

https://dspace.org/

Teachers' and pupils' attitudes and practices regarding the abolishment of corporal punishment in schools in the Gauteng area.

Cohen, Sheryl

1996

http://hdl.handle.net/10539/22852

Cohen, Sheryl (1996) Teachers' and pupils' attitudes and practices regarding the abolishment of corporal punishment in schools in the Gauteng area, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, <http://hdl.handle.net/10539/22852>

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

administered was also open to subjective interpretation and resulted in children being punched, pinched, slapped, kicked and belittled (Rice, 1987). In terms of the instrument used, Rice's study showed that the cane was most often used in the case of boys, but being kicked occurred third most regularly in schools in the Johannesburg area. Weiss (in Holdstock, 1987) found that in schools in Bophuthatswana, sticks were used most often followed by the sjambok and fanbelt. In a letter to The Star Newspaper (Leeuw, 1985), a teacher writes "in actuality, the regulations are broken more often than adhered to. Caning is seldom resorted to 'after full inquiry by the principal' ... in fact he is often unaware of the matter" (p. 6).

It is clear, therefore that the laws governing corporal punishment did not protect children from unjust caning. This alone served as justification for its abolishment. As Holdstock (1987) says, the only protection against its harmful effects is to abolish it.

New Policy On Corporal Punishment

In June 1995 the constitutional court abolished corporal punishment for juveniles. Delivering his judgement, Judge Langa said that:

"It is a practise which debases everyone involved in it ... it is inhuman and it is degrading. No compelling interest has been proved which can justify the practice. Nor has it been shown to be a significantly effective deterrent ... its effect is likely to be coarsening and degrading rather than rehabilitative" (Langa, 1995, p. 42).

This ruling applied specifically to the judicial system, but clause 3(n) of the National Education Policy Bill (1995) outlaws both physical and psychological abuse of students at educational

morally correct when used for social control, and particularly favoured in the classroom.

Furthermore, in South Africa, Corporal punishment, until 1994 was overtly sanctioned by law. The Legal regulations governed the type of offence, the point of contact, the time between hidings, the number of strokes, the age of the child, the sex of the child, the nature of the instrument, the procedure for caning, and even the manner in which it was to be administered.

The type of offence included: "grave neglect of work, truancy, insubordination, wilful damage to property, flagrant lying, theft, dishonesty, assault, bullying, indecency, or any other breach of discipline established after full inquiry by the principal" (Olmesdahl, 1984, p. 533). Corporal punishment could only be administered by the principal or in his presence. The buttocks was accepted as the appropriate point of contact with a cane not exceeding 75 cm in length and 1.2 cm in diameter. A leather strap of not less than 2.5 cm in width was also permitted. Corporal punishment was not to cause permanent bodily injury and no more than four strokes in one day was permitted. It was required to record in a register the names of the pupil and the teacher who did the punishing, the offence, the number of strokes, the instrument used and the date. In no case was corporal punishment allowed to be administered to any girl, or to any pupil with a serious physical disability, and only in the Transvaal were nursery school children excluded from corporal punishment (Olmesdahl, 1984)

While these regulations aimed to provide fair protection against unjust caning, many aspects of the law were vague and open to subjective interpretation. This resulted in children being caned 'legally' for being late for school, failing a test, making a noise, not doing homework, and so the list goes on (Holdstock, 1987). The manner in which corporal punishment was

This study explores teachers' and pupils' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment, considering the fact that Rice (1987) found, in the not too distant past, overwhelming support for its use. This study also explores whether teachers' practices are in line with the governments' policy and what alternatives to corporal punishment teachers use and whether teachers and pupils see these as effective in the classroom.

The focus of this research is thus on a new view of classroom discipline which seems to be the path upon which the Gauteng Education Department is embarking. This study hopes to elicit teachers' and pupils' suggestions of effective alternatives to corporal punishment. It also hopes to uncover the gap between policy and practice, and what steps are necessary in facilitating effective classroom discipline in order to bridge this gap.

In order to investigate these issues it is necessary to review the change in South Africa's education policy, and to review the body of literature on corporal punishment, both of which support its abolishment.

Literature Review

Past Practices of and Policy on Corporal Punishment

For centuries, educators have used corporal punishment (Benthall, 1991; Manning 1959, Pallas, 1973). It was considered necessary in order to maintain discipline, to educate children, to reform characters, and even to expel "the foolishness bound up in the heart of the child" (Radbill, 1968, p. 3). The biblical dictum to "spare the rod and spoil the child" (Proverbs, 13:24) has been used as the sanction for corporal punishment, and "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth" (Exodus, 21:24) as the justification for retribution. Thus violence has been seen as

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> "Good old-fashioned discipline was bad for both teachers and students in the good old days, and it remains so today" (Hyman & D'Alessandro, 1984, p. 41)

Researchers from the 1920s to the 1990s have shown that there is no scientific basis for justifying the use of corporal punishment (Benthall, 1991; Hentoff, 1973; Holdstock, 1985; Skinner, 1953; Thorndike, 1931). Moreover, abundant evidence indicates the detrimental effects of it (Boonin, 1979; Boren & Coleman, 1970; Bryan & Freed, 1982; Eron, Walder & Lefkowitz, 1970; Holdstock, 1987). Despite the evidence, however, corporal punishment has been used for centuries, and in some countries, continues to be used today (Manning, 1959; Pallas, 1973; Radbill, 1968). In South Africa, Rice's (1987) study found that not only was corporal punishment considered an acceptable means of classroom discipline, but the treatment of choice for the majority of white educators in the Johannesburg area. Furthermore, corporal punishment had been overtly sanctioned by law in South Africa. The change of government (April 1994), however, marked the beginning of major political, judicial and educational changes. Judicial corporal punishment was abolished in June 1995, and the use of corporal punishment in the classroom has become unconstitutional. While these policy changes are in line with the development of a human rights culture, teachers' and pupils' attitudes and practices with regard to the abolishment of corporal punishment need to be investigated considering the overwhelming support for its use in the past (Rice, 1987).

using a battery of alternatives, but despite this, they believe that corporal punishment should not be abolished and that it should be available as a last resort.

Teachers' attitudes were compared across gender, level of training, school type and years of experience. Private school teachers' attitudes appeared to be more in line with the aims of the new policy on corporal punishment than community and public school teachers. College trained teachers were more at odds with current policy than university trained teachers. Most teachers felt the need for further training in the area of classroom discipline.

Pupils' attitudes were compared across gender, standard and school type. No significant differences were found.

Thus results of this study suggest that more education about corporal punishment as well as effective alternatives are needed in order to bring teachers' attitudes and practices in line with the new policy which abolishes corporal punishment in schools.

ABSTRACT

Educationalists throughout the ages have supported the belief that corporal punishment creates harmful effects and should be avoided at all costs. Furthermore, corporal punishment has been found to be neither effective nor permanent in stopping undesirable behaviour in the classroom.

Despite the evidence however, South Africa frequently used corporal punishment for the sake of discipline, social control and even 'moral education'. In the not too distant past, it was sanctioned by law, by parents and by teachers (Rice, 1987). However, in 1994 judicial corporal punishment was outlawed and corporal punishment at schools became unconstitutional (clause 3(n) of the National Education Policy Bill, 1995; clause 22 of the Gauteng Schools Education Bill).

While policy and legislation must play their role, this is not enough to bring about a change in the practices and perceptions of teachers at the grass roots. An understanding of its harmful effects, and recognition of alternatives is necessary in order to bring about its complete abolishment. This study investigates teachers' and pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment as well as what discipline strategies are being used and are considered effective.

A sample of teachers and pupils were randomly selected from private, community and public high school types. A total of 602 subjects participated in this study (240 teachers and 362 pupils). Responses to an anonymous questionnaire were tabulated and analysed.

Findings demonstrated that teachers are ambivalent towards corporal punishment, while pupils are clearly anti-corporal punishment and support its' abolishment. Teachers do report

Key Words: corporal punishment, classroom discipline, aternative discipline strategies used in the classroom.

CHAPTER		Page no
4	DISCUSSION	46
	Interpretation of Results	46
	Teachers	46
	Pupils	50
	Teachers and Pupils	51
	Implications and Recommendations	53
	Limitations	55
	REFERENCES	56
	APPENDIX A	63
	APPENDIX B	70
	APPENDIX C	76
	APPENDIX D	78
	APPENDIX E	80
	APPENDIX F	83
	APPENDIX G	85
	APPENDIX H	86
	APPENDIX I	88
	APPENDIX J	89
	APPENDIX K	92
	APPENDIX L	93
	APPENDIX M	94
	APPENDIX N	95

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page no
	Acknowledgements	ii
	Abstract	viii
	Table 3.1	35
	Figure 3.1	32
	Figure 3.2	34
	Figure 3.3	40
	Figure 3.4	42
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Literature Review	2
	Past Practices of and Policy on Corporal Punishment	2
	New Policy On Corporal Punishment	4
	Harmful Effects of Corporal Punishment	6
	Alternative Methods of Classroom Discipline	9
	Conclusion	14
2	THE STUDY	16
	Rationale for the Study	16
	Aims of the Study	19
	Method	20
	Subjects	20
	Measures	21
	Procedures	24
	Research Design	25
3	RESULTS	26
	Quantitative Results	26
	Teacher Variables	26
	Pupil Variables	35
	Qualitative Results	43
	Teachers	43
	Pupils	44

DEDICATION

To my husband and my parents for your love, endless support, encouragement and patience.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the following people for their assistance in the preparation of this research report.

