



Western Michigan University  
ScholarWorks at WMU

---

Masters Theses

Graduate College

---

12-1980

## A Study of Opinions Related to Corporal Punishment: 1980

Susan J. Walz  
*Western Michigan University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses)



Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

---

### Recommended Citation

Walz, Susan J., "A Study of Opinions Related to Corporal Punishment: 1980" (1980). *Masters Theses*. 1918.

[https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters\\_theses/1918](https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/masters_theses/1918)

This Masters Thesis-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact [wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu](mailto:wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu).



A STUDY OF OPINIONS RELATED  
TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: 1980

by

Susan J. Walz

A Thesis  
Submitted to the  
Faculty of The Graduate College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts  
Department of Education and  
Professional Development

Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, Michigan  
December, 1980

A STUDY OF OPINIONS RELATED  
TO CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: 1980

Susan J. Walz, M.A.

Western Michigan University, 1980

A traditional method of correcting errant behavior of young children has been the use of corporal punishment in the home and 'in loco parentis' in our public schools. Corporal punishment as a disciplinary method, stands on historical precedent and continued social practice, having found its way to America as part of Old World tradition and Puritan theology.

In an attempt to assess current opinion regarding corporal punishment in the schools, a twenty-two-item questionnaire, based on contemporary child development theory, was developed. Responses of two hundred eighty-one teachers and student teachers were studied for the purpose of finding differences in various sub-sets of professionals and pre-professionals in Southwest Michigan.

Data gathered indicate a shift toward more positive methods of classroom discipline from those less humane. In comparison with earlier studies, there is more objection to the use of corporal punishment than there has been in the past; however, agreement with the use of physical force as a disciplinary technique still exists.

No significant difference between the opinions of teachers and opinions of student teachers was found. There was, however, a significant difference in the opinions of male and female subjects; males had less objection to corporal punishment.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Deep appreciation is extended to the Chairperson of my thesis Committee, Dr. Mary Cain, whose insights proved invaluable. Deep appreciation is also extended to the other members of the Committee, Dr. Dorothy Bladt and Dr. Robert Brasher, for their continued encouragement and counsel.

Sincere thanks is given to my family and friends for their support and understanding.

Susan J. Walz

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

**This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.**

**The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.**

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.**
- 5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.**

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

1316095

WALZ, SUSAN JANE  
A STUDY OF OPINIONS RELATED TO CORPORAL  
PUNISHMENT: 1980.

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY, M.A., 1980

University  
Microfilms  
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Definition of Terms.....	1
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
III. RELATED RESEARCH.....	13
IV. PROCEDURES.....	30
V. DATA ANALYSIS.....	33
VI. DISCUSSION.....	38
VII. CONCLUSION.....	41
APPENDICES.....	43
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	54

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table

I	NEA Elementary Teacher Opinion, By Sex, Favoring Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Measure For The Years 1960 and 1969.....	16
II	Procedural Restrictions Mentioned In the 1977 Reports.....	26
III	Distribution of Scores.....	32
IV	Range and Comparison of Teachers and Student Teachers Agreement With Statements Related to Appropriate Discipline for Young Children.....	33
V	Responses of Males and Females.....	33
VI	Comparison of Scores of 20- to 30-Year Olds and 30- to 40-Year-Olds As to Agreement With Statements Depicting Democratic Disciplines.....	34
VII	Responses of Males and Females to Two Specific Statements.....	35
VIII	Comparison of Male Responses From the 1960 and 1969 NEA Surveys with Data of the Present Study.....	36
IX	Comparison of Female Responses From the 1960 and 1969 NEA Surveys with Data of the Present Study.....	36



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The present investigation includes new information derived from a questionnaire regarding opinions about the use of corporal punishment (as a form of discipline) in the public schools. The questionnaire was used to gain responses from teachers and student teachers concerning appropriate discipline for young children.

Following the upsurge of interest in the 1960's regarding the battered-child syndrome, many publications have supported the need for society to address the issue of children's discipline. Various authors (Helfer and Kemp, 1968; Gil, 1975; Walters, 1975; Valusek, 1974) state that a child suffers psychological and emotional trauma when subjected to the continual threat of or actual non-accidental physical punishment.

Unfortunately, discipline and punishment are often thought to mean the same thing. Confusion between definitions and the traditional use of physical punishment have supported the use of various forms of corporal punishment in the home and at school. Corporal punishment in the schools has caused controversy. The use of corporal punishment in the home has not been as great an issue. The question still remains, however, if the rod is spared, will the child be spoiled?

#### Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this thesis, corporal punishment is defined

as the intentional "infliction of pain by a teacher or other educational official upon the body of a student as a penalty for doing something which has been disapproved of by the punisher" (Wineman and James, 1967, in Hyman and Wise, p. 4). Usually, one thinks of spanking or striking a child with the hand or with a paddle as a method of corporal punishment. Standing a child in the corner of a room for an extended period of time, or confining a child in an uncomfortable space, are examples of situations producing excessive discomfort. Forcing a child to eat a substance foreign to oral ingestion can be included as causing excessive discomfort.

The term "child abuse" is defined here as the "intentional, non-accidental use of physical force, or intentional, non-accidental acts of omission, on the part of a parent or other caretaker interacting with a child in his care, aimed at hurting, injuring or destroying that child" (Gil, 1975, p. 6).

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The issue of corporal punishment is still with us. The purpose of this study was to find whether some of the more negative notions of classroom discipline have changed in favor of more democratic methods. Some educators believe that a child needs force in order to learn. Such a belief has been kept alive throughout the history of American education, being perpetuated by the notion that children are an inferior part of society.

Corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure stands on grounds of historical precedent and social practice. The literature shows that corporal punishment found its way to America as part of Old World tradition and Puritan theology. Piele (1977) describes the use of corporal punishment in the Massachusetts Bay Colony during the seventeenth century as stemming from traditional methods used prior to colonization. Though there had been a glimmer of uniqueness surrounding various groups making their way to America (differences in blood lines, language, religion, customs, and agriculture), the basic forms of Colonial culture existing along the eastern seaboard were dominated by Old World English tradition. Along with the caste system of social order came the element of the English family system derived from the early Roman family system. Legally, the husband and father was master of his family. The wife and children were subservient to the master.

The search for religious freedom brought the Puritans to the

shores of New England. Others, with differing religious convictions, were not tolerated by the Puritans and were driven out of the area. Class prejudices and religious interests were reflected in the schools, further supporting Old World tradition and practice. Schools in the colonies were conceived as instruments for the propagation of religious faith, to preserve and instill existing social and economic patterns, just as were the schools of England.

The Puritan view held that people were basically weak, sin-ridden creatures with little or no capacity for independent moral behavior. Puritan governors believed that they reflected God's ultimate authority, destined to lead the sinful on paths of righteousness. Attitudes toward children were repressive. Life during this time was austere for all, and there was an insistence on conformity to the moral and ethical code based on purely religious sanction. Due to the severity and strictness of the day, children's joy and laughter were suppressed. A child was considered evil and doomed to eternal damnation unless he or she were seen as the progeny of the innately depraved creature called "man". Reform required proper training to develop good habits. Education, according to John Calvin, was to be "a complete regimentation of the child to suppress his evil nature and build good living and thinking" (Walker in Piele, 1977, p. 111).

Parents' rod-enforced training of children was transferred to the school which assumed authority over the children. The master of the school acted in loco parentis, following the rules like those drawn up for the Free Town of Dorchester in 1645 which gave impetus to Calvin's method of education:

...and because the Rodd of correction is an ordinance of God necessary sometymes to bee dispenced unto children...it is therefore ordered and agreed that the schoolmaster for the tyme beeing shall have full power to minister correction to all or any of his schollars without respect of p'sons according as the nature and qualitie of the offence shall require whereto, all his schollars must bee duley subject and no parent or other of the Inhabitants shall hinder or goe about to hinder the master therein.

(Walker in Piele, 1977, p. 211)

Puritanism, as described by Piele, was based on strict adherence to the Puritans' interpretation of God's rule, allowing for the formation of a theocratic government with highly autocratic control. Church and state were joined in the effort to enforce the value and obedience of authority. The Puritans believed that human beings were evil by nature, and that innate human evil had to be suppressed. They found support for their beliefs in the Bible. Any Puritan parent who may have had second thoughts about the righteousness of rod-enforced discipline for their children could look to the Bible for reassurance. "Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child, but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him" (Proverbs 22:15).

