale	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis
Always	1.00	1.15	1.732	0.182	Rejected and Significant
Sometimes	(-) 1.00	1.15	(-) 1.732	0.182	Rejected and Significant
Never	0.00	0.00	-	-	Accepted and Insignificant

Significance Level: 5%

teachers' attitudes in Never scale. So the null hypothesis has been accepted in Never scale and the insignificant result has been found at 5% significance level.

Although there is mixed opinion between the rural and urban teachers towards the above corporal punishment resolution mechanism but major portion of both rural and urban teachers are always interested to adopt these types mechanism. During the field survey a portion of the rural and urban teachers reported that teacher should be a role model for empathy, kindness, co-operation and patience towards the students. Although they have told that punishment should be unbiased and on the basis of verbal and non-verbal response, but inter-personal relationship

among students and teachers is an effective way to avoid punishment.

6. *Rural and urban parents' attitudes towards the critical view of school corporal punishment*

The rural parents' opinions vary highly from the urban parents in favour of always scale towards the critical view of corporal punishment used in school (such as, punishment leads to increase the rate of suicide/depression among the students, corporal punishment is illegal, corporal punishment should not be allowed at school, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high. On the other hand the urban parents' opinions vary highly from the rural parents in favour of Sometimes and Never scale towards the

Table 6

Scale	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Always	30.00	38.08	126.93	40.00	39.06	97.65
Sometimes	20.00	10.8	54	22.5	21.06	93.6
Never	50.00	39.16	78.32	37.5	43.02	114.72
Paired Two Samples for Means						
Scale	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis	
Always	(-) 10.00	13.76	(-) 1.454	0.242	Rejected and Significant	
Sometimes	(-) 2.50	16.54	(-) 0.302	0.782	Rejected and Significant	
Never	12.5	29.85	0.838	0.464	Rejected and Significant	
Significance Level: 5%						

critical view of corporal punishment, since coefficient of variation is high.

The negative differences have been found in favour of Always and Sometimes scales between the rural and urban parents' attitudes towards the critical view of corporal punishment; whereas a positive difference has been found in favour of Never scale. So the null hypothesis has been rejected in favour of all scales and the significant results have been found at 5% significance Level.

From Table 6, it is clear that few urban parents are always or sometimes against of school corporal punishment only because of the ill-effects. They do believe that since corporal punishment is illegal in the school and have many ill-effects on the life of the students, so it should be banned. But still few rural

parents are not against of corporal punishment used in school. They do believe that it is not true that corporal punishment increases the rate of suicide/depression among the students. They also believe that corporal punishment is not always illegal. It is sometimes necessary either to have a control over the indisciplined students or to improve the academic performance level of the students.

7. *The relationship between the attitudes of parents and teachers towards the disciplinary actions for the students in urban and rural areas*

High negative (reverse) relationship has been found in all the scales between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for the students

Table 7

Scale	Urban		Rural		Null Hypothesis
	Correlation Coefficient	Sig.	Correlation Coefficient	Sig.	
Always	(-) .898	0.102	(-) 0.726	0.274	Rejected and Significant
Sometimes	(-) .888	0.112	(-) 0.655	0.345	Rejected and Significant
Never	(-) .990	0.010	(-) 0.979	0.021	Rejected and Significant

in urban areas. Similarly a high negative (reverse) relationship has also been found in all scales between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for the students in rural areas. So the null hypothesis has been rejected in favour of all scales and the significant results have been found at 5% significance Level.

From Table 7, it is clear that there is a reverse relationship between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions in both urban and rural areas. The parents' and teachers' thoughts are totally different from each other's regarding the students' disciplinary actions. It reflects a tug of water between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary action. This is due to the

lacuna of coordination and communication between parents and teachers. So school authorities are required to arrange more frequent guardian meeting in proper intervals.

8. *Rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes towards the school corporal punishment*

The urban students' opinions vary highly from the rural students regarding the behavioural attitudes towards the school corporal punishments (such as, punishment makes students obedient, punishment is indispensable to maintain discipline in the classroom, punishment is the only way to have a control over the naughty students, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high.