My warm and sincere thanks go to my supervisor, Mandia Mentis at the Division of Specialised Education, Department of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, who has shown care and concern in supervising me and in so doing has taught me so much.

The Gauteng Education Department for granting me permission to administer the questionnaires.

The principals, teachers and pupils of the various schools who participated so willingly and whose co-operation made this study possible.

The Centre for Science Development, (HSRC, South Africa) for their financial assistance towards the cost of this research. Opinions expressed and conclusions reached are those of the author and are not to be attributed to the Centre for Science Development.

My sincere thanks go to Lawrence for his help on the computer, and to my family who have endured my studies with cheerful tolerance and have shown pride in my accomplishments.

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own, unaided work. It is being submitted for the degree of Master of Education (Educational Psychology) at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination at any other university.



S. Cohen

May 1996

TEACHERS' AND PUPILS' ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN SCHOOLS IN THE GAUTENG AREA

Sheryl Cohen

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Education, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Master of Education degree.

While policy and legislation must play their role, this is not enough to bring about a change in the practices and perceptions of teachers at the grass roots. An understanding of its harmful effects, and recognition of alternatives is necessary in order to bring about its complete abolishment. In Gauteng, the first steps in finding alternatives to corporal punishment were taken (August 1995) through the Member of the Executive Council (MEC) for Education. A subcommittee was established to work on the foundations for launching a campaign on alternatives to corporal punishment in 1996. In a proposal for the campaign, the subcommittee points out the importance of investigating the views of those teachers and pupils at the grass roots. After all, if legal policies and academic theories are going to debate the issues and suggest alternatives without the views of those directly involved, then the law will be defied where possible, and the campaign will be an exercise in futility.

Thus, this study focuses on the attitudes and practices of those teachers and pupils at the grass roots level of education.

significant role. This included a massive information campaign, similar to what is proposed above.

5. Establishing legitimate and representative structures at all levels in the system to sustain the programme.

6. A tentative budget for the campaign is also proposed.

The legal provision which outlaws corporal punishment and the campaign on alternatives to corporal punishment are the first steps towards protecting the interests and rights of the child. As part of the way forward, it is important to investigate and incorporate those who are directly affected by the change in education policy. If legal policies and academic theories are going to debate the issues and suggest alternatives without the views of those at the grass roots, then the law will be defied where possible, and the campaign will be an exercise in futility.

Conclusion

In summary, general agreement exists that corporal punishment creates harmful effects and that it should be avoided at all costs. Furthermore, corporal punishment has been found to be neither effective nor permanent in stopping undesirable behaviour.

Despite the evidence, however, South Africa frequently used corporal punishment for the sake of discipline, social control, and even 'moral education'. It was sanctioned by law, teachers and by parents. However, in April 1994 judicial corporal punishment was outlawed and corporal punishment at school became unconstitutional.

teachers and students who have suffered the effects of corporal punishment for years.

3. The process of developing a collaborative and comprehensive programme of action is considered an important part of the programme. Wayson and Lasley (1984) claim that if all parties are involved in the decision-making process, then all parties share the responsibility and a climate of self-discipline is created and maintained. The process involves:

- consulting with representatives of parents, teachers, students, management, cultural and religious organisations, political parties, welfare and human rights bodies, law enforcement agencies etc.
- communicating the results of investigations into the current problems and practices extensively so as to ensure a more informed public response to the issues at hand
- developing a "shared vision" for specific interventions
- building a programme of alternatives from experience of what strategies work
- establishing procedures for evaluation and re-assessment of plans.

4. Improving awareness and involvement. This might take the form of media campaigns, in-service training and counselling programmes, schools and community projects, and the active involvement of cultural, religious and youth movements. Perhaps a lesson can be learnt from Sweden. Corporal punishment was legally abolished in Sweden in July 1979. Ziegert (1983) assessed the effects of the law on the population's attitudes towards corporal punishment, two years later. He found that the population's knowledge of the legal ban increased dramatically, as did their awareness of its harmful effects. Ziegert does not attribute the change in attitude to the legal abolishment alone. Supplementary measures introduced by the government played a

not considered concrete and tangible enough to allow teachers to feel that they have techniques at their disposal which can be used to maintain discipline.

In Gauteng, the first steps in looking at alternatives to corporal punishment more specifically and formally, were taken on 23 August 1995 through the initiative of the Member of the Executive Council for education (MEC), Ms Mary Metcalfe. A representative group of teachers and principals' organizations met to discuss issues arising from the provision which outlaws corporal punishment (Gauteng Schools Education Bill, 1995). There was broad support for implementing a campaign on the need for alternative strategies to corporal punishment. A subcommittee was set up and agreed to propose the activities which will lay the foundation for launching this campaign in 1996.

The proposal for preliminary steps to be taken over the period September 1995 to March 1996 include the establishment of a research and administrative unit. This unit, among other activities, will conduct an intensive research programme into corporal punishment and its alternatives currently in practice in Gauteng's schools (Magasa, Ralphs & Vally, 1995).

Magasa et al. (1995) outline six areas for discussion and debate for a programme which will look at alternatives to corporal punishment in schools in Gauteng. These include:

1. Researching the broad field within which problems arise and solutions must be found. This includes looking at the social, pedagogic and legal issues.

2. Focusing on alternatives to corporal punishment. This includes 'preventive alternatives' which focus mostly on primary, pre-primary schools, and pre-service teacher training; and 'remedial alternatives' which focus on Secondary schools with

member to be available once a month to see parents; and another school allotted each teacher a free hour each week to see parents.

Time-out procedures is another alternative discipline strategy. In Europe, children who are not behaving are sent to another class, preferably one in which the same subject is being taught, or to the teacher in whose class they were the year before. Vally (1995) says that the exclusion should be "as dull and boring as possible ... and [the pupil] should be supervised at all times" (p. 3).

Reinforcing positive, and ignoring negative, behaviour is considered an effective discipline strategy in the classroom. Piaget (1954) notes the interdependence between learning and reward, and suggests that when pupils are positively rewarded, their level of acquiring skills improves.

Consulting with the child after the class, or after school is considered another 'trick' of the trade. Whispering in the pupil's ear rather than shouting, and having as much direct eye contact with the pupils as possible, are other disciplinary strategies recommended (Holdstock, 1987). These are just but a few of the many 'tricks' and tips to maintain classroom discipline.

Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston and Smith (1979) support the view that the most important factor contributing to effective classroom discipline, is the attitude of the teacher and the quality of the interpersonal relationship with the pupils. Holdstock (1987) sums this up aptly when he says "rather than tell them what to do ... tell them how to be" (p. 197). Thus, he says, that "the most important task awaiting education is to prepare teachers not only academically, but in a personal sense" (Holdstock, 1987, p. 198). He notes, however, that often this is

Thus it seems discipline should aim for the development of an individual who is able to exercise self-control in an atmosphere compatible with the principles of equality, mutual respect and freedom of choice (Rice, 1987).

This, however, still does not tell teachers what alternative strategies to use in the classroom in order to achieve this goal.

Perhaps some lessons can be learnt from European schools which do not rely on corporal punishment in their system of discipline.

Jones and Jones (1981) note that the root cau of 'misbehaviour' must be understood if effective and long-lasting change is to be achieved. In Norway, the Basic School Act lays down that the school must determine whether misconduct has been caused by teacher-pupil, home-school or pupil-pupil relationships. Counselling is a method commonly employed to address behaviour problems. In Spain and France it is quite usual for teachers to be allocated time to counsel pupils.

Holdstock (1987) points out that disciplinary problems can be reduced by relaxing teachers' attitude toward non-essential matters. Such is the attitude of European teachers where teacher-pupil relationships tend to be much friendlier and more relaxed. Petty rules and regimentation are virtually unknown in Europe. Pupils have more freedom in matters such as dress, coming and going, and personal appearance.

Parent consultation is another alternative discipline strategy. Newcombe (in Holdstock, 1990) investigated discipline strategies in European schools and found that many European countries emphasises the importance of consulting parents. The ways in which parents are consulted vary from country to country and school to school. One Italian school required every staff

Thus it seems discipline should aim for the development of an individual who is able to exercise self-control in an atmosphere compatible with the principles of equality, mutual respect and freedom of choice (Rice, 1987).

This, however, still does not tell teachers what alternative strategies to use in the classroom in order to achieve this goal.

Perhaps some lessons can be learnt from European schools which do not rely on corporal punishment in their system of discipline.

Jones and Jones (1981) note that the root cause of 'misbehaviour' must be understood if effective and long-lasting change is to be achieved. In Norway, the Basic School Act lays down that the school must determine whether misconduct has been caused by teacher-pupil, home-school or pupil-pupil relationships. Counselling is a method commonly employed to address behaviour problems. In Spain and France it is quite usual for teachers to be allocated time to counsel pupils.

Holdstock (1987) points out that disciplinary problems can be reduced by relaxing teachers' attitude toward non-essential matters. Such is the attitude of European teachers where teacher-pupil relationships tend to be much friendlier and more relaxed. Petty rules and regimentation are virtually unknown in Europe. Pupils have more freedom in matters such as dress, coming and going, and personal appearance.

Parent consultation is another alternative discipline strategy. Newcombe (in Holdstock, 1990) investigated discipline strategies in European schools and found that many European countries emphasises the importance of consulting parents. The ways in which parents are consulted vary from country to country and school to school. One Italian school required every staff

factor in "facilitating, exonerating and under reporting of crimes of family violence, abuse and child molesting" (p. 170).