James (1963) offers further reference to the Bible as advocating corporal punishment, noting that the book of Proverbs contains several such statements. Proverbs 13:24, the King James version, states: "he that spareth the rod hateth his son; he that loveth him chasteneth him betimes." Proverbs 19:18 suggests that one must "Chasten thy son while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." The pondering Puritan parent needed to question no further after reading Proverbs 23:13-14 which advise "Withhold not correction from

the child; for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shall beat him with the rod and shall deliver his soul from hell." Another bit of reinforcement for the use of physical punishment relies on the guilt feeling of the parent: "A rod and reproof give wisdom: but a child left unto himself bringeth his mother to shame" (Proverbs 29:15).

The governors developed a system of instruction that would perpetuate Puritan doctrine and values through extended knowledge of the scriptures. Such fundamentalist thought has endured the ravages of time and still carries influence today.

Piele (1979) notes that not all early colonists subscribed to the same point of view regarding corporal punishment. Although the Society of Friends used corporal punishment in their schools, physical punishment did not receive the same importance as it did in the Puritan schools. Quakers did not view children as being essentially depraved and did not see the need to govern them by fear of God or authority. School overseers demonstrated the need to show children love and respect by recommending, in 1796, that "the children under your care be governed, as much as possible by love. This will make the use of the Rod in a good degree, unnecessary, and will induce the Children to love and respect rather than to fear" (J. Straub, 1965, p. 451). Rules dealing with student behavior were printed and placed in the Quaker schools. Such rules were periodically read publicly.

The Society of Friends chose to see children as amoral, not immoral. Rules of schools contained no mention of consequences, though there were disciplinary measures for misbehavior. The Quakers

took steps toward positive reinforcement to encourage scholarship. Students were participators, not just receptors. It was common in the Friends' schools to see student newspapers and 'premiums' or 'awards' given as extra incentives.

Thus, contrasting and conflicting religious and educational philosophies developed early in American culture.

The views of parents and educators regarding the use of corporal punishment have not changed much over the years. Friedman and Hyman (in Hyman and Wise, p. 157) suggest that, "Today those feelings continue to be securely embedded in the minds of what is probably a large percentage of educators, students, and laymen." Newspapers provide us with glaring reports of corporal punishment. In an editorial supporting the Supreme Court decision on Ingraham vs. Wright, a West Virginia newspaper describes children as "being born into this world as wild and unruly little animals who have to be trained in order to fit into a civilized society" (Martinsburg Journal, 1977, in Hyman and Wise, p. 157). In Virginia, a newspaper took an informal poll of its readers to determine the local attitude toward corporal punishment. The results of their survey showed an equal number both for and against the practice (Norfolk Star Ledger, 1977, in Hyman and Wise, p. 157).

Others look on corporal punishment as a form of child abuse. Friedman and Friedman assert that discipline and punishment are not synonymous.

Some parents and teachers who are strict disciplinarians seldom resort to punishment. Some punitive parents and teachers are poor disciplinarians. The aim of discipline is to provide the child with outside control until he or she can develop the inner or self-control necessary to function as a mature adult. Punishment

is what adults resort to when discipline fails.

(Friedman and Friedman in Hyman and Wise, 1979, p. 337)

Friedman and Friedman correlate the detrimental effects of corporal punishment with the negative aspects of Erikson's early states of development (Erikson, 1950). On the positive side of Erikson's early stages we find that trust, autonomy, initiative, industry, and identity may develop. Friedman and Friedman see corporal punishment as stimulating mistrust, shame, and doubt, guilt, inferiority, and role confusion. A child striving for a sense of autonomy is sometimes seen as a threat to a teacher's control techniques. Corporal punishment reinforced a child's feeling of shame and doubt. In an attempt to develop initiative, to move out in the world, children often meet with a teacher's inability to accept such independent development. Here again, the authors suggest that corporal punishment will reinforce the negative aspects of development, making the child doubt abilities and feel guilt for trying. A feeling of wanting to learn, to accomplish, and to work is often squelched when corporal punishment is used. In the struggle for identity, a child is confused. Should the teacher be unable to adjust to changing classroom roles, relationships, or interactions and so rely on corporal punishment as a means of discipline, the child will receive the message that might makes right.

Not only do teachers stifle children by the use of corporal punishment, but they stifle their own growth as well. By closing other avenues to appropriate discipline, the teacher fails to develop optimal behavior standards for the classroom, and loses the ability



to develop and model a variety of alternative coping and/or controlling systems. There is no mutual respect, since the use of physical punishment promotes the teacher as all-powerful and the student as power-less. The students lose respect for the teacher and internalize a feeling of lowered self-esteem. Some students are not encouraged to develop self-control and, instead, submit to being controlled.

Friedman and Friedman feel that there needs to be increased public and professional awareness concerning injuries to children resulting from the use of corporal punishment.

Paddling and other forms of corporal punishment...  
...may cause tissue damage and we believe that  
any punishment which causes such damage clearly  
falls in the category of child abuse.

Corporal punishment is one teacher-child  
interaction harmful to children. Corporal  
punishment inhibits learning, interferes  
with accomplishment of each of the important  
developmental tasks of children and their  
teachers, and has the potential for physical  
harm to the child. Corporal punishment  
should be considered as child abuse and pro-  
hibited in all our schools.

(Friedman and Friedman in Hyman  
and Wise, 1979, p. 340)

Public interest was aroused in the early 1960's when Kempe confirmed that some children were literally being battered by their caretakers. Curiosity and concern for children subjected to such inhumane treatment brought sincere attempts to identify the problem and ways to help prevent child abuse. Eleven years after the public had been exposed to the battered-child syndrome, federal legislation enacted Senate Bill 1191 into law. This 1973 law makes reporting of all alleged child abuse a mandatory procedure. All 50 states are

in compliance with the federal legislation and have enacted their own state mandatory reporting laws. The Child Abuse Protection Act was passed in the state of Michigan in 1975.

The movement to protect children in the United States was interrupted by a decision from the Supreme Court supporting the use of corporal punishment in the schools. With laws to protect children from physical abuse and the decision to use corporal punishment, the inconsistency of legalities heightened. Gertrude Williams notes that

...it is obvious that the extent of violence against children at school and at home is irrationally denied in the face of evidence. Violence against children by parents and teachers is discipline; violence against parents and teachers by children is assault. A teacher's lack of discipline--it is the least competent teachers who resort to corporal punishment--is magically transformed into discipline. A child who strikes a teacher creates disorder; a teacher who strikes a child creates order in the classroom.

(Williams in Hyman and Wise, 1979, p. 35)

Several factors are prominent contributors to the frustrations of classroom management and discipline. Over-crowded classrooms can add to confusion and student misbehavior; inadequate facilities or equipment add to general discontent resulting in stressful situations; teacher fatigue is a prime cause of poor attitudes toward students, poor coping capabilities, and classroom mismanagement; under-paid teachers often fail to have the necessary dedication to and interest in their position, and parent/community support of the use of corporal punishment in the schools will continue to perpetuate the ancient, yet traditional idea that children are to be subservient to adults.

It is unrealistic, however, to assume that teachers are any more immune to the pressures that lead to the use of physical force as a disciplinary method than are parents. We have no assurance that a parent, teacher, or administrator using physical force as a disciplinary measure, is in enough control of his or her feelings to be able to separate personal feelings from the offense and the degree of force used to alter a child's behavior. There is a fine line between child abuse and corporal punishment; there are those who see no separation at all.

Teachers' right to defend themselves from attack or to stop vandalism is often used irrationally to justify the need for physical coercion of students. It is commonly known that younger, elementary-age children are most often the recipients of corporal punishment. Is it not easier to strike (abuse, if you will) a smaller child than one nearly adult-size who might strike back? Opposition to corporal punishment is not opposition to discipline of disruptive students. It is ironic, though, that the use of corporal punishment is often the method used to teach children respect for authority. Is this the result of failing to separate the meanings of the words discipline and punishment? Discipline ought to promote internal self-control, self-direction, and efficiency of the student or individual. Punishment, on the other hand, refers to outside control: physical control or coercion of the student or individual.