Table 8

Dummy Variables	Rural			Urban		
	Mean	S.D.	C.V.	Mean	S.D.	C.V.
Yes	26.5	39.75	150	26.0	44.03	169.35
No	73.0	39.41	53.99	74	44.03	59.5

Paired Two Samples for Means

Dummy Variables	Mean	S.D.	T	Sig. (2-tailed)	Null Hypothesis
Yes	0.5	4.43	0.255	0.836	Rejected and Significant
No	(-) 1.00	4.76	(-) 0.420	0.703	Rejected and Significant
Significance Level: 5%					

A positive difference has been found in support of school corporal punishment between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes; whereas a negative difference has been found against of school corporal punishment between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes. So the null hypothesis has been rejected and significant results have been found at 5% significance level.

During the field survey it was observed that few rural students do believe that punishment makes students obedient and punishment is indispensable to maintain discipline in the classroom. On the other hand few urban students do not believe that punishment is only way to have a control over the naughty students. However, a major portion of both rural and urban students are against corporal punishment used in schools.

However from the above discussion the following results have come out:

1. (a) The urban teachers' opinions vary highly from the rural teachers in favour of all scales regarding the disciplinary actions for the students, since coefficient of variation is high.

- (b) The positive differences have been found in favour of Always and Sometimes scales between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the above disciplinary actions for the students. But negative difference has been found in favour of Never scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes.

2. (a) A portion of rural and urban teachers are always against of different types of corporal punishment used in schools for the students. On the other side rural teachers' opinions vary highly from the urban teachers in favour of Sometimes and Never scales regarding the different types of corporal punishment, since coefficient of variation is high.

- (b) There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes in favour of Always scale towards the different types of corporal punishment used in schools for the students. On the other hand, the positive difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale

- between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the different types of corporal punishment. But a negative difference has been found in favour of Never scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes.
3. (a) The rural teachers' opinions vary highly from the urban teachers regarding the consequences of corporal punishment (such as punishment leads to increase the rate of suicide, punishment leads to increase the rate of depression, punishment incites students to violence, etc.), since coefficient of variation is high.
 - (b) There is no difference in favour of Always scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the consequences of corporal punishment. On the other side, negative difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the consequences of corporal punishment. But a positive difference has been found in favour of Never scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes.
 4. (a) The urban teachers' opinions highly vary from the rural teachers in favour of Always scale regarding the inter-personal relationship techniques for the students, since coefficient of variation is high. On the other side, the rural teachers' opinions vary highly from the urban teachers in favour of Sometimes and Never scales regarding the inter-personal relationship techniques, since coefficient of variation is high.
 - (b) The positive difference has been found in favour of both Always and Never scales between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes towards the inter-personal relationship techniques for the students, whereas, a negative difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale.
 5. (a) The urban teachers' opinions vary highly from the rural teachers in favour of always scale regarding the corporal punishment resolution mechanism, since coefficient of variation is high. On the other hand, the rural teachers' opinions vary highly from the urban teachers in favour of Sometimes scale regarding the corporal punishment resolution mechanism, since coefficient of variation is high. No teachers are against of above corporal punishment resolution mechanism. That is why no variation has been found in Never scale between the rural and urban teachers opinion.
 - (b) The positive difference have been found in favour of Always scale between the rural and urban teachers attitudes towards the corporal punishment resolution mechanism, whereas, negative

difference has been found in favour of Sometimes scale between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes. There is no difference between the rural and urban teachers' attitudes in Never scale.

6. (a) The rural parents' opinions vary highly from the urban parents in favour of Always scale towards the critical view of corporal punishment used in school, since coefficient of variation is high. On the other hand the urban parents' opinions vary highly from the rural parents in favour of Sometimes and Never scales, since coefficient of variation is high.
- (b) The negative differences have been found in favour of Always and Sometimes scales between the rural and urban parents attitudes towards the critical view of corporal punishment; whereas a positive difference has been found in favour of Never scale.
7. The high negative (reverse) relationship has been found between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for the students in both urban and rural areas.
8. (a) The urban students' opinions vary highly from the rural students regarding the behavioural attitudes towards the school corporal punishments, since coefficient of variation is high.
- (b) A positive difference has been found in support of school corporal punishment between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes; whereas a negative difference has been found against of school corporal punishment between the rural and urban students' behavioural attitudes.