Alternative Methods of Classroom Discipline

Punishment procedures, other than corporal punishment, commonly used in the classroom in order to maintain control include: detaining pupils after school or during break, writing-out senseless statements; cleaning up the classroom or school grounds; extra homework; sending the pupil out of the classroom; appointing a pupil to report on other pupils; sending pupil to head; depriving pupil of an enjoyable activity; verbal abuse; or making the pupil look foolish. These strategies, writes Holdstock (1987) "do not prevent future problems, but at best delay them" (p. 197).

Self-discipline, embodying an ideal of growth towards independence and self-control, rather than dominant external authority and punitive measures should be the ultimate educational goal of discipline (Dewey, 1897). Jones and Jones (1981) claim that the effects of this would be a more permanent change in behaviour than a temporary one. This is supported by Edcent Williams (personal communication, October 13, 1995), the Director of Support Services for Gauteng Education Department, who says that schools need to facilitate the development of internal self-discipline as an educational goal rather than impose external fear of punishment as its system of discipline.

The way in which this is achieved, however, remains unspecific and unclear. Research indicates that the successful disciplinarian is one who models caring, committed behaviour; one who takes time to reason and communicate with the child (Calabrese, 1985); one who collectively creates clear rules (Wayson & Lasley, 1984); one who is flexible, student-centred and capable of individualizing teaching (Arnove & Strout, 1980).

Corporal punishment interferes with academic functioning. Bryan and Freed (1982) found that those students in a high corporal punishment group reported lower grades.

As indicated by Vally (1995), it is often assumed that corporal punishment stops bad behaviour altogether. Yet, in many cases, the same pupils are caned for the same offences, by the same teachers over and over again. Scientific research shows that the effects of punishment are at best temporary (Bugelski, 1956). It has also been shown that punishment has increased the undesirable behaviour rather than eliminated it. Bandura (in Church, 1963) notes that in the treatment of a severely behaviour disordered boy, punishment might augment the undesirable behaviour by generating hostile feelings similar to those that may have caused the original behaviour disorder.

Both Dobson and Engelman (in Woolfgang & Glickman, 1986) have positioned themselves firmly as advocates of corporal punishment, as part of 'moral education'. They argue that people who have done wrong should be punished for it. Marshall (1984), in response to this, argues that moral education and punishment are incompatible since moral education aims for the development of moral obligations and corporal punishment encourages mere obedience. Further, rehabilitation, rather than punishment should be the aim of correctional services. Judge Langa (1995) warns against "society wreacking its vengeance on wrongdoers" (p. 32), which might happen under the guise of teaching morality.

Thus corporal punishment is neither quick nor harmless. While physical punishment does initially appear to be effective in stopping undesirable behaviour, this is temporary but the psychological effects are not (Hill, 1981). Holdstock (1987) refers to the justification of corporal punishment as 'harmless' as a form of 'psychological denial' which he says is the major

Corporal Punishment, Holdstock (1987) argues, is morally reprehensible. He says that the violation of the child's body space and privacy conveys the message that adults have authority over them, including the right to inflict pain. This prepares them to become victims of abuse. In their study, Catron and Masters (1993) found that pre-school children showed broad acceptance for severe corporal punishment given for any type of transgression, and by any agent. Pre-adolescent children, on the other hand, were able to consider the type of transgression, severity of punishment, and the appropriateness of the agent administering the physical punishment. Younger children, therefore, are more vulnerable to abuse since their judgement of the severity of the punishment, type of transgression, and the fallibility of the agent is poor.

Sir Laurence Olivier (in Benthall, 1991) said that "the first time a schoolmaster ordered me to take my trousers down I knew it was not from any doubt that he could punish me efficiently enough with them up" (p. 385). Morris (in Benthall, 1991) argues that corporal punishment interferes with the sexual and psychological development of the child and is thus a contributing factor to sexual deviations. A task force of the British Psychological Association (in Holdstock, 1990) concluded that corporal punishment was a significant factor in the autogenesis of sexual perversion. The existance of erotic magazines such as "The Joy of Spanking", "Art of Caning" and "Sting", which are devoted to corporal punishment, demonstrates "an unwholesome interest in this area" (Holdstock, 1990, p. 358). Morris (in Benthall, 1991) further argues that there is a close association between corporal punishment and homosexuality for both involve "the sexual excitation of the anal area" (p. 384). Benthall describes this as the "invisible wounds of corporal punishment" (p. 385).

Harmful Effects of Corporal Punishment

When teachers punish a child physically they give the child a model for aggressive behaviour (Bandura & Walters, 1959; Weiss, Dodge & Bates, 1992). Clarke and McKenzie (1968) found that those elementary school children with punitive teachers manifest significantly more aggressive and deviant behaviour involving physical harm to peers and damage to property, than children with non-punitive teachers. Conversely, Hyman and D'Alessandro (1984) note that school vandalism is dramatically reduced when students view their school positively.

When teachers administer corporal punishment, the message to pupils is clear: violence is an acceptable way to resolve conflict (Newell & Kibel, 1995).

"When we make children afraid, we stop learning dead in its tracks" (Holt, 1967, p. 23). Clarke and McKenzie (1968) note that the fear of punishment negatively affects motivation, and that it also might cause the development of a generalised avoidance response such as school refusal. Moreover, Holdstock (1987) argues that fear of punishment can affect the autonomic nervous system, which may result in psychosomatic symptoms. He also says that corporal punishment has negative psychological effects such as: a lowered self esteem, anxiety, regression, and depression. A personal account is that of Brandon Benjamin, a 14 year old boy from Ottery, Cape Town. At the end of Std 2, Brandon obtained the "best progress" certificate at school. A year later he began complaining of stomach cramps, had nightmares and became withdrawn. At the age of 10 he was given his first script of tranquillizers and at present attends a Special School. Brandon and his mother attribute this to the fact that he was caned excessively by his headmaster over a period of 3 months (Thamm, 1995, p. 52).

institutions. It says that "no person shall administer corporal punishment or subject a student to psychological or physical abuse at any education institution" (p. 20). Clause 22 of the Gauteng Schools Education Bill (1995) makes the breach of this a criminal offence. It says that "any person who intentionally or negligently contravenes [ie: administers corporal punishment] shall be guilty of an offence and liable on conviction to a fine or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months" (p. 6).

This legislation brings South Africa in line with the views of the United Nations Convention on the Right of the Child (1989), which is ratified by 144 states worldwide. The convention is committed to children's right to physical integrity, and protection from "all forms of physical or mental violence while in the care of parents and others" (Article 19).

Vally (1995), who is investigating the need for alternatives to corporal punishment in Gauteng, points out that "policy and legislation must play their role, but without a concomitant understanding of the harmful effects of corporal punishment and a recognition of alternatives by those involved, the law and dictates from above will be defied" (p. 1). He says that "the routines, rituals, myths and irrational prejudices which surround this practice will require much more than legislation to be eradicated" (Vally, 1995, p. 1). This is particularly true in South Africa where violence has been such an integral part of our culture and institutions.

There are an overwhelming number of studies, from many different countries which point to the harmful effects of corporal punishment on the pupils, teachers and society. A summary of these findings are discussed below.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Quantitative Results

The results of this study can be divided into teacher variables and pupil variables.

Definition of terms:

Never	-	defined as not at all
Seldom	-	defined as once a year
Sometimes	-	defined as once a month
Often	-	defined as once a week
Always	-	defined as once a day

Teacher Variables

Teachers' Attitudes to Corporal Punishment

Teachers' overall attitude to corporal punishment, based upon the sum total of their responses to the questionnaire, indicates that they are undecided since there are as many responses in support of corporal punishment (42.6%) as there are against it (43.4%) (see Appendix D). However, a breakdown of their responses to specific questions proves valuable.

Teachers justified their support of corporal punishment by the following responses:

The majority of teachers (53.3%) believe that corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school (20% strongly agree, 33.3% agree, 20.8% disagree, 11.3% strongly disagree, and 14.6% were undecided).

currently being discussed and investigated by the Education Department. Letters from the Gauteng Department of Education and the University of the Witwatersrand were sent to the principal of each school sampled in the study in order to obtain permission and to elicit cooperation (see Appendix C). Questionnaires were translated into English, Afrikaans, Zulu and Sotho. A group of 60 questionnaires (30 teacher and 30 pupil questionnaires), in the preferred language, was given to each of the 15 pre-selected schools. No further specification was given to the schools, such as the grade to which the pupil questionnaires were to be administered. The assumption was that if the administration of the questionnaires caused the least amount of disruption, then the response rate might improve.

After completion at the school's convenience, the questionnaires were collected and analysed. Thus the researcher had no control of variables which might have influenced completion of the questionnaires.

Research Design

This was a survey study. The type of analysis used was contingency table analysis. This method was used to cross-tabulate data in order to examine relationships across table classes. The classes in question were treated as stratification variables with school type being stratified before sampling and the rest after sampling (post-stratification). This stratification reflects official classifications of the Gauteng Education Department.

Within each strata a simple random sample of schools was drawn. Post stratification was done according to the remaining classification variables (ie: gender, age, standard, training, years of experience).

strategy. In addition, subjects were also asked to indicate the effectiveness of each strategy. Here a three-point scale was used. The fourth section of the questionnaire dealt with the attitudes of teachers towards discipline structures at school, and the need for further training. These questions were, in part, open ended. The last section of the questionnaire asked about teachers' views on the proposed abolishment of corporal punishment. Subjects were given the opportunity to freely state their beliefs and opinions (see Appendix A).