Psychologist John E. Valusek feels that violence is taught through the use of physical force on our young. Valusek contends that the use of spanking by parents or teachers promotes the notion that violence

against another is legitimate behavior. The use of physical force very often tends to reduce chances for effective influence. Most damaging is the development of low self-esteem. Frequent use of corporal punishment has been shown to be strongly associated with the development of a low self-image in children (Coopersmith (1967) and Rosenberg (1965)). In addition to promoting the development of a poor self-image, the use of physical punishment does nothing to help one learn about constructive ways to resolve conflict. What is learned is that the way to react to force and violence is to hit back in a more powerful way. Those who hit are doing nothing but reinforcing the belief that might makes right. It is sad that the impulse to hit is even acceptable and perpetuated in our schools. One principal, responding to the National Education Association Task Force on Corporal Punishment, said "When I found that I was hitting smaller kids harder than bigger kids, I realized I'd better stop hitting kids" (NEA Report of the task force on corporal punishment, 1972, p. 14).

The value of the use of corporal punishment remains an issue of debate. There are still many individuals who see the use of physical force to correct misbehavior as being the only way; there are many others who view the use of physical force as extremely debilitating for the development of a healthy classroom atmosphere not to mention the adverse affects on a child. The use of physical force gives ammunition to the notion that "might makes right".

### CHAPTER III

#### RELATED RESEARCH

Studies have looked at the status of corporal punishment in the public schools. It is in use in some school districts in the country and was further condoned as a disciplinary measure by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1977.

The National Education Association presented a report of the Task Force on Corporal Punishment in 1972. The Task Force has reviewed literature, made on-site visits to schools, interviewed many educators, and gathered, examined, and evaluated all the reasons it could identify that support or oppose the use of corporal punishment in the schools. The conclusion of the Task Force was that, "The weight of fact and reasoning was against infliction of physical pain as an attempt to maintain an orderly learning climate" (NEA Report of the task force on corporal punishment, 1972, p. 7). The NEA Task Force recommended that corporal punishment be abolished. The following recommendations were offered as ways to bring about change in the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary method. It was recommended that:

1. All educators move immediately to phase out, over a one-year period beginning with the 1972-73 school year, infliction of physical pain upon students, except for the purposes of restraint or protection of self or other students.
2. The National Education Association takes an official position opposing the infliction of physical pain upon children for the purposes of discipline and calling a time schedule for its elimination in all schools.

3. The National Education Association propose and support the adoption of model state legislation for outlawing corporal punishment. It should urge and assist its state affiliates to achieve that end.
4. The National Education Association, through its Center for Human Relations and Division of Instruction and Professional Development, and state and local education associations, assist members in securing the minimal conditions necessary for dealing with disruption and in identifying and developing alternatives to inflicting physical pain on students.
5. The National Education Association and state and local education associations move, through negotiation or other means, to secure for all teachers released time during the school day so they can obtain the in-service education necessary to routinely utilize alternative methods of maintaining discipline.
6. The National Education Association establish a Task Force at least half of whose members are students, to develop packages presenting alternative methods, for use by state and local education associations, school systems, and teach education institutions in in-service or pre-service programs.  
(Report of the Task Force on Corporal Punishment, NEA, 1972, pp. 3-4)

It should be noted here that the NEA Task Force's Investigation of the rationale and results of corporal punishment limited the definition of corporal punishment to the infliction of physical pain upon a student. The use of physical restraint or of psychological punishment were not considered in the study, nor did the Task Force take a position on whether the exclusive use of physical punishment is an effective form of discipline.

Previous surveys by the NEA Research Division offered other insights into the recommendations of the Association to abolish corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure. In 1960, the NEA Research

Division found that 71.6 percent of public school teachers surveyed favored the use of corporal punishment in the elementary school. Nearly twenty-two percent disapproved of the use of corporal punishment and 6.6 percent had no opinion. By 1969, little change had occurred. The later NEA nation-wide survey again asked if teachers favored the judicious use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure. Elementary teachers responded 65.7 percent in favor of the use of corporal punishment; 24.5 percent were against the use of corporal punishment, and 9.8 percent replied that they had no opinion. Of the secondary teachers surveyed in 1969, 66.2 percent favored corporal punishment in the elementary grades, 23.6 percent opposed its use in the lower grades, and 10.2 percent were uncertain.

Another interesting finding of both the 1960 and 1969 surveys was that a higher percentage of men than women favored the use of corporal punishment at both the elementary and secondary levels. At the elementary level, fewer women than men were in favor of corporal punishment in both surveys. From 1960 to 1969, the decrease in support of corporal punishment was more noticeable among women than among men. Table I summarizes responses of male and female teachers answering the 1960 and 1969 surveys regarding the use of corporal punishment at both lower and upper school levels.

The recommendations of the National Education Association to phase out the use of corporal punishment and to use non-physical methods of disciplining children have failed to have an effect on a determined effort to eliminate the use of physical punishment. A later study, conducted by the NEA in 1975, showed that 67 percent of

its members were still in favor of the use of corporal punishment in elementary schools, and 45 percent favored its use in secondary schools.

Table I  
NEA Elementary Teacher Opinion, by Sex, Favoring  
Corporal Punishment as a Disciplinary Measure  
For the Years 1960 and 1969

MALE OPINION			FEMALE OPINION		
	1960	1969		1960	1969
YES	78.0%	73.6%	YES	69.2%	61.5%
NO	15.0%	18.2%	NO	24.4%	27.8%
NO OPINION	7.0%	8.2%	NO OPINION	6.4%	10.7%

A 1968 survey, conducted by the Office of Research for the Pittsburgh Board of Education, requested knowledge about the use of corporal punishment in the classroom. The instrument used was a twenty-one item questionnaire distributed to Pittsburgh teachers through their building principals. The 72.8 percent return provided some interesting facts, such as: 60 percent of the responding teachers hit children at least once a year; 61 percent of the responding teachers wanted the privilege of using corporal punishment at their own discretion. Sixty percent of the responding teachers felt that inservice training was needed to provide for more effective ways of dealing with problem children.

A survey of educators was mandated by the state of California during the 1972-73 school year. Analysis of the corporal punishment survey revealed that 46,022 cases of corporal punishment had been



recorded. Of these, 10,000 of the children affected were in Kindergarten or the Primary grades.

A study requested by the Pennsylvania State Board of Education in 1975 has been described as being one of the best designed surveys of corporal punishment to date. Completed by Reardon and Reynolds, the study answers questions concerning corporal punishment in Pennsylvania public schools at the time. Situations in which teachers said they needed to use corporal punishment included:

Continual disruptive behavior in class.

Physical assault on a school employee.

Insubordination.

Physical assault on another student.

Disrespect.

Disobedience.

Fighting.

Continual disruptive behavior was cited by parents, principals, administrators, teachers, and School Board presidents as the situation in which corporal punishment should be used.

Provisions were made for comments regarding this study. Some of the comments made by teachers include:

I do not believe that this survey really will bring out how teachers really feel about the situation at present. Try eliminating compulsory attendance for the misfits and you will have good schools. Give the 'hoods' apprentice training.

or

I believe we must have the right to use corporal punishment. I am also convinced it must be used more wisely than what I have

observed in my 19 years experience. Its proper usage depends on the offense, age of the student, and whether other punishments have proven to be effective. It also depends on the individual teacher.

(Reardon and Reynolds in Hyman and Wise, 1979, pp. 320 and 324)

Of the 292 school districts in Pennsylvania responding to the survey, 269 districts did permit the use of corporal punishment; 16 districts prohibited its use; and seven school districts were not certain as to the status of corporal punishment in their districts. A conscientious approach was indicated by most districts to develop policies on discipline defining who may be hit, what parts of the body may be hit, what striking implement may be used, and the amount of bare skin to be exposed. Frivolous or frequent use of this kind of punishment was discouraged, but the availability of this type of punishment was desired. The use of corporal punishment was supported on the basis of the following beliefs:

It will cause changes in behavior.

Students learn self-discipline from it.