Recommendations to Prohibit Corporal Punishment in Schools

The philosophy of '*spare the rod and spoil the child*' had gone forever. Now students don't need to fear to see the '*Guru Moshai*'. Today the students are very much sentimental. That's why punishment leads to increase the rate of suicide among the students.

The following alternative ways have been recommended for the teachers to prohibit the corporal punishment in schools:

1. An important technique in maintaining classroom control is to develop a milieu of effective communication, in which the teacher displays an attitude of respect for the students. The teachers can exhibit cordiality to students and an attitude that they generally enjoy working with students in the academic setting. Students must be taught in an environment that clearly states they are valued and understood. The emphasis is on positive educational exchanges between teachers and students, not futile, contentious, win-lose contests.
2. Teachers can learn sound blueprints regarding student motivation and

nonviolent techniques of classroom control. It is difficult to present educational material which is stimulating to the students and is aimed at their ability levels. Some students do need alternative academic courses and these should be offered. All students and parents should be carefully involved in decision making process about school issues affecting them, including educational goals and disciplinary rules.

3. Behaviour modification techniques for classroom control can be effectively utilised by school teachers. Inappropriate behaviour can be reduced by using extinction. This technique removes or eliminates inappropriate actions. A variety of nonviolent disciplinary techniques can be taught and utilized, such as soft verbal reproofs or social isolation in addition to the persistent use of rewards (as love, praise and attention by the teacher) for appropriate behaviour. Such methods can be powerful, compelling tools; changing unacceptable behaviour and helping the locus of control become placid within the students in this model.
4. It is difficult that teachers receive as much support and training as possible in their efforts to maintain effective classroom control without resorting to violent techniques. Such training should include instructions on the deleterious short and long-term consequences of corporal punishment. Schools should have an ample supply of counsellors, especially for younger students.

Schools need to have in-school suspension facilities while avoiding use of large classroom sizes. Schools' policies need to allow for a wide variety of teaching and disciplinary methods which de-emphasize the necessity for corporal punishment. The input of parents and students into such policies is vital to its overall success. An effective relationship must be developed between school teachers, parents and students to frame sensible rules which have appropriate consequences when infractions inevitably occur.

Conclusion

The present study has observed that no teachers, parents and students in rural and urban areas are in favour of school corporal punishment. But there are mixed opinions between the rural and urban teachers towards the consequences of school corporal punishment. Interestingly a reverse relationship has been found between the parents' and teachers' attitudes towards the disciplinary actions for students in both rural and urban areas. These have been justified by the statistical results as well. During the field survey parents and teachers are told that sometimes punishment is needed to maintain the discipline either in school or at home but given to the ill-effects of corporal punishment, it should be banned. So, no violence against students is justifiable. Even verbal violence should not be permitted in schools. Corporal punishment is not correct and insists the undesirable behaviour of the students. Discipline is necessary but discipline is not equivalent to

punishment. Corporal punishment should be completely wiped out from the academic system and teaching should be made joyful experience for the teachers as well as students. The school authorities may recruit counsellors to understand students' psychology. Deprivation and motivation should be done simultaneously to discipline students. During this process all stakeholders (parents, peers and counsellors) should be involved. The corporal punishment may adversely affect a student's self image and contributes to disruptive and violent behaviour. Besides these, it creates emotional stress and low-self esteem amongst students due to mental and physical injury. If the students are loved and their feelings are respected, the situation of punishment to them will not arise. Teachers who love their students unconditionally would never find any occasion to hit or hurt them. The school authorities may conduct workshops and training programmes on students' behaviour and psychology in frequent intervals. The case studies and real life situations should be incorporated in the course curriculum of the teachers' training institutes so that they can churn out probable teachers who are more caring and understanding towards students. Teachers need to adopt "positive re-enforcement" and "assertive discipline" while dealing with students. A culture has to be developed in the school by the teachers where the word "punishment" is rooted out from the academic settings. The present study has recommended that school authorities should take initiatives for more frequent

interaction between parents and teachers by arranging meetings to exchange the views regarding students' disciplinary actions. Last but not least, since the sample size is very small so the present study may not reflect the real attitudes of the teachers, parents and students towards the school corporal punishment. Due to the short period of time the study has not been able to consider all dimensions of school corporal punishment which may have an adverse impact on the students' behaviour and attitudes.