In the pupils' questionnaire, the first section dealt with biographical details such as the subjects' sex, age and standard. The following section, consisting of 28 statements, investigated pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment and alternative strategies. Subjects were asked to rate each statement according to a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree, to strongly disagree. The third section, consisting of 19 questions, investigated what disciplinary strategies pupils have experienced at school. Subjects were asked to rate each disciplinary strategy experienced, according to a five-point scale on how often they receive each method of discipline. In addition, subjects were also asked to indicate the effectiveness of each strategy. A three-point scale was used here. The fourth section investigated pupils' views on the proposed abolishment of corporal punishment. Subjects were given the opportunity to freely state their beliefs and opinions. The last section of the questionnaire asked pupils about the offences for which they have been caned (see Appendix B).

Procedures

A letter requesting permission for teachers and pupils to take part in the study, was sent to the Gauteng Education Department. The Department expressed an interest in the research as it contributes to a new view of classroom discipline which is

and allows for comparisons to be made between different groups of respondents (Sheatsly, 1983).

The Likert type scale was selected in the construction of the questionnaire since it is the most popular attitude scale for reasons of efficiency and ease of construction (Berdie & Anderson, 1974). It assumes that a particular test item has the same meaning for all respondents and thus comparisons within and between different groups of respondents can be made (Zimbardo, Ebbesen & Maslach, 1977). The Likert type scale also assumes prior knowledge of a fair response which is usually determined from a pilot study. In this study, this was not the case, and therefore it was decided to consider response frequency rather than scores.

In the construction of the questionnaire, Babbie (1973) suggests that items be short, clear, and relevant to the objectives of the research. In this study care was taken to follow these suggestions.

Two similar questionnaires were constructed, one for teachers and one for pupils. A separate discussion of these will follow.

In the teachers' questionnaire, the first section dealt with biographical details such as the subjects' sex, age, number of years' teaching experience, and training. The following section, consisting of 28 statements, investigated teachers' attitudes to corporal punishment and alternative strategies. Subjects were asked to rate statements according to a five-point scale ranging from strongly agree, to strongly disagree. The third section, consisting of 20 questions, investigated teachers' practices of corporal punishment as well as alternative strategies. Subjects were asked to rate the practice of disciplinary strategies given according to a five-point scale on how often they used this

both attitudes and practices were investigated in the questionnaire.

Since the 1920s a variety of techniques have been developed to measure attitudes. These include: the Thurstone (1931), Guttman (1944), Likert (1932), and Osgood (in Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957) semantic differential techniques. Monyooe (1986) describes these in the following manner: The Thurstone Successive-Interval Technique consists of a series of statements that are given to the respondent to agree or disagree with. The Guttman Scalogram Analysis consists of a series of test items, each of which contain several opinion statements. The Likert Summated-Rating Technique associates each response with a number and the overall attitude score is the sum of the responses that the respondent marks. The Osgood Semantic Differential comprises of a series of bipolar adjectives.

The data used in this study was derived from an anonymous questionnaire which was administered to the sample of teachers and pupils. The Likert type scale was used in the construction of the questionnaire. The frequency of responses were counted rather than associating a response with a number in order to evaluate overall attitudes. The rationale for this choice is given below.

The questionnaire was chosen, since it enables a researcher to collect information from a large geographical area in a relatively short space of time. Also, as Selltiz et al. (1965) point out, when using an anonymous questionnaire for controversial issues, respondents may have greater confidence in their anonymity and thus feel freer to express views they fear might be disapproved of or might get them into trouble. Another advantage is that questions and instructions are uniform for all respondents and this contributes to standardization procedures,

According to research conducted by Arnott and Chabane (1995), 41% of teachers of all races at both primary and secondary schools are between 25 and 35 years. In 'African Secondary Schools', research shows that 54% of teachers fall between 25 and 35 years. This sample therefore, appears to be representative of the ages of teachers in secondary schools in Gauteng.

Of the 362 pupils 150 were male and 212 were female. 43.4% of the sample of pupils were in Std 9. The next biggest group was in Std 10 (24.3%). The ages of the pupils ranged from 12 to 27 years, while 47.8% of the pupils sampled were between 16 and 17 years old.

Measures

"If we want to know how people feel: what they experience and what they remember, what their emotions and motives are like, and the reasons for acting as they do - why not ask them ?" (Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch & Cook, 1965, p. 16)

The underlying assumption of measuring attitudes is that there is a strong relationship between one's attitudes and one's behaviour. In this sense, attitudes can be inferred from an individual's behaviour, and behaviour can also be indicative of certain attitudes (Kiesler, 1971). However, not all behaviour is produced by specific attitudes. There are multiple determinants of behaviour. In the case of corporal punishment, school teachers might not believe in corporal punishment but go along with it since they are not aware of, and have not been trained in using alternative techniques for classroom management. These limitations need to be cons. d in the construction of the questionnaire, in order to give respondents the opportunity to express their attitudes towards corporal punishment as well as the rationale for behaving the way they do. Thus, in this study

According to research conducted by Arnott and Chabane (1995), 41% of teachers of all races at both primary and secondary schools are between 25 and 35 years. In 'African Secondary Schools', research shows that 54% of teachers fall between 25 and 35 years. This sample therefore, appears to be representative of the ages of teachers in secondary schools in Gauteng.

Of the 362 pupils 150 were male and 212 were female. 43.4% of the sample of pupils were in Std 9. The next biggest group was in Std 10 (24.3%). The ages of the pupils ranged from 12 to 27 years, while 47.8% of the pupils sampled were between 16 and 17 years old.

Measures

"If we want to know how people feel: what they experience and what they remember, what their emotions and motives are like, and the reasons for acting as they do - why not ask them ?" (Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch & Cook, 1965, p. 16)

The underlying assumption of measuring attitudes is that there is a strong relationship between one's attitudes and one's behaviour. In this sense, attitudes can be inferred from an individual's behaviour, and behaviour can also be indicative of certain attitudes (Kiesler, 1971). However, not all behaviour is produced by specific attitudes. There are multiple determinants of behaviour. In the case of corporal punishment, school teachers might not believe in corporal punishment but go along with it since they are not aware of, and have not been trained in using alternative techniques for classroom management. These limitations need to be considered in the construction of the questionnaire, in order to give respondents the opportunity to express their attitudes towards corporal punishment as well as the rationale for behaving the way they do. Thus, in this study

5. To determine pupils' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment in Gauteng's schools.

Method

Subjects

A total of 602 subjects participated in the study. 240 of these subjects were teachers and 362 were pupils. Both teachers and pupils were from co-educational secondary schools (Std 6 to Std 10).

Subjects were drawn from three types of schools: public, community and private schools. The Regional office for the Gauteng Education Department classified schools in the Gauteng region into private, public, community, farm, hospital and mine schools (1995). Farm, hospital and mine schools were not included in the sample of this study since they are mostly primary schools, and the sample of this study was defined as consisting of secondary school teachers and pupils.

Lists of schools in each school type were obtained from the Education Department and five high schools were randomly sampled from each school type (i.e.: public, community and private). In total, 15 schools participated in this study, and made up the stratified sample. Owing to non-response, three schools selected had to be replaced.

Of the 240 teachers, 70 were male and 167 were female. 65.4% of the teachers had a university degree. Teaching experience ranged from 6 months to 40 years, while 48.7% of the teachers sampled had less than 10 years teaching experience. The ages of teachers ranged from 21 to 69 years, with 47.7% younger than 35 years, and 38.5% between 25 and 35 years.

Aims of the Study

The general aim of the present study is to investigate teachers' and pupils' attitudes to the proposed abolishment of corporal punishment as indicated by clause 3(n) of the National Education Policy Bill (1995), and clause 22 of the Gauteng Schools Education Bill (1995). This study also aims to investigate the extent to which corporal punishment is practiced in a sample of schools in the Gauteng area; and what alternatives are used and whether they are considered effective. More specifically the aims of this study are:

Teachers

1. To determine teachers' attitudes to corporal punishment.
2. To determine how often teachers administer corporal punishment.
3. To determine the extent to which alternative strategies of classroom discipline, other than corporal punishment, are used.
4. To determine the extent to which discipline strategies are seen as effective.
5. To determine teachers' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment in Gauteng's schools.
6. To determine whether teachers consider they have a need for further training in the area of classroom discipline.

Pupils

1. To determine pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment.
2. To determine how often pupils experience corporal punishment.
3. To determine how often pupils experience alternative strategies of classroom discipline, other than corporal punishment.
4. To determine which discipline strategies are seen by pupils as effective.

In Gauteng, the first steps in finding alternatives to corporal punishment were taken (August 1995) through the education MEC. A subcommittee was established to work on the foundations for setting up a campaign on alternatives to corporal punishment in 1996. In the proposal for the campaign, the subcommittee proposes to investigate the views of teachers and pupils at the grass roots. This study hopes to contribute to this, by investigating the attitudes towards and practices of corporal punishment with respect to teachers and pupils in the Gauteng area.

Teachers

- Do teachers feel that corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline in school?
- How often do teachers use corporal punishment, if at all?
- What alternative strategies of classroom discipline, other than corporal punishment, do teachers use?
- What strategies of discipline do teachers consider effective?
- What are teachers' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment?
- Do teachers feel the need for further training in the area of classroom discipline?

Pupils

- Do pupils feel that corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school?
- How often, if at all, do pupils experience corporal punishment?
- How often do pupils experience alternative strategies of classroom discipline, other than corporal punishment?
- Which disciplinary strategies are seen by pupils as effective?
- What are pupils' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment in Gauteng's schools?