It can be less harmful than some other forms of humiliation.

There are situations where it is the most appropriate technique.

It is the only thing that will work with some students.

There is no harmful effect on student attitudes.

(Reardon and Reynolds in Hyman and Wise, 1979, p. 325)

While the NEA Task Force recommended the abolition of corporal punishment during the 1972-73 school year, these studies (Pittsburgh,

California, and Pennsylvania) support the notion that corporal punishment is still being used in American schools. Further evidence of the approved use of corporal punishment was made clear by the 1977 United States Supreme Court decision involving the case of Ingraham vs. Wright.

The case of Ingraham vs. Wright developed from a situation in Dade County, Florida. The statutes of Florida, and the policies and regulations of the Dade County Board of Education permitted (and still do) the use of corporal punishment. The plaintiff in the case, James Ingraham, alleged a severe beating. Ingraham received twenty swats with a paddle, causing a painful hemotoma requiring medical treatment. The boy was advised by the doctor to stay inactive and therefore remained at home for eleven days. The twenty swats were given Ingraham for failure to respond immediately to a teacher's instruction.

Another student, Roosevelt Andrews, also received physical damage requiring medical treatment. The Andrews boy was unable to use his wrist and arm as a result of physical punishment. This incident was not the first for Andrews. During one year at Drew Junior High, Andrews had been paddled ten times including four times within a twenty-day period.

In 1971, a three-count complaint was filed in United States District Court. Two counts requested damages for personal injuries resulting from paddling incidents to Ingraham and Andrews. The third count was a class action suit seeking to stop the use of corporal punishment in the Dade County school system, on behalf of all students of that system. Willie J. Wright, principal of Drew Junior High

School; Lemmie Deliford, assistant principal; Solomon Barnes, an assistant to the assistant principal; and Edward L. Whigham, superintendent of the Dade County school system, were named as defendants on each of the three counts filed. The court granted a defense motion for dismissal, ruling on count three that the plaintiffs had no right to relief, and on counts one and two that there was not sufficient evidence to go to the jury. All three counts were dismissed without hearing any evidence on behalf of the school authorities. The case was appealed.

On July 29, 1974, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the dismissal ruling of the District Court. Further proceedings resulted in an affirmation of the earlier judgment of the District Court. The Court held that the cruel and unusual punishment clause did not apply to corporal punishment in the schools.

On April 19, 1977, the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, in a five-to-four decision, that corporal punishment should be allowed as a disciplinary tool in the public schools. It was decided that corporal punishment did not constitutionally constitute cruel and unusual punishment. Children disciplined in this manner by an educator, the Court held, would not be granted protection by the Eighth Amendment. The 1977 decision of the Supreme Court reaffirmed the earlier Court of Appeals decision, supporting the use of physical force as a disciplinary measure in the schools and ignoring the Eighth Amendment as a protection for children subjected to its use. It was also decided at the time of this ruling that students have no constitutional right to due process under the Fourteenth Amendment to

determine whether punishment administered by an educator is justified.

The Supreme Court decision sparked controversy again. Should we or shouldn't we? Will we or won't we use physical force to maintain our idea of appropriate behavior in the classroom? Public and professional opinion remains sharply divided on this issue, not only in the United States, but in other countries as well. However, the practice of corporal punishment has been banned in many other countries such as: the Soviet Union, the Philippines, Belgium, Denmark, Austria, Japan, Norway, Holland, Luxembourg, France, Italy, and Sweden. The Swedish Parliament not only banished corporal punishment from its schools, but also voted to banish the use of "corporal punishment or any other degrading treatment" of children by parents in the home (Kalamazoo Gazette, February 1980, p. 2).

The U.S. Supreme Court decision (1977) simply preserved the right of each state to develop its own rules and regulations concerning the discipline of school children. It is possible for a state totally to reject the use of corporal punishment in its schools; the state may leave the decision up to each individual school district; or the state may simply support the freedom to use corporal punishment in the schools. The meaning of the Supreme Court decision is very vague. It was a five-to-four decision, with a strong argument for the continuation of corporal punishment. Though no evidence was presented, the personal perceptions of Justice Powell gave firm support for the continued use of corporal punishment in the schools:

The schoolchild has little need for the protection of the Eighth Amendment. Though attendance may not always be voluntary, the public school remains an open institution. Except perhaps when very young,

the child is not physically restrained from leaving school during school hours; and at the end of the school day, the child is invariably free to return home. Even while at school, the child brings with him the support of family and friends and is rarely apart from teachers and other pupils who may witness and protest any instances of mistreatment.

The openness of the public school and its supervision by the community afford significant safeguards against the kinds of abuses from which the Eighth Amendment protects the prisoner. In virtually every community where corporal punishment is permitted in the schools, these safeguards are reinforced by the legal constraints of the common law. Public school teachers and administrators are privileged at common law to inflict only such corporal punishment as is reasonably necessary for the proper education and discipline of the child; any punishment going beyond the privilege may result in both civil and criminal liability. As long as the schools are open to public scrutiny, there is no reason to believe that the common law constraints will not effectively remedy and deter excesses such as those alleged in this case.

(Ingraham vs. Wright, supra, p. 1412  
in Hyman and Wise, 1979, pp. 185-6)

To date, two states have abolished the use of corporal punishment in their educational systems. Both Massachusetts and New Jersey prohibit the use of corporal punishment. Article I of New Jersey's legislation (New Jersey 18A: 6-1) includes the statement that "...no person employed or engaged in a school or educational institution shall inflict or cause to be inflicted corporal punishment upon a pupil attending such school or institution." Massachusetts legislation states that, "The power of the school committee to maintain discipline upon school property shall not include the right to inflict corporal punishment on any pupil" (Massachusetts General Laws, C71, 5, p. 376). Limited use of corporal punishment is allowed in Maryland and Maine. An article in the Public School Laws of Maryland indicates that, regardless of any regulations approved by the Board of Education, the

administrators in twenty-one of its twenty-four counties may use corporal punishment. The Criminal Code of Maine mandates that a student cannot be corporally punished, but physical force may be used in order to control a disturbance or remove a disorderly student. Just what constitutes a disturbance is dealt with on an individual basis.

Several cities have abolished the use of corporal punishment. Chicago, New York, Washington, D.C., Pittsburgh, and Baltimore are among the larger ones cited. Los Angeles had abandoned the use of corporal punishment, but in February of 1980 the practice was reinstated. According to an article by Clive Cookson in the Times Education Supplement (3327: 15), the Los Angeles Board of Education voted four-to-one to resume paddling in the city's elementary and junior high schools. The article goes on to say that paddling is described as the traditional method of corporal punishment in the United States--involving the use of a paddle-like wooden implement with which to spank an errant student. The restoration of paddling in Los Angeles follows a five-year ban on the use of corporal punishment. Clarkson notes that Roberta Weinstraub, President of the Los Angeles Board of Education, said the decision to reinstate such disciplinary measures reflected parental feelings. A Parent Teacher Association survey showed that parents involved with 267 Los Angeles schools favored the use of corporal punishment, while parents involved with 38 Los Angeles schools opposed its use. There was strong support for the reinstatement of corporal punishment from inner-city Black and Hispanic parents. The reinstatement of corporal punishment in the Los Angeles schools included strong restrictions regarding its use, including:

No more than one to three swats for any one incident.

Paddling can only be carried out by a senior teacher.

Another member of the staff must be present as a witness.

Other pupils are not to witness the spanking.

The paddling is to be administered by paddle to the buttocks through normal clothing.

(Cookson, Times Education Supplement, 3327: 15)

Three studies were carried out over a six-year period (Brown, 1971; New Jersey Department of Education, 1976; and Friedman and Hyman, 1977) in an attempt to discern the status of corporal punishment in the United States. These studies were made prior to the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court regarding the use of corporal punishment in the schools. The Brown study (1971) examined state statutes regarding corporal punishment; the New Jersey Department of Education study (1976) examined the wording of all state legislation concerning corporal punishment; and the Friedman and Hyman study examined various dimensions of legislation dealing with corporal punishment. Concern for the welfare of students in our educational system prompted studies such as these, yet the issue of corporal punishment is still unsettled.