National Curriculum Framework- 2005 Perspective on School Discipline and Corporal Punishment

At present, school rules, norms and conventions define permitted 'good' and 'proper' behaviour for individual and groups of students. Maintaining discipline in schools is usually the prerogative of teachers and adults in positions of authority (often the sports master and administrators). Frequently, they also induct children as 'monitors' and 'prefects' and delegate the responsibility of maintaining 'order' and ensuring control. Punishment and reward play an important role in this. Those who implement rarely question the rules or the implications that ensuring compliance may have for children's overall development, self-esteem and also their interest in learning. Forms of disciplining such as corporal punishment and, verbal and non-verbal abuse of children, continue to feature in many schools, and are used to humiliate children in front of their peers. Yet many teachers and even parents still believe

that such punishment is important, unaware of the immediate and long-term detrimental effects of these practices. It is important for teachers to reflect on the rationale that underlies the rules and conventions that govern schools, and whether these are consistent with our aims of education. For instance, rules such as the length of socks and the whiteness of sports shoes are of no educational defensible importance. Rules regarding maintaining silence in classrooms, answering 'one at a time' and answering only if you know the right answer, can undermine the values of equality and equal opportunity. Such rules may also discourage processes that are integral to children's learning, the development of a sense of community among peers, though they may make the class 'easy to manage' for the teacher and facilitate 'covering the syllabus'.

Inculcating the value/habit of self-discipline is important for the systematic pursuit of learning and the development of the child's interests and potential. Discipline must enable the performance of, and be conducive to, the task at hand. It should enable freedom, choice and autonomy for both teacher and child. It is necessary to involve children themselves in evolving rules, and feel a sense of responsibility in ensuring that it is followed. In this way they would also learn the process of setting codes of self-governance and the skills required to participate in decision making and democratic functioning. Similarly, the children themselves could also evolve mechanisms for conflict resolution between teachers and students, and

among students. The teacher should ensure that there are as few rules as possible, and that only rules that can be reasonably followed are created. It does no one any good to humiliate children for breaking rules, particularly when there are good reasons for the rule being broken. For instance, 'noisy classrooms' are frowned upon by teachers as well as headmasters, but it is possible that rather the noise being evidence of the teacher not being in control, it may be evidence of a lively and participatory class.

Similarly, headmasters can be unreasonably strict about punctuality. A child who is late for an examination on account of a traffic jam must not be penalised, and yet we find such rules being imposed in the name of higher values. Unreasonableness on the part of authorities in such matters can demoralize children, their parents, and also teachers. It may help to remember to first ask a child why he or she broke a rule, to listen to what the child says, and act accordingly. It is befitting a school head or teacher to exercise authority rather than power. Arbitrariness and unreasonableness are characteristics of power, and are feared, not respected. Systems for the participatory management for the school by children and school teachers and administrators need to be evolved. Children should be encouraged to elect their own representatives to children's councils, and similarly the teachers and administrators of a given school need to be organized themselves, so also the parents.