Policy Bill (1995) which proposes to outlaw both physical and psychological abuse of students at all educational institutions. Further, Clause 22 of the Gauteng Schools Education Bill (1995) proposes to make the breach of this a criminal offence.

Thus the evidence shows that South Africa's policies are moving away from institutionalized violence, where physical and verbal punishment was legal, to a human rights culture, where the child has the right to physical integrity, and to protection from all forms of interpersonal violence.

However, despite the proposed changes in education policy, teachers and pupils in the not too distant past (Rice, 1987), have shown overwhelming support for corporal punishment.

According to Minister of Justice, Dullah Omar (personal communication, 25 October, 1995) certain matters, such as corporal punishment, will not be decided by a referendum since the decision might not be in the spirit of the constitution which is committed to the promotion of human rights. Therefore, he says that even if teachers and pupils oppose the abolishment of corporal punishment this does not mean that it should be reinstated since it violates fundamental principles within the constitution.

In the light of this, it is still important to evaluate teachers' and pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment in order to assess the gap between policy and opinion and address this if necessary. It is also necessary to evaluate what disciplinary strategies are considered effective and can be used as alternatives to corporal punishment. After all, the practice of corporal punishment will require more than legislation to be eradicated.

CHAPTER 2

THE STUDY

Rationale for the Study

It is evident, according to the literature and research, that classroom discipline is an ongoing area of concern and debate. Modern educationalists tend to regard self-discipline as the ultimate educational goal (Dewey, 1897; Holdstock, 1987; Wayson & Lasley, 1984), and encourage those disciplinary strategies which facilitate the development of this. Punishment, and more specifically corporal punishment, does not contribute to the development of self-discipline. Corporal punishment has been found to, at best, temporarily suppress undesirable behaviour (Skinner, 1953). Moreover, it has been found to produce harmful effects making it an unsuitable disciplinary strategy in the classroom (Holdstock, 1990; Azrin, Hake, Holz & Hutchinson, 1965; Church, 1963).

Despite the negative effects, Rice (1987) found that corporal punishment was the treatment of choice by 51% of white educationalist in the Johannesburg area. In her study, only 9.3% of the sample considered 'positive disciplinary strategies' to be effective (ie: those strategies which encourage self-discipline such as rewarding positive behaviour); and only 1.8% mentioned self-discipline as an important educational goal.

Since Rice's (1987) study, however, South Africa has undergone major political, judicial and educational changes. Judge Langa (1995) of the Constitutional Court abolished judicial corporal punishment for juveniles on the grounds that it is "cruel ... inhuman ... and debases everyone involved in it" (p. 42). This is supported by Clause 3(n) of the National Education

Frequency of Pupils' Experience of Corporal Punishment

Results show that the majority of pupils never experience corporal punishment. In response to the question, 50% said they never experience corporal punishment, 23.2% said seldom, 12.7% said sometimes, 7.2% said often, and 6.9% said always (n=362).

A comparison of pupils' experiences of corporal punishment across gender, grade and school type indicates that twice as many public school pupils are reportedly caned often (10.71%), when compared to community (5.43%) and private school pupils (5.79%) (see Appendix L). While grade and gender had no significant effect on pupils' experience of corporal punishment, it is interesting to note that the std 8 group of pupils claim to experience corporal punishment most often (16.67%) (see Appendix M). Also, three times as many male pupils (12.67%) claim to experience corporal punishment 'often' than female pupils (3.3%) (see Appendix N).

Extent of Pupils' Experience of Alternative Strategies of Classroom Discipline

Of all forms of discipline given, pupils rated their experience of them as follows:

(a) Given extra homework and teachers trying to reason with the pupil in the lesson were considered the most frequently used methods of classroom discipline. This was followed by
(b) getting positive reinforcement,and staying in at break or after school, followed by
(c) corporal punishment, being sent out, taking an unfavourable report home, given physical tasks around the school, deprived of an enjoyable activity, and made to look foolish in class. This is followed by,

teacher (9.1% strongly agree, 16.9% agree, 32.6% disagree, and 27.3% strongly disagree, 14.1% were undecided).

Similarly, most pupils (61.4%) disagree with the statement that "corporal punishment enhances the teacher-pupil relationship" (5.5% strongly agree, 13.8% agree, 30.7% disagree, 30.7% strongly disagree, and 19.3% were undecided).

Most pupils were undecided about whether they think corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view (10.8% strongly agree, 21.3% agree, 17.7% disagree, 16.3% strongly disagree, and 34% were undecided).

The only area where pupils did not feel the effects of corporal punishment to be problematic was in relation to abuse.

Many pupils (45.3%) disagree with the statement claiming that "corporal punishment prepares pupils to become victims of abuse" (18% strongly agree, 19.1% agree, 26.5% disagree, 18.8% strongly disagree, and 17.7% were undecided).

Most pupils (61.5%) feel that corporal punishment should be used only as a last resort (33.4% strongly agree, 28.5% agree, 13.3% disagree, 10.5% strongly disagree, and 14.4% were undecided).

When investigating pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment across gender, school type, and grade, no significant differences were found. However, it is interesting to note that almost three times as many male pupils (30%) feel that female pupils should be caned than female pupils (10.85%) (see Appendix K).

responses to the questionnaire will be considered in terms of their attitudes in support of corporal punishment, and their attitudes against it.

Their attitudes against corporal punishment included the following:

The majority of pupils (54.7%) disagree with the statement that "corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school" (11.3% strongly agree, 19.9% agree, 23.8% disagree, 30.9% strongly disagree, and 14.1% were undecided).

Most pupils (55.5%) feel that corporal punishment enhances aggression in pupils (31.5% strongly agree, 24% agree, 15.7% disagree, 10.8% strongly disagree, 15.7% disagree, and 18% of the sample of pupils were undecided).

Most pupils (59.1%) believe that a 'good' teacher does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils (32.6% strongly agree, 26.5% agree, 18% disagree, 8% strongly disagree, and 14.9% were undecided).

Most pupils (50.5%) disagree with the view that "corporal punishment creates an environment of learning" (12.4% strongly agree, 22.4% agree, 27.3% disagree, 23.2% strongly disagree and 14.6% were undecided).

The majority of pupils (53.3%) believe that corporal punishment teaches pupils to fear the teacher (24% strongly agree, 29.3% agree, 23.8% disagree, 13% strongly disagree, and 9.9% were undecided).

However, the majority of pupils (59.9%) disagree with the view that corporal punishment teaches pupils to respect the

Teachers' Attitudes to the Proposed Abolishment of Corporal Punishment in Gauteng's Schools

The majority of teachers (70%) disagree with the abolishment of corporal punishment in Gauteng schools, while 30% agree.

Gender, school type, level of training and years of experience did not effect teachers' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment significantly.

The Need for Further Training in the Area of Classroom Discipline

Most teachers (2:1) feel that their training in the area of classroom discipline has not been adequate and would like further training in this area.

Table 3.1
Teachers' Attitudes Towards Adequate Structures in School at Present and their Views on the Need for More Training

F	Q7 Adequate Training	Q8 Need for more training
Yes	156	150
No	80	86

Frequency missing = 4

Pupil Variables

Pupils' Attitudes to Corporal Punishment

Results show, based upon the sum total of pupils' responses to the questionnaire, that the majority of pupils (51.34%) disagree with corporal punishment (13.63% strongly agree, 19.36% agree, 23.83% disagree, 27.51% strongly disagree, and 15.68% remained undecided) (see Appendix J). A breakdown of their




Figure 3.2 Teachers' Rating of Effective Discipline Strategies

Teachers' Evaluation of Effective Discipline Strategies

When asked which of the alternative strategies given were considered effective, teachers rated them as follows:

(a) Positive reinforcement and giving the pupil a "good talking to in private" were considered most effective, followed by
(b) consulting with parents, followed by
(c) sending to the principal, sending an unfavourable report home, reasoning with the pupil in the lesson, giving a daily report on the pupil's behaviour to the head, making the pupil do physical tasks around the school, followed by
(d) sending to head for corporal punishment, sending to counsellor, administering corporal punishment yourself, giving extra homework, detention, depriving pupil of an enjoyable activity, followed by
(e) sending pupil out of class, using a contract system, followed by
(f) giving a hit or slap in passing, and making the pupil look foolish, were seen as least effective by the sample of teachers.




Figure 3.1 Frequency of Discipline Strategies Used by Teachers

(e) sending to counsellor, using a contract system, administering corporal punishment yourself, making a pupil look foolish in class, and giving a hit or slap in passing were considered least used by teachers in the classroom.

Further, results of this study indicate that most teachers, reportedly, do not send pupils to the Head for corporal punishment. In fact, 39.5% said never, 32.8% seldom, 23.1% sometimes, 3.4% often and 1.3% always (n=238).

When investigating teachers' self-reported practices of using corporal punishment across gender, school type, years of experience and level of training a significant difference was found between college- and university-trained teachers. College-trained teachers reported that they u e corporal punishment more frequently than university-trained teachers (see Appendix H). Gender, and level of training did not effect the frequency of corporal punishment reportedly practiced. However, it is interesting to note that more than twice as many male teachers (4.26%) say that they administer corporal punishment themselves than female teachers (1.76%), and more than twice as many female teachers (4.12%) say that they send to the Head for corporal punishment than male teachers (1.43%) (see Appendix I).