The Friedman and Hyman study involved all fifty states. A letter was sent to the commissioner of education in each state, requesting a copy of the law in their state which dealt with corporal punishment. Thirty-six states replied. A second letter was sent to the fourteen states that had not replied. A total of forty-eight responses were received and the information is summarized here (see Table II).



In addition to Massachusetts and New Jersey, Maryland and Maine have abolished the use of corporal punishment, except in rural counties of Maryland, and physical force can be used to quell a disturbance in the schools of Maine. The results of the 1977 study show that sixteen states were noncommittal on the issue of corporal punishment. Six of these states, however, did issue qualifying statements indicating limitations on the use of corporal punishment. Kansas and Kentucky noted that, while the rights of the teacher and school officials to administer corporal punishment must be upheld, limitations on the use of corporal punishment require that students are accorded minimal procedures of due process. The states of Idaho and West Virginia were reported to follow "in loco parentis" guidelines. Missouri and Wyoming commented that local school boards have been given the authority to make the needed rules and regulations necessary to maintain school discipline.

The remaining thirty-six states indicated that they allow the use of corporal punishment in their schools. Thirty of these states authorize the classroom teacher to use such disciplinary measures; twenty of the thirty states authorize school administrators and teachers; nine of the states also authorize other certified employees; and two of the states also permit non-certified employees the use of corporal punishment. It is interesting to note too, that there are six states permitting the teacher--but not an administrator--to use corporal punishment. Some states have written procedural safeguards for the use of corporal punishment. Apparently, some individuals must believe that as long as there are procedural safeguards and limitations to the use of corporal punishment, any potential harm to children will be prevented.

Some of the procedural restrictions mentioned in the 1977 reports include:

Table II  
Procedural Restrictions Mentioned In the 1977 Reports

RESTRICTIONS	NUMBER OF STATES
Statements requiring that punishment be administered in a reasonable manner.	16
Deadly force may not be used.	1
Punishment may not be administered with undue anger.	2
A child cannot be hit in the head or face.	1

The other thirty states did not indicate restrictions regarding the use of corporal punishment other than to limit who may use it.

One of the states requiring "reasonable" corporal punishment is Georgia. In 1977, the Atlanta Constitution reported, "A music teacher in Americus, a city outside Plains, seems to have overlooked that procedural requirement. When her class became unruly, she gave them a choice--the writing of a sentence one hundred times or five licks with a paddle. Twelve children in this elementary class chose the latter. Consequently, "...the teacher was faced with a \$5,000 damage suit (Friedman and Hyman in Hyman and Wise, 1979, p. 164).

According to the School Code of the State of Michigan, corporal punishment is permitted as a means of discipline. The School Code of 1955 states:

340.755 Physical force to take possession of dangerous weapons from pupils (M.S.A. 15.3755).

Sec.755 Any teacher or superintendent may use physical force as may be necessary to take possession from any pupil of any dangerous weapon carried by him.

History: Add. 1964, p. 595, Act 290, Eff. Aug. 28.

340.756 Physical force to maintain proper discipline over pupils (M.S.A. 15.3756).

Sec.756 Any teacher or superintendent may use such physical force as is necessary on the person of any pupil for the purpose of maintaining proper discipline over the pupils in attendance at any school.

History: Add. 1964, p. 595, Act 290, Eff. Aug. 28.

340.757 Liability for use of physical force; gross abuse (M.S.A. 15.3757).

Sec.757 No teacher or superintendent shall be liable to any pupil, his parent or guardian in any civil action for the use of physical force on the person of any pupil for the purposes prescribed in sections 755 and 756 of this act, as amended except in case of gross abuse and disregard for the health and safety of the pupil.

History: Add. 1964, p. 595, Act 290, Eff. Aug. 28.  
(State of Michigan General School Laws, 1973)

In 1974, the Michigan Department of Education issued a Recommendation Guide to Student Rights and Responsibilities in Michigan. The guide was written to show how local boards of education might effectively formulate student rights and responsibilities in order that:

- 1) each district promulgate a written code of student conduct
- 2) make public and accessible to all students and parents, and

- 3) within the document, define as precisely as possible student rights and responsibilities, including unacceptable student behavior and penalties to be imposed when such behavior is exhibited.

Guideline number 7, Corporal Punishment, states that, "While existing law is quite specific regarding such authority, many districts have established conditions and circumstances modifying or restricting the use of Corporal Punishment (Michigan Department of Education, A recommended guide to student rights and responsibilities, 1974, p. 21). The booklet did not indicate which school districts restricted physical punishment but indicated that some districts have specified what form of discipline may be used as punishment; that corporal punishment be used only by the principal; and that corporal punishment be used only as a last resort. This 1974 booklet further states that some school districts in Michigan have totally rejected the use of corporal punishment. However,

It should be pointed out that the school's use of corporal punishment as much or more than any other function is contained within the traditional doctrine of 'in loco parentis'. School officials are advised, therefore, to specify in their student codes of conduct how corporal punishment will be administered. The amount of force that is used must be reasonable and should reflect on the viability, legal, political and educational implications of such use.

(Michigan Department of Education,  
A recommended guide to student  
rights and responsibilities, 1974, p. 21)

Whether or not the use of corporal punishment continues in the schools depends on a change of attitude toward its use. Levine and Shane conducted a study at Indiana University during the 1976-77 academic year. Approximately 1,000 questionnaires were sent to

public school teachers; three hundred sixty responses were received. Analysis of the data showed 46 percent opposing the use of corporal punishment, except as a response to bodily assault. Exactly 100 teachers responding to the questionnaire indicated opposition to the use of corporal punishment regardless of student misbehavior. Perhaps there exists a trend toward more humane treatment of students requiring discipline for misbehavior. However, the Supreme Court decision and the attitudes supporting the traditional use of corporal punishment as a means of discipline continue to give credence to acts of aggression.

The NEA Task Force recommendation that corporal punishment be abolished as a disciplinary measure in the public schools was made in 1972. The impact of the NEA recommendation was not strong enough to bring about the elimination of corporal punishment in the public schools. Reports are still being made as to how many children were spanked in a particular school building or district.

Is corporal punishment still the favored way to deal with problem behavior in the classroom? It is important to determine current opinion concerning the use of physical force as a means to correct problem behavior. Just what is teacher attitude toward discipline in the classroom? Is there a difference in attitude between teachers and potential teachers? Could there be a difference among males and females regarding the use of physical force as a method of classroom discipline? Is there evidence of a need for further teacher training regarding discipline for the classroom?

## CHAPTER IV

### PROCEDURES

A questionnaire was developed to answer these questions and assess the current attitudes of teachers and student teachers concerning appropriate discipline for young children.

Statements that reflect the authoritarian style of classroom management or the democratic style of classroom management were developed for the questionnaire. From the many statements developed, twenty-two statements were selected to appear on the questionnaire. The advice of experts in child development was used to eliminate less desirable statements.

The authoritarian statements reflect the dominance and control an authoritarian teacher might exhibit; the democratic statements capture the openness and fairness a democratic teacher might use.

Examples are:

- Item 9) "Physical punishment is often the only disciplinary measure a young child understands." an authoritarian statement.
- Item 2) "Good discipline should ultimately lead to the child's ability to govern his or her self." a democratic statement.

A teacher and student teacher population was needed to accomplish the purpose of this study. The questionnaire was used to gather current opinions that might indicate continued support for the use of corporal punishment in the schools or support for the use of more democratic methods of classroom management.

Professors in the Department of Education and Professional Development at Western Michigan University were asked to participate in administering the questionnaire to graduate classes composed mainly of teachers, and to student teacher seminars. Approximately ten staff members were able to administer the questionnaire to the appropriate groups. A cover letter explained the intent of the questionnaire (See Appendix A).

A total of two hundred eighty-one individuals responded to the questionnaire. One hundred thirty-four were teachers; one hundred thirty-three were student teachers; while fourteen individuals indicated neither designation. There were eighty-four males and one hundred ninety-six females among the respondents. (One individual did not indicate sex.) The variable of gender was selected to make possible comparison with the NEA surveys of 1960 and 1969.