REFERENCES

- KILIMCI, S. 2009. "Teachers perceptions on corporal punishment as a method of discipline in elementary schools", *The Journal of International Social Research*, 2(8).
- MUHAMMAD, S.A AND S.R. MUHAMMAD. 2007. Effects of corporal punishment and psychological treatment on students learning and behaviour. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*. 3(2): 171-180.
- BAUMAN, L.J. AND FRIEDMAN, B. 1998. "Corporal Punishment: Pediatric Clin NoAm". BBC News. (00:22 GMT, April 17, 2007). US University Shooting Kills 33: (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/6560685.stm>).
- CLIMINILLO, L.M. 1988. "Discipline: The school's dilemma adolescence." *Daily Times*, (July 4, 2005), Staff Report, Corporal Punishment.
- GALLUP ORGANIZATION. 1995. *Discipline children in America: A Gallup Poll Report*, Princeton, NJ: Gallup Organization.
- GERSHOFF, E.T. 2002. "Corporal Punishment by Parents and Associated Child Behaviours and Experiences: A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review." *Psychological Bulletin*, 14(2): 490-49.
- GRAZIANO, A.M. AND LINDA, J. 1992. "Effects of corporal punishment on children." *Violence Update*. 86(3): 368-382.
- GRAZIANO, A.M. AND NAMASTE, K.A. 1990. "Parental use of physical force in child Discipline". *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 5 (4): 43-50.
- HYMAN, I.A. 1988. "Eliminating corporal punishment in schools: Moving from Advocacy Research to Policy Implementation." *Child Legal Rights*. 15(6): 110-115.
- HYMAN, I.A., McDOWELL, E. AND RAINS, B. 1977. "Corporal punishment and alternative in the schools: An overview of theoretical and practical issues in National Institute of Education Preceding." Conference on Corporal Punishment in Schools, A National Debate February 18-20. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- LARZELERE, R.E. AND JOHNSON, B. 1999. "Evaluation of the effects of Sweden's Spanking Ban on Physical Child Abuses," *Psychology Rape*. 12 (54): 15-16.
- MCCORD, J. 1991. "Questioning the value of punishment," *Social Problems*. 38(2): 190-200.
- ROHNER, R.P., KEAN, K.J. COURNOYER, D. 1991. "Effects of corporal punishment, Perceived Caretaker Warmth and Cultural Beliefs on the psychological adjustment of children in St. Kitts, West Indies," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 19 (25):40- 45.
- STRAUS, M.A. 1991. "Discipline and Deviance: Physical punishment of children and violence and other crime in adulthood," *Social Problems*. 38 (2): 205-206.
- WAUCHOPE, B.A. AND STRAUS M.A. 1990. "Physical punishment and physical abuse of American Children: Incidence rates by age, gender and occupational class," In: Straus MA Gelles RJ (Eds), *Physical Violence in American Families*, New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- WRIGHT, B.D. 1999. *Fundamental measurement for psychology a new rules of measurement: What every psychologist and educator should know*, Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- GERSHOFF, E.T. 2002. "Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviours and experiences: A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review." *Psychological Bulletin*. 128(4): 539-579.
- MORRELL, R. 2001. "Corporal punishment in South African schools: A neglected explanation for its persistence." *South African Journal of Education*. 21(4): 03.
- SLEE, R. 1995. *Changing theories and practices of discipline*, Falmer Press, London.

- ROSEN, L. 1997. *School Discipline: Best practices for administrators*, Corwin Press Thousand Oaks, California.
- CANTER, L. 2000. *Assertive discipline in Childhood*, Edwards Eds., *Classroom Discipline and Management*, 3rd Ed, John Wiley & Sons, MA, USA.
- KOCHANSKA, G. AND THOMPSON, R.A. 1997. "The emergence and development of conscience in toddlerhood and early childhood," in JE Grusec and L Kuczynski, Eds., *Parenting and Children's Internationalisation of Values*, PP: 53-77, Wiley, New York.
- CANTER, L. 1989. "Assertive discipline more than names on the board and marbles in a Jar," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71: 57-61.
- STRAUS, M.A. SUGARMAN, D.B. AND GILES-SIMS. 1997. "Corporal Punishment by parents and subsequent antisocial behaviour of children," *The Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*. 155: 761-767.
- STERNBERG, K.J., LAMB, M.E., AND ET. AL. 1993. "Effect of domestic violence on children's behaviour problems and depression" *Development Psychology*. 29: 44-52.
- STRAUS, M.A. 1994. *Beating the Devil out of Them: Corporal Punishment in American Families*, New Lexington Press, San Francisco.
- BHATIA, R. AND MAHAJAN, V. 2008. "Elimination of Corporal Punishment in Schools: Bane or Boon." *Journal of Indian Education*. 34(1):28-38.
- STRAUS, M.A. AND MATHUR, A.K. 1995. *Corporal punishment and children's academic achievement*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Society, San Francisco.
- STRAUS, M.A. AND PASCHALL, M.J. 1998. *Corporal Punishment by Mothers and Child's Cognitive Development: A longitudinal Study*. Paper presented at the 14th world conference of sociology, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, Durham, NH: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.
- BREZINA, T. 1998. "Teenage violence towards parents as an adaptation to family strain: Evidence from a National Survey of Male Adolescents." *Youth and Society*.30:416-444.
- DURRANT, J.E. 2000. "Trends in Youth Crime and Well-Being since the Abolition of Corporal Punishment in Sweden." *Youth and Society*. 31: 437-455.