Extent to which Alternative Strategies are Used

Teachers were asked to rate how often they use alternative strategies of discipline. Teachers rated them as follows:

(a) Positive reinforcement was considered to be used most frequently, followed by
(b) giving the pupil a "good talking to" in private, and reasoning with the pupil during the lesson, followed by
(c) seeing parents, giving extra homework, giving the pupil physical tasks around the school, sending an unfavourable report home, followed by
(d) sending to the principal, sending to the head for corporal punishment, depriving pupil of an enjoyable activity, giving a daily report of behaviour to the head, detention, and sending pupil out of class, followed by

The majority of public school teachers support the view that the fear of corporal punishment creates an environment of learning (53.84%), while most private school teachers do not (65.63%).

While most community (70.41%) and private school (73.44%) teachers strongly feel that female pupils should not be caned, most Public school teachers were undecided.

The level of teacher training had no significant effect on teachers' overall attitude to corporal punishment. However, it is interesting to note that more college-trained teachers (11.25%) believe that female students should be caned than university trained teachers (5.73%). In addition, more college trained teachers believe that corporal punishment teaches pupils to respect the teacher (8.75%) than university trained teachers (4.46%), and almost twice as many college trained teachers (6.25%) believe that corporal punishment enhances the teacher-pupil relationship than university trained teachers (3.18%) (see Appendix F).

Teachers' years of experience did not effect their attitudes to corporal punishment significantly. However it is interesting to note that those teachers with less than five years experience believe that a 'good' teacher does use corporal punishment to discipline pupils, while those teachers with more than five years experience disagree (see Appendix G).

Frequency of Corporal Punishment Practised

Results show that the majority of teachers say that they do not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils. In response to the question of whether teachers administer corporal punishment themselves, 60.9% said never, 17.2% said seldom, 19.3% said sometimes, and 2.5% said often (n=238).

teacher" (5.8% strongly agree, 23.8% agree, 44.2% disagree, 12.5% strongly disagree, and 13.8% were undecided).

Similarly, most teachers (55.9%) disagree with the statement claiming that "corporal punishment enhances the teacher-pupil relationship" (4.2% strongly agree, 19.6% agree, 41.3% disagree, 14.6% strongly disagree, and 20.4% were undecided).

Teachers attitudes to corporal punishment were compared across gender, school type, level of training and years of experience. No significant difference between gender, level of training and years of experience were found. There were significant differences between teachers' attitudes to corporal punishment across private, community and public school types (see Appendix E).

Private school teachers had a different view to community and public school teachers on whether corporal punishment is necessary to maintain classroom discipline. Almost half the sample of private school teachers (48.44%) feel that corporal punishment is unnecessary in maintaining discipline at school. This is almost twice the number of community (26.53%) and public school teachers (25.64%).

The majority of community school teachers (64.29%) disagree with the statement that corporal punishment enhances aggression in pupils, whereas private and public school teachers are undecided.

Most community (50%) and public (53.84%) school teachers believe that corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view, while most private school teachers disagree (56.25%).

Many teachers (45.9%) believe that corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view (14.2% strongly agree, 31.7% agree, 21.7% disagree, 15% strongly disagree, and 17.5% were undecided).

Half the sample of teachers (49.6%) disagree with the view that corporal punishment enhances aggression in pupils (7.1% strongly agree, 23.8% agree, 37.5% disagree, 12.1% strongly disagree, and 19.6% were undecided).

The majority of teachers (71.7%) do not feel that corporal punishment prepares pupils to become victims of abuse (6.7% strongly agree, 7.5% agree, 47.5% disagree, 24.2% strongly disagree, and 14.2% of the sample were undecided).

However, most teachers (77.5%) feel that corporal punishment should be used only as a last resort (32.5% strongly agree, 45% agree, 9.6% disagree, 7.5% strongly disagree, and 5.4% were undecided).

Attitudes against corporal punishment included the following:

Most teachers (54.6%) disagree with the statement claiming that "fear of corporal punishment creates an environment of learning" (7.9% strongly agree, 25.8% agree, 37.5% disagree, 17.1% strongly disagree, and 11.7% were undecided).

Many teachers (48.4%) believe that a 'good' teacher does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils (19.2% strongly agree, 29.2% agree, 26.3% disagree, 7.9% strongly disagree, and 17.5% were undecided).

The majority of teachers (56.7%) disagree with the statement claiming that "corporal punishment teaches pupils to respect the

corporal punishment than an older group. The implications are that less experienced teachers are more likely to resort to using corporal punishment.

Differences between college- and university-trained teachers were also found. More college-trained teachers believe that female students should be caned than university-trained teachers; more college-trained teachers believe that corporal punishment teaches pupils to respect the teacher, and almost twice as many college-trained teachers believe that corporal punishment enhances the teacher-pupil relationship. Furthermore, results show that college-trained teachers use corporal punishment more frequently than university-trained teachers. This reflects that college-trained teachers are more at odds with current policy in their attitudes towards and practices of corporal punishment.

Despite the fact that teachers do have a battery of alternative strategies, which they reportedly use (see results), the majority feel that their training in the area of classroom discipline has not been adequate and would like further training in this area. As one teacher commented, "In teacher training we were not trained to deal with children form deprived homes - as ideal situation was focused on [at college]. We have to deal with children who cause havoc because of hunger, broken families and abuse ... our training should consider different situations that children come from ... and a guidance service should be available to both students and teachers for the benefit of the school". Another teacher noted that "children of different cultures behave in different ways. So the punishment of one culture could fail when practised in another culture".

learning. Most teachers feel that corporal punishment does not teach pupils to respect the teacher.

According to Rutter et al. (1979), the most important factor contributing to effective classroom discipline is the quality of the interpersonal relationship between teacher and pupils. Thus, corporal punishment harms the teacher-pupil relationship which in turn inhibits the teacher's ability to discipline effectively. In addition, Holt (1967) says that "when we make children afraid, we stop learning dead in its tracks" (p. 23).

Teachers attitudes were compared across gender, school type, level of training and years of experience in order to investigate any differences between them.

Only a quarter of private school teachers believe that corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school, as compared to three quarters of both public and community school teachers. Also, most private school teachers do not feel that corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view. Thus, private school teachers' attitudes appear to be more in line with the aims of the new policy on corporal punishment.

It was found that the majority of public school teachers believe that the fear of corporal punishment does help to create an environment of learning. Thus, public school teachers' in this regard, are at odds with the literature and the aims of the new education policy.

Results of this study show that teachers with less than five years experience believe that a 'good' teacher does use corporal punishment to discipline pupils. These findings are similar to those of Starr (1967), who found that younger teachers (i.e. those under 24 years of age) were more in favour of using

In Rice's (1987) study, the majority of teachers were in favour of corporal punishment. Results of this study show that teachers are ambivalent towards corporal punishment, and that teachers' views are still not totally in line with the literature, nor with the aims of the new education policy.

Despite their ambivalence, there are areas where teachers show support for corporal punishment.

The majority of teachers believe that corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school, that it does not enhance aggression in pupils, nor prepare them to become victims of abuse. In addition, teachers feel that corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view.

This is in contrast with the studies which show that corporal punishment does enhance aggression since it gives children a model for aggressive behaviour and teaches them that violence is an acceptable means of resolving conflict (Clarke & McKenzie, 1968; Hyman & D'Alessandro, 1984). Holdstock (1987) adds that corporal punishment demonstrates to children that adults have authority over their bodies which thus prepares them to become victims of further abuse. In addition, there are those who argue, that it is better to spoil the child and spare the rod, given the harmful effects of corporal punishment, than the opposite (Benthall, 1991; Holdstock, 1990; United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989; Vally, 1995).

However, there are areas where teachers are against the use of corporal pun hment, and hence in line with current educatio policy.

Most teachers feel that a 'good' teacher does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils as it interferes with the teacher-pupil relationship and with the environment of

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Interpretation of Results

The results, previously summarized, are discussed below under the headings of teachers, pupils and comparison of both teachers and pupils.

Teachers

The new eduction policy bill abolishing corporal punishment (National Education Policy Bill, 1995) reflects the government's move away from institutionalized violence to a human rights culture. The literature supports this step, pointing out the harmful effects of corporal punishment which make it an unsuitable choice in classroom discipline (Holdstock, 1990; Azrin et al., 1965; Church, 1963). Despite the literature and the new policy, however, teachers in the not too distant past have shown overwhelming support for its use (Rice, 1987). Given this discrepancy, it is necessary to investigate whether teachers' and pupils' attitudes are in line with the literature and the aims of the new policy or not.

Results show ambivalence in teachers' overall attitude to corporal punishment, since there are as many responses in support of corporal punishment as there are against it. Teachers' ambivalence is reflected in the fact that most teachers reportedly do not use it, see it as mildly effective, but believe that it should not be abolished and that it should be available as a last resort.

3. When asked for which misdemeanour pupils have been caned, the following responses were found: Fighting, skipping school, not doing homework, hair too long, cheek to the teacher, not bringing P.T togs, late for school, eating in class, talking in class, bunking a lesson, not bringing books, smoking at school.

4. Instruments used, according to pupils, include: Cane, whip, spoon, electric wire, a steel pipe, and a ruler.

3. When asked for which misdemeanour pupils have been caned, the following responses were found: Fighting, skipping school, not doing homework, hair too long, cheek to the teacher, not bringing P.T togs, late for school, eating in class, talking in class, bunking a lesson, not bringing books, smoking at school.