Each item on the questionnaire was originally scored by using numbers one through five to designate: strong agreement (1); moderate agreement (2); no opinion (3); moderate disagreement (4); and strong disagreement (5). The lowest possible score was 22 and the highest 110. The weights of statements favoring good discipline were reversed so that the higher the score, the more agreement with positive discipline and the lower the score, the less agreement with democratic methods. A lower score indicated a greater tendency toward corporal punishment; a higher score meant the subject viewed corporal punishment with less favor.

Table III  
Distribution of Scores

Range	Frequency	Percentage
55-58	2	0.7
58-61	2	0.7
61-64	4	1.4
64-68	3	1.1
68-71	9	3.2
71-74	16	5.7
74-77	21	7.5
77-81	29	10.3
81-84	41	14.6
84-87	37	13.2
87-90	37	13.2
90-94	49	17.4
94-97	19	6.8
97-100	8	2.8
100-104	4	1.4
	<u>281</u>	

These scores are fairly normally distributed with a slight negative skewness.

Comparisons were made between teacher and student teacher responses; male and female responses; and between the 20- to 30-year-old age group and the 30- to 40-year-old age group. A summary of teacher, student teacher, and male and female responses can be found in Appendix B.



CHAPTER V  
DATA ANALYSIS

Table IV shows the results of a comparison by test of teacher and student teacher responses. There was no significant difference between responses of the two groups.

Table IV  
Range and Comparison of Teachers and Student  
Teachers Agreement With Statements Related to  
Appropriate Discipline for Young Children

Subjects	N	Range	Mean	s	t	p
Teacher	134	55-101	84.14	8.941		
					1.016	NS
Student Teacher	133	61-103	85.20	8.107		

Table V summarizes the comparison between male and female responses.

Table V  
Responses of Males and Females

Subjects	N*	Range	Mean	s	t	p
Males	84	55-104	78.73	8.99		
					8.469	.001
Females	196	61-103	87.39	7.30		

\*One subject did not indicate sex, and was therefore eliminated from this comparison. Females are far more positive than males regarding the responses to these items.

Table VI compares the results of the 20- to 30-year-old age group and of the 30- to 40-year-old age group.

Table VI

Comparison of Scores of 20- to 30-  
Year-Olds and 30- to 40-Year-Olds  
As to Agreement with Statements  
Depicting Democratic Disciplines

Group	N	Range	Mean	s	t	p
20 to 30	203	61-103	83.92	8.69		
					1.102	NS
30 to 40	52	55-104	85.42	9.18		

As Table VI shows, there was no significant difference in responses by age. Five age ranges were used, but only the two groups shown in Table VI were large enough to consider for analysis of data.

A more direct assessment of specific attitudes toward corporal punishment was made, using two statements from the questionnaire. The statements used for further analysis were:

Item 10) "Although physical punishment must be repeated again and again, it is an efficient way to maintain order in the classroom."

Item 11) "Physical punishment or humiliation may in the long run be the best thing for the child."

Table VII shows the degree of agreement and disagreement with these two statements.

Table VII  
Responses of Males and Females  
to Two Specific Statements

Statements	MALES		FEMALES	
	Agree	Disagree	Agree	Disagree
ITEM 10. "Although physical punishment must be repeated again and again, it is an efficient way to maintain order in the classroom."	23.8%	58.3%	7.1%	88.2%
ITEM 11. "Physical punishment or humiliation may, in the long run, be the best thing for the child."	19.1%	65.4%	9.2%	83.6%

Items 10 and 18 of the present study are similar to questions raised by the NEA Surveys of 1960 and 1969. An appropriate comparison is made by interpreting agreement with the Items of this study as favoring corporal punishment and disagreement with the Items as opposition to corporal punishment. The NEA surveys asked for "yes" or "no" responses to corporal punishment. The following two tables show the comparison of opinions by sex.

Table VIII

Comparison of Male Responses From the 1960  
and 1969 NEA Surveys with Data of the Present Study

Male Opinion	1960	1969	1980	
			Item 10	Item 18
Agreement with corporal punishment	78.0%	73.6%	23.8%	19.1%
Disagreement with corporal punishment	15.0%	18.2%	58.3%	65.4%
No opinion	7.0%	8.2%	17.8%	15.5%

Table IX

Comparison of Female Responses From the 1960  
and 1969 NEA Surveys with Data of the Present Study

Female Opinion	1960	1969	1980	
			Item 10	Item 18
Agreement with corporal punishment	69.2%	61.5%	7.1%	9.2%
Disagreement with corporal punishment	24.4%	27.8%	88.2%	83.6%
No opinion	6.4%	10.7%	4.6%	7.1%

These tables indicate a change of attitude over the past twenty years. There is still a disparity of attitude between the males and the females, but both groups show more disagreement with corporal punishment than subjects of earlier studies.

Responses regarding teacher preparation in the Pittsburgh study of 1968 and the present study were compared. Sixty percent of the Pittsburgh teachers surveyed said they needed in-service training in order to deal more effectively with problem behavior in the classroom. The present study asked respondents whether "My undergraduate classes prepared me adequately for understanding classroom discipline." Two hundred twenty-four respondents (79.7%) disagreed. Inadequacy of preparation was registered more often by teachers (89.5%) than by student teachers (73.7%). Though this comparison is not exact, since statements from the two studies are not identical, it allows us to conclude that teachers feel inadequately prepared for classroom discipline.

## CHAPTER VI

### DISCUSSION

The majority of respondents to this study indicated a move away from the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure. Teachers and student teachers favored democratic statements regarding discipline in the classroom. No significant difference was found between the opinions of the teachers and the opinions of the student teachers responding to the questionnaire. It can be said, however, that the current attitude of individuals responding to this study favors more positive forms of discipline.

It is heartening to notice a possible trend opposing the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary technique in the classroom. The past twenty years have shown the growth of more humanistic attitudes toward children. We have come a long way from the whipping post in the middle of the classroom, but there is still much to be done to eliminate the use of physical force in the educational system. It is difficult to break with tradition.

The comparison of responses by sex showed a significant difference. Both males and females were in agreement with the statements demonstrating more democratic discipline and both groups indicated disagreement with the two specific statements regarding corporal punishment. However, there is a difference in the degree to which the males and the females responded. Studies have shown (Sears, 1951; Bandura, 1973) that males behave more aggressively than females. In our

culture, boys have been shown to employ more direct physical aggression (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974) than girls, having learned that behavior as part of their traditional sex role. Girls have been reported (Feshbach, S. 1970) to express aggressive feelings in a less direct way. A piercing glance is as intrusive as a slap. The greater preference of male subjects for corporal punishment may be due, in part, to learned aggression as part of their role.

Traditionally, males have dominated decision making in American schools. It may be revealing for future research to determine whether there is a connection between the continuation of traditional methods of teacher control and who usually applies the paddle.

It would be helpful to find out just how many of the teachers or administrators still favoring and, in fact, using corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure, were severely punished by their parents or caretakers. We learn from behavior modeled for us and use the same methods of discipline that were used on us. Perhaps there should be a method of screening to eliminate as potential teachers those college students coming from an abusive background.

The comparison of male and female responses to this study, and the NEA surveys of 1960 and 1969 is encouraging however. Respondents to this study demonstrate a trend toward more positive discipline by teachers. It should be noted here that the NEA surveys were national surveys and the present study was done in a small segment of Southwest Michigan. Another nationwide survey of the issue is called for. Given the past and present data, we may find that the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary technique will soon be a part of history rather than a part of the present.

The need for further teacher preparation regarding classroom discipline was called for twelve years ago by the teachers of Pittsburgh responding to a survey on discipline. Nearly all of the respondents to the present study indicated a need for more specific training related to classroom discipline. What can be done about this? It appears that all colleges and universities involved in teacher education might take a closer look at how classroom discipline is being presented to their students. Perhaps a class dealing specifically with classroom discipline and its related problems would more adequately prepare the teacher of the future.

Fair discipline and encouragement of student self-control are indicative of a democratic classroom. Absolute teacher control and lack of control both defeat the development of a child's self-worth. Children need to develop confidence in their ability to control their own behavior. Roberts gives this advice:

Recognize that each child has a separate timetable for learning. The only rule is that children function best when they are respected and supported, not forced.

(Roberts. May, 1980, p. 60)



## CHAPTER VII

### CONCLUSION

In so far as the findings of this study are valid, we may conclude that progress has been made toward more humane treatment of children in schools. Public awareness of the phenomenon of child abuse and neglect has brought attention to the inhumane treatment of children. According to law, all states now have reporting procedures for suspected cases of child abuse and neglect. Another law has granted all states the option to use corporal punishment in their schools. These two laws contradict each other when it comes to the protection of young children. We perpetuate violent behavior by reinforcing the hitting habit. Children learn what is modeled for them. We want children to be able to cope with themselves and with society in productive ways. Showing a child that "might makes right" is not the best way to encourage respect for self or others.

Corporal punishment, as a disciplinary method in some of our public schools, tends to reinforce a child's anxiety, hostility, and feelings of inadequacy. The use of physical force to solve behavior problems encourages misbehavior as a way for a child to get attention and it supports the use of violence to solve disagreements. Violence is common in our society. We do not need to condone acts of aggression in our educational systems by allowing the use of corporal punishment to continue.

Further studies need to be made to determine just how far we have come from the old wooden paddle. Teacher attitudes toward children

and classroom discipline ought to be re-evaluated to determine whether there is a trend away from the use of various forms of physical punishment in the schools. Have more school districts eliminated the option to use corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure, or have more districts reinstated such an option? There are many questions to be answered as the incendiary issue remains.

Appendix A  
Cover Letter

February, 1980

Dear Educator:

As part of my work towards a Master's Degree in Early Childhood Education at Western Michigan University, I am studying opinions concerning appropriate discipline for young children.

Although the literature gives many opinions concerning discipline, it seldom considers the problems of teachers and student teachers. That's what makes your opinions so important.

I would be grateful if you would take just a few minutes to complete the attached questionnaire.

The results of this study will be shared with teacher educators, giving an opportunity for them to discuss current trends related to discipline, and to provide more helpful training for teachers and student teachers.

Your responses will be treated confidentially. Thank you for helping.

Sincerely,

Susan J. Walz

## Findings

The statements and responses to each are as follows:

Table III  
Summary of Responses to Questionnaire Items

ITEM 1) Children behave better in a positive and encouraging environment.					
RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	101	30	--	2	1
Student Teacher	101	29	2	1	--
Total	202	59	2	3	1
Male	49	31	2	1	1
Female	163	31	--	2	--
Total	212	62	2	3	1
ITEM 2) Good discipline should ultimately lead to the child's ability to govern his or her self.					
RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	101	27	1	3	2
Student Teacher	89	41	1	2	--
Total	190	68	2	5	2
Male	54	28	--	1	1
Female	144	45	2	4	1
Total	198	73	2	5	2

## ITEM 3) Disciplined young children are orderly and quiet.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	9	50	11	49	15
Student Teacher	14	45	17	40	16
Total	23	95	28	89	31
Male	5	38	11	26	4
Female	18	65	17	66	30
Total	23	103	28	92	34

## ITEM 4) If we allow young children to be free of classroom rules they will eventually govern themselves.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	2	7	3	32	90
Student Teacher	8	11	7	46	60
Total	10	18	10	78	150
Male	3	7	2	28	44
Female	7	12	8	53	115
Total	10	19	10	81	159

## ITEM 5) Discipline for boys ought to differ from discipline for girls.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	4	5	5	40	80
Student Teacher	--	11	9	26	87
Total	4	16	14	66	167
Male	2	11	9	24	38
Female	2	5	5	46	138
Total	4	16	14	70	176

ITEM 6) The teacher's method of discipline must demonstrate respect for each child's unique personality.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	65	52	2	9	6
Student Teacher	63	50	6	9	5
Total	128	102	8	18	11
Male	22	40	5	13	4
Female	113	65	3	9	6
Total	135	105	8	22	10

ITEM 7) Young children from lower socio-economic backgrounds tend to require stricter discipline.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	10	34	12	52	26
Student Teacher	8	27	29	38	31
Total	18	61	41	90	57
Male	6	22	14	28	14
Female	12	39	27	74	44
Total	18	61	41	102	58

ITEM 8) Teachers help young children foresee the consequences of their behavior by the threat of corporal punishment.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	3	21	15	57	38
Student Teacher	3	18	33	37	42
Total	6	39	48	94	80
Male	3	17	26	29	9
Female	3	23	25	69	76
Total	6	40	51	98	85

ITEM 9) Physical punishment is often the only disciplinary measure a young child can understand.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	10	38	6	48	32
Student Teacher	9	17	9	47	51
Total	19	55	15	95	83
Male	12	23	4	27	18
Female	7	35	11	73	70
Total	19	58	15	100	88

ITEM 10) Although physical punishment must be repeated again and again, it is an efficient way to maintain order in the classroom.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	7	8	11	34	74
Student Teacher	4	16	9	31	73
Total	11	24	20	65	147
Male	7	13	15	22	27
Female	4	10	9	44	129
Total	11	23	24	66	156

ITEM 11) A teacher who can keep order in the classroom is a good teacher.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	11	38	20	36	29
Student Teacher	19	46	10	41	17
Total	30	84	30	77	46
Male	17	21	12	21	13
Female	15	68	18	58	37
Total	32	89	30	79	50

ITEM 12) Reinforcement of good behavior will diminish misbehavior.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	37	85	4	6	2
Student Teacher	35	80	7	11	--
Total	72	165	11	17	2
Male	20	50	7	7	--
Female	57	120	4	13	2
Total	77	170	11	20	2

ITEM 13) The less punitive and more rewarding the teacher is, the more successful the learning environment will be.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	39	61	12	16	5
Student Teacher	49	61	13	8	2
Total	88	122	25	24	7
Male	19	33	15	11	4
Female	75	92	13	13	3
Total	94	125	28	24	7

ITEM 14) Even young children should expect to have reasons for the rules they must obey.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	68	51	6	6	3
Student Teacher	82	39	8	4	--
Total	150	90	14	10	3
Male	31	46	6	1	--
Female	129	47	8	9	3
Total	160	93	14	10	3



ITEM 15) Young children learn to respect others when they themselves have been treated with respect by understanding adults.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	89	41	--	2	2
Student Teacher	92	34	4	2	1
Total	181	75	4	4	3
Male	40	35	2	6	1
Female	151	40	2	1	2
Total	191	75	4	7	3

ITEM 16) Young children respect an adult who uses strict methods of discipline.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	14	53	16	45	6
Student Teacher	19	44	25	29	16
Total	33	97	41	74	22
Male	22	37	8	14	3
Female	14	65	36	61	20
Total	36	102	44	75	23

ITEM 17) When the teacher has to rely on the threat of corporal punishment, the young child can make a choice between right and wrong.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	4	11	42	45	30
Student Teacher	2	14	37	44	35
Total	6	25	79	89	65
Male	5	10	32	26	11
Female	1	16	49	67	60
Total	6	26	81	93	71

ITEM 18) Physical punishment or humiliation may, in the long run, be the best thing for the child.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	4	10	14	42	64
Student Teacher	3	14	12	32	72
Total	7	24	26	74	136
Male	6	10	13	33	22
Female	1	17	14	40	124
Total	7	27	27	73	146

ITEM 19) The degree of discipline required should determine who, of the teaching or administrative staff, shall do the disciplining.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	12	53	27	25	17
Student Teacher	21	42	35	23	12
Total	33	95	62	48	29
Male	11	35	17	11	10
Female	26	61	46	41	22
Total	37	96	63	53	32

ITEM 20) Effective planning is a prerequisite to effective discipline.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	80	42	7	4	1
Student Teacher	76	44	5	7	1
Total	156	86	12	11	2
Male	44	29	7	4	--
Female	122	60	5	7	2
Total	166	89	12	11	2

ITEM 21) Young children learn responsibility by having it given to them a bit at a time.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	75	47	9	3	--
Student Teacher	58	66	6	3	--
Total	133	113	15	6	--
Male	37	39	6	2	--
Female	105	78	9	4	--
Total	142	117	15	6	--

ITEM 22) Teacher/pupil planning of classroom limits creates better behavior.