4. Instruments used, according to pupils, include: Cane, whip, spoon, electric wire, a steel pipe, and a ruler.

was focused on [at college]. We have to deal with children who cause havoc because of hunger, broken families and abuse ... our training should consider different situations that children come from ... and a guidance service should be available to both students and teachers for the benefit of the school."; "Children of different cultures behave in different ways. So the punishment of one culture could fail when practices in another culture"

4. When teachers were asked to suggest alternatives to corporal punishment, the following comments were made: "Suspension", "expulsion", "sweep the floor", "clean the toilets", sand desks to remove graffiti", be "banned from a favourite sport or school activity."; "There needs to be more interesting material to encourage pupils with their studies, e.g: computers."

5. General comments included: "We are always blamed for what goes wrong in the classroom."; "We need the involvement of parents in our children's education."

Pupils

1. Pupils in support of corporal punishment, had the following to say: "It acts as a deterrent and enforces respect" (15 years); "I think that girls should be caned. I have always, since I was a little girl, been caned for things I have done wrong. I respect my parents for it and believe that I have become a better person because of it. I know that I will discipline my children in this way" (15 years).

2. Pupils against the practice of corporal punishment had the following to say: "No one has the right to hurt a child" (14 years); "It makes me want to run away from school for good" (20 years).

Pupils' Attitudes to the Abolishment of Corporal Punishment

Results show that 60% of pupils agree with the abolishment of corporal punishment (n=350), while 39% disagree.

Pupils' attitudes to the abolishment of corporal punishment across gender, grade and school type indicates that most private (55.37%) and public school pupils (72.32%) are in favour of its abolishment, however, community school pupils are undecided (48.84% agree and 48.84% disagree).

Qualitative Results

Open-ended questions on both the teacher and pupil questionnaire, elicited the following comments.

Teachers

1. Teachers gave qualitative comments in support of corporal punishment. For example: "... corporal punishment is a deterrent 'with teeth' which should be used when deemed necessary."; "... a good smack at the right time can not harm a junior student."

2. Teachers against the practice of corporal punishment had the following to say: "Not all teachers are responsible enough to punish corporally."; "How can we condone child abuse?"

3. Teachers comments on the need for further training include the following: "In college, discipline was mentioned as a problem for new teachers, this is not the case! After several years of teaching experience, teachers still have problems."; "The classes are much larger nowadays, something has to be done to help teachers cope."; "In teacher training we were not trained to deal with children from deprived homes - an ideal situation




Figure 3.4 Pupils' Rating of Effective Discipline Strategies

Pupils' Perceptions of Effective Discipline Strategies

Of all forms of discipline strategies given, pupils rated their effectiveness as follows:

(a) Positive reinforcement and being given a good talking to in private were considered by pupils as the most effective methods of classroom discipline. This was followed by,
(b) being sent to principal, taking an unfavourable report home, teacher reasoning with pupil during the lesson, and teacher seeing parents. This is followed by,
(c) being given extra homework, sending a daily report of behaviour to head, staying in at break or after school, being deprived of an enjoyable activity, being sent to counsellor, and being given corporal punishment, followed by
(d) being given physical tasks around the school, signing a contract, and being sent out of class, followed by
(e) being made to look foolish and given a hit or slap in passing.




Figure 3.3 Frequency of Discipline Strategies Experienced by Pupils

(d) being given a good talking to in private, being sent to the principal, followed by

(e) being given a hit or slap in passing, having parents called in, followed by,

(f) being given a daily report of behaviour to head, using a contract system, and being sent to the counsellor.

Starr, J.W. (1967). The attitudes to corporal punishment among student teachers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51-55.

Thamm, M. (1995, April). A battering headmaster. Femina, pp. 52-53.

Thorndike, E.L. (1931). Human learning. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Thurstone, L.L. (1931). The measurement of social attitudes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 26, 249-269.

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, (1989), Article 19.

Vally, S. (1995). Spoil the rod and spare the child. Unpublished manuscript, University of the Witwatersrand, Education Policy Unit, Johannesburg.

Wayson, W.W., & Lasley, T.J. (1984, February). Climates for excellence: Schools that foster self-discipline. Phi Delta Kappan, 419-421.

Weiss, B., Dodge, K.A., & Bates, J.E. (1992). Some consequences of early harsh discipline: Child aggression and a maladaptive social information processing style. Child Development, 63(6), 1321-1335.

Wilson, P.S. (1971). Interest and discipline in education. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Pallas, A. (1973). Corporal punishment: Ancient practice in modern times. The Clearing House, 312-314.

Peters, R.S. (1966). Ethics and education. London: Allen & Unwin.

Piaget, J. (1954). The construction of reality in the child. New York: Ballantine Books.

Proverbs, Ch. 13, vs 24.

Radbill, S.X. (1968). A history of child abuse and infanticide. The Battered Child, 3-21.

Rice, J. (1987). An investigation into the attitudes towards corporal punishment of teachers in the Johannesburg area. Unpublished masters dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Rutter,M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and the effects on children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S.W. (1965). Research methods on social relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sheatsley, P.B. (1983). Questionnaire construction and item methods. In P.H. Rossi, J.D. Wright, & A.B. Anderson (Eds.), Handbook of survey research. (pp. 195-230). New York: Academic Press.

Skinner, B.F. (1953). Science and human behaviour. New York: MacMillan.

Leeuw, E.D. (1985, October). Caning regulations often broken in an obsession with trivia [Letter to the editor]. The Star, p. 8.

Likert, R.A. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. Archives of Psychology, 40, 1-55.

Magasa, M., Ralphs, A., & Vally, S. (1995). Proposal for preliminary steps aimed at supporting a campaign on alternatives to corporal punishment in Gauteng. Unpublished manuscript, University of the Witwatersrand, Education Policy Unit, Johannesburg.

Manning, A. (1959). Discipline in the good old days. Phi Delta Kappan, 94-99.

Marshall, J. (1984). Punishment and moral education. The Journal of Moral Education, 13(2), 83-88.

Monyooe, A.L. (1986). A study of corporal punishment and its effects on learning at secondary and high schools in Lesotho. Unpublished masters dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

National Education Policy Bill (1995). B 83-95, p. 4.

Newell, P., & Kibel, M.A. (1995). Ending physical punishment of children in South Africa. South African Medical Journal, 85(2), 66-68.

Olmesdahl, M.C.J. (1984). Corporal punishment in schools. South African Law Journal, 101(3), 527-544.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana: Illinois University Press.

Hentoff, N. (1973). A parent-teacher view of corporal punishment. Today's Education, 62, 18-21.

Hill, W.F. (1981). Principles of learning: A handbook of applications. California: Alfred Publishing.

Holdstock, T.L. (1985). Beat the cane: The case for abolition of corporal punishment in our schools. Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand, School of Psychology.

Holdstock, T.L. (1987). Education for a new nation. Johannesburg: Africa Transpersonal Association.

Holdstock, T.J. (1990). Violence in schools: Discipline. In B. McKendrick & W. Hoffmann (Eds.), People and violence in South Africa (pp. 341-372). Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Holt, J. (1967). How children learn. New York: Pitman.

Hyman, I.A., & D'Alessandro, J. (1984, September). Good old fashioned discipline: The politics of punitiveness. Phi Delta Kappan, 39-45.

Jones, V.F., & Jones, L.S. (1981). Responsible classroom discipline: Creating positive learning environments and solving problems. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Kiesler, C.A. (1971). The psychology of commitment. New York: Academic Press.

Langa, J. (1995). Judgement in the Constitutional court of South Africa, in the matter of The State v. Williams, H., Koopman, J., Mampa, T., Papier, G., Goliath, J., Witbooi, S. Case No. 7CCT/20/94.

Bryan, J.W., & Freed, F.W. (1982). Corporal punishment: Normative data and sociological and psychological correlates in a community college population. Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 11, 77-87.

Bugelski, B.R. (1956). The psychology of learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Calabrese, R.L. (1985). Communication is the key to good discipline. N.A.S.S.P. Bulletin, 109-110.

Catron, T.F., & Masters, J.C. (1993). Mothers' and children's conceptualizations of corporal punishment. Child Development, 64(6), 1814-1828.

Church, R.M. (1963). The varied effects of punishment on behaviour. Psychological Review, 70(5), 369-398.

Clarke, A.M., & McKenzie, I.C. (1968). Punishment and its behavioural outcomes: Application of research evidence to the modification of behaviour. The Australian Journal of Education, 12, 30-47.

Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. The School Journal, 54, 77-80.

Eron, L., Walder, L.O., & Lefkowitz, M.M. (1970). Learning of aggression in children. Boston: Little Brown.

Exodus, Ch. 21, vs 24.

Gauteng Schools Education Bill (1995). Provincial Gazette Extraordinary, notice 1587(30), p. 20.

Guttman, L.A. (1944). A basis for scaling qualitative data. American Sociological Review, 9, 139-150.

REFERENCES

Arnott, A., & Chabane, S. (1995). Teacher demand, supply, utilization and costs. Report for the National Teacher Audit (p. 24). Johannesburg: Edusource.

Arnove, R.F., & Strout, T. (1980). Alternative schools for disruptive youth. Educational Forum, 44, 453-471.

Azrin, N.H., Hake, D.G., Holz, W.C., & Hutchinson, R.R. (1965). Motivational aspects of escape from punishment. Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behaviour, 8, 31-44.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R.H. (1959). Adolescent Aggression. New York: Ronald Press.

Babbie, E.R. (1973). Survey research methods. California: Wadsworth.

Benthall, J. (1991). Invisible wounds: Corporal punishment in British schools as a form of ritual. Child Abuse and Neglect, 15, 377-388.

Berdie, D.R., & Anderson, J.F. (1974). Questionnaires: Design and use. NJ: Scarecrow Press.