RESPONSE:	SA	MA	NO	MD	SD
Teacher	48	68	8	6	4
Student Teacher	57	51	15	6	3
Total	105	119	23	12	7
Male	16	38	10	14	5
Female	95	84	13	1	2
Total	111	122	23	15	7

Teacher Total = 134

Student Teacher Total = 133

Unmarked Total = 14

281 Total Observations

## Appendix C

## Questionnaire Used for 1980 Study

## OPINIONS CONCERNING APPROPRIATE DISCIPLINE FOR YOUNG CHILDREN

The following statements reflect opinions with which you may or may not agree. There are no right or wrong answers. Please mark each statement with a choice to show how you feel.

1 STRONG      2 MODERATE      3 NO      4 MODERATE      5 STRONG  
AGREEMENT      AGREEMENT      OPINION      DISAGREEMENT      DIS-  
AGREEMENT

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Children behave better in a positive and encouraging environment.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. Good discipline should ultimately lead to the child's ability to govern his or her self.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. Disciplined young children are orderly and quiet.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. If we allow young children to be free of classroom rules they will eventually govern themselves.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. Discipline for boys ought to differ from discipline for girls.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. The teacher's method of discipline must demonstrate respect for each child's unique personality.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. Young children from lower socio-economic backgrounds tend to require stricter discipline.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. Teachers help young children foresee the consequences of their behavior by the threat of corporal punishment.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. Physical punishment is often the only disciplinary measure a young child can understand.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. Although physical punishment must be repeated again and again, it is an efficient way to maintain order in the classroom.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. A teacher who can keep order in the classroom is a good teacher.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. Reinforcement of good behavior will diminish misbehavior.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. The less punitive and more rewarding the teacher is, the more successful the learning environment will be.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. Even young children should expect to have reasons for the rules they must obey.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 15. Young children learn to respect others when they themselves have been treated with respect by understanding adults.

- \_\_\_\_ 16. Young children respect an adult who uses strict methods of discipline.
- \_\_\_\_ 17. When the teacher has to rely on the threat of physical punishment, the young child can make a choice between right and wrong.
- \_\_\_\_ 18. Physical punishment or humiliation may, in the long run, be the best thing for the child.
- \_\_\_\_ 19. The degree of discipline required should determine who, of the teaching or administrative staff, shall do the disciplining.
- \_\_\_\_ 20. Effective planning is a prerequisite to effective discipline.
- \_\_\_\_ 21. Young children learn responsibility by having it given to them a bit at a time.
- \_\_\_\_ 22. Teacher/pupil planning of classroom limits creates better behavior.

Please answer the following appropriately.

Sex: male 84 female 196 No Response 1

Age: 20-30 203 30-40 52 40-50 19 50-60+ 6  
No Response 1

Currently employed: Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Years of teaching experience \_\_\_\_\_.

Grade currently taught \_\_\_\_\_.

I teach (or taught) in a Public School 198 Private school 13  
Pre-school/public 3 Pre-school/private 3  
Day Care 3 Middle school 12  
High school 17 Elementary school 15

School location: Urban 67 Suburban 75 Rural 116  
No Response 23

School size \_\_\_\_\_ District size \_\_\_\_\_

Where did you earn your teaching degree? 205 WMU; 66 Other

During your Undergraduate program, in what classes did you learn most about discipline? \_\_\_\_\_

My undergraduate classes prepared me adequately for understanding classroom discipline. Yes 37 No 224 No Response 20

I am currently a Student Teacher. Yes 133 No 134  
No Response 14

Total 281

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bandura, A. Aggression: a social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Brenton, Myron. A further look at corporal punishment. Today's Education, November-December, 1978, 67, 52-55.
- Brown, Joan G. Law and punishment: Status of state statutes. Clearing House, 1971, 46, 106-109.
- Cookson, C. Corporal punishment returns. Times Education Supplement, March 14, 1980, 3327, 15.
- Costa, Joseph J., and Nelson, Gordon K. Abuse and Neglect: Legislation, reporting, and prevention. Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1978.
- Discipline and learning: An inquiry into student-teacher relationships. National Education Association of the United States, Research Division. Washington: NEA, 1977.
- Dollar, Barry. Humanizing Classroom discipline, a behavioral approach. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.
- Erickson, E. Childhood and society. New York: W.W. Norton, 1950.
- Falk, Herbert Arnold. Corporal punishment. New York: Columbia University Press, 1941.
- Feshbach, S. Aggression in P. Mussen (Ed). Carmicheal's Manual of Child Psychology. New York: John Wiley, 1970.
- Flygare, Thomas J. Schools and the law. Phi Delta Kappan, January 9, 1978, 59, 347-348.
- Friedman, R. and Hyman, I. An analysis of state legislation regarding corporal punishment. Proceedings: Conference on corporal punishment in the schools. National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 20, 1977.
- Gil, David G. Violence against children: Physical child abuse in the United States, (2nd ed.). Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Gilmartin, Brian G. The case against spanking. Human Behavior, February, 1979, pp. 18-23.

- Glasser, William. Disorders in our schools: Causes and remedies. Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1978, 59, 331-333.
- Gnagey, William J. The psychology of discipline in the classroom. London: Collier-MacMillan Limited, 1968.
- Hawkins, Vincent J. The negativism of corporal punishment. The Clearing House, January, 1976, 49, 223-226.
- Helfer, Ray E., and Kempe, C. Henry, (Eds.). The battered child. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Helfer, Ray E., and C. Henry Kempe. Child abuse and neglect: The family and the community. Massachusetts Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.
- Hentoff, Nat. Teachers who beat up kids. Kalamazoo Gazette Family Weekly, March 18, 1979, 4-6.
- Hyman, Irwin A., and Wise, James H. Corporal punishment in American education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1979.
- James, Keith Franklin. Corporal punishment in the public schools. Los Angeles: University of southern California, 1963.
- Levine, Mary Ann. Are teachers becoming more humane? Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1978, 59, 353-354.
- Macoby, E.E., and Jacklin, C.M. The psychology of sex differences. California: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Mahon, J. Patrick. Ingraham v. Wright: The continuing debate over corporal punishment. Journal of Law and Education, October, 1977, 6, 473-479.
- Massachusetts General Laws, C71, 5, 376.
- Michigan Department of Education. A recommended guide to student rights and responsibilities in Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Department of Education, 1974.
- NEA Research Bulletin. National Education Association Research Division. 48, 49, Washington: NEA, 1970.
- New Jersey Department of Education, NJSA, 18A, 6-1.
- Piele, Phillip K. Neither corporal punishment cruel nor due process due: The United States Supreme Court's decision in Ingraham v. Wright. Journal of Law and Education, January, 1978, 7, 1-19.

Report of the task force on corporal punishment. National Education Association of the United States. Washington: NEA, 1972.

Roberts, Francis. You and your child's teacher; How to get along. Parents, March, 1980, pp. 57-60.

Rothman, Esther R. Troubled teachers. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1977.

Rovetta, Catherine, Humbarger, and Rovetta, Leon. Teacher spansks Johnny: A handbook for teachers. California: The Willon House, 1968.

Ryan, Patrick J. Historical foundations of public education in America. California: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1975.

Sears, P.S. Doll play, Aggression in normal young children: Influence of sex, age, sibling status, father's absence. Psychological Monograph, 1951, 65(6), IV, 42.

Segal, Julius, and Yahraes, Herbert. A child's journey. New York: McGraw-Hill Co., 1978.

State of Michigan General School Laws, 1973. Legislative Service Bureau for the State Board of Education.

Straub, J. Quaker school life in Philadelphia before 1800. The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography, 89 (October, 1965), p. 451.

Turner, Jeffrey S., and Helms, Donald B. Life Span Development. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Co., 1979.

Valusek, John E. Some ways of thinking about human behavior. Kansas: McCormick-Armstrong Co., Inc., 1971.

Walters, David R. Physical and sexual abuse of children: Causes and treatment. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Weber, Evelyn. Early childhood education: Perspectives on change. California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1970.

Whiteside, Marilyn. School discipline: The ongoing crisis. The Clearing House, December, 1975, 48, 160-162.

Zigler, Edward, and Hunsinger, Susan. Viewpoint, Supreme Court on spanking: Upholding discipline or abuse? Young Children, September, 1977, 32, 14-15.