Boonin, T. (1979). The benighted status of U.S. corporal punishment practice. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 395-396.

Boren, J.J., & Coleman, A.D. (1970). Some experiments on reinforcement principles within a psychiatric ward for delinquent soldiers. Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, 3, 29-37.

Ultimately, our education system must seek to manage its' affairs without resorting to violence. The emphasis on self-discipline will inevitably contribute to rearing responsible members of society, which will improve our social climate.

Limitations

Certain limitations of the study should be noted. The researcher had no control over administration of questionnaires, which were carried out by the principal and teachers at their convenience. In addition, no specifications were given to the schools, such as the standard to which the pupil questionnaires were to be administered. The assumption was that if the administration of the questionnaires caused the least amount of disruption, then the response rate might improve. However, confounding variables such as motivation to complete questionnaires, time of day chosen to complete the questionnaire, sharing responses to questions, etcetera. may have coloured findings.

In addition, results pertain only to teachers and pupils from private, public and community schools in the Gauteng area.

January 30, 1996), relying on this committee to suggest alternatives and help implement them, will not be enough. Schools need to find their own solutions, which match their own needs.

The implications are that teachers and pupils in each school need to workshop their own system of discipline, with the help and support of the Education Department. In addition, teachers need more knowledge on the harmful effects of corporal punishment, given the fact that, in certain areas, they are at odds with both the literature and the new policy. Given the fact that private school teachers are more in line with the literature and policy than other school types, further research on discipline structures in private versus other schools is necessary in order to account for these differences and to help other schools move in the same direction. Considering the fact that teachers with less experience are more likely to rely on corporal punishment, greater support needs to be available for these teachers. The discrepancy between college- and university-trained teachers suggests the need for further research in order to account for these differences. For teachers in schools at present, in-service training is crucial in order to help teachers express their feelings and frustrations, as well as to consider the issue of effective discipline.

Pupils also need to be involved in the discipline process so that they take responsibility and begin to develop the skills for self-discipline.

Communication between what disciplinary strategies teachers report to use and what pupils' report to experience is necessary in order to create an alternative system of discipline which is effective. In addition, both teachers and pupils need to confer on the effectiveness of disciplinary strategies used.

private' as the most effective alternatives to corporal punishment. Both teachers and pupils consider sending pupils to the Head for corporal punishment as mildly effective and giving a hit in passing or making the pupil look foolish in class was rated as least effective.

Thus, while teachers have a battery of alternatives to corporal punishment which they use and consider effective, they do not want corporal punishment abolished. On the other hand, pupils claim to experience alternatives to corporal punishment which are far more effective and thus support its abolishment.

Implications and Recommendations

The results of this study have major implications for our educational system and for our society.

The democratizing process, in the education system, brings uncertainty making the change for those at the grass roots difficult. For teachers, old systems of discipline are being removed but without new systems in place. This might leave teachers feeling disempowered which creates greater stress - and of course less discipline.

Thus there is an urgent need to create alternative systems of discipline in schools.

Under the initiative of the MEC for Education, a committee was set up for implementing a campaign on alternative strategies to corporal punishment. In light of the findings from this study, there is a great need for the Education Department to facilitate the changes occurring at the grass roots. Teachers and pupils will need to be involved in the campaign so that it does not become a debate about theories and an exercise in futility. However, as Ms Metcalfe said (personal communication,

In contrast, however, both teachers and pupils believe that corporal punishment does not prepare pupils to become victims of abuse, and that it should only be used as a last resort. In this regard teachers' and pupils' attitudes are at odds with the literature and the new education policy.

The differences between teachers' and pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment are indicated by the following results:

While most teachers are ambivalent about corporal punishment, most pupils are anti-corporal punishment. Most teachers feel that corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school, while most pupils disagree. Most teachers believe that corporal punishment does not enhance aggression in pupils, while most pupils believe that it does. Most teachers disagree with the recent abolishment of corporal punishment, while most pupils have welcomed this step.

The differences between teachers' practice and pupils' experience of corporal punishment, are indicated by the following results.

The majority of teachers report that positive reinforcement is the most frequently used alternative to corporal punishment. In contrast, pupils claim that extra homework is used most often by teachers, as well as being reasoned with during the lesson.

Both teachers and pupils report that corporal punishment is hardly used in schools, while sending to the school counsellor or using a contract system (an undertaking to abide by a set of rules which is signed by teachers, pupil and parents) is used least often.

In rating their effectiveness of alternatives, both teachers and pupils rated positive reinforcement and a 'good talking to in

There was only one area where pupils' views were not in line with the literature. Many pupils feel that corporal punishment does not prepare them to become victims of abuse. However, according to Holdstock (1987), Benthall (1991), and Hill (1981), corporal punishment is abuse, and it teaches pupils that adults have authority over their bodies which thus prepares them to become victims of further abuse.

While pupils are against the use of corporal punishment in schools, they feel that if they have to be caned then it should be used only as a last resort.

Teachers and Pupils

The similarities and differences between teachers' and pupils' attitudes, as well as teachers' practices and pupils' experiences of corporal punishment, are interesting to note. These differences also provide information on what alternatives to corporal punishment are available and are considered effective; what teacher and pupil training is necessary in order to bridge the gap between policy and opinion; and what areas need to be further researched.

Both teachers' and pupils' attitudes towards corporal punishment are similar in the following regard.

Both teachers and pupils believe that a 'good' teacher does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils and that it does not teach pupils to respect the teacher. Both teachers and pupils believe that corporal punishment inhibits the environment of learning and interferes with the teacher-pupil relationship. In this regard teachers' and pupils' attitudes to corporal punishment are in line with both the literature and the new education policy.

Pupils

This research went beyond the perceptions and practices of only teachers and included those of pupils to assess whether pupils' attitudes are in line with the new policy and the literature or not.

Results show, based upon the sum total of pupils' responses to the questionnaire, that the majority are anti-corporal punishment. Most pupils feel that corporal punishment is unnecessary in maintaining discipline at school, and that a 'good' teacher does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils. In addition, the majority of pupils said that corporal punishment does not help create an environment of learning, nor does it enhance the teacher-pupil relationship. As one pupil said, "Stop corporal punishment because it causes hatred between pupils and teachers and that increases the school violence which we have". Furthermore, most pupils believe that corporal punishment enhances aggression in pupils, and that it teaches pupils to fear rather than respect the teacher. These views are reflected by the fact that most pupils consider corporal punishment as mildly effective and support its abolishment.

Pupils' attitudes against corporal punishment are supported by an overwhelming number of research studies which point to its harmful effects (Azrin et al., 1965; Bandura & Walters, 1959; Boren & Coleman, 1970; Hentoff, 1973; Holdstock, 1987).

Rutter et al. (1979) claim that physical punishment damages the interpersonal relationship between teacher and pupil, which in turn inhibits the environment of learning. In addition, countless field studies and research results show that physical punishment enhances rather than inhibits aggressive behaviour (Clarke & McKenzie, 1968; Hyman & D'Alessandro, 1984).

(3) Taken an unfavourable report home?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(4) Sent out of class?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(5) Teacher has reasoned with me during the lesson?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(6) My parents have been seen or phoned?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(7) Teacher has given me a "good talking to" in private?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(8) Corporal punishment (jacked; hit with cane)?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(9) Sent to counsellor/other to resolve conflict between teacher and me?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(10) Signed a contract?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

Question 1 (continued)

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. Corporal punishment teaches pupils to fear the teacher	1	2	3	4	5
19. Consulting with parents is not an effective way of solving pupils' misbehaviour in class	1	2	3	4	5
20. Corporal punishment teaches pupils to respect the teacher	1	2	3	4	5
21. Discipline problems should be solved together with the pupils so that they can take responsibility for the problem	1	2	3	4	5
22. Fear and learning don't mix well (i.e. when pupils are afraid they don't learn)	1	2	3	4	5
23. Appointing a classroom monitor to report to the teacher about misbehaviour is effective	1	2	3	4	5
24. Corporal punishment enhances the teacher-pupil relationship	1	2	3	4	5
25. Pupils prefer authoritarian teachers (i.e. very strict teachers)	1	2	3	4	5
26. Corporal punishment should be used as a last resort, when all other methods of discipline have failed	1	2	3	4	5
27. Corporal punishment is the best form of punishment because it is over quickly	1	2	3	4	5
28. Female pupils should not be caned (corporal punishment)	1	2	3	4	5

2. Which of the following forms of classroom discipline have you experienced? Mark the box corresponding to your answer. Rate the effectiveness of the approach even if you have never experienced it.

(1) Sent to detention?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(2) Sent to headmaster/headmistress?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

1. **Here are a selection of controversial statements on classroom discipline. Show your agreement or disagreement by circling the appropriate number:**

   1 = Strongly Agree
   2 = Agree
   3 = Undecided
   4 = Disagree
   5 = Strongly Disagree

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Giving extra homework as a punishment only results in hating the subject	1	2	3	4	5
2. When the teacher sends a pupil out of class, the problem is removed but not solved	1	2	3	4	5
3. Organised teachers have less discipline problems	1	2	3	4	5
4. Corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school	1	2	3	4	5
5. Pupils tend to disregard teacher's threats of punishment	1	2	3	4	5
6. Corporal punishment prepares pupils to become victims of abuse	1	2	3	4	5
7. Detention is an effective way of preventing pupils from misbehaving	1	2	3	4	5
8. A good teacher is one who does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils	1	2	3	4	5
9. Keeping pupils in during break, is not an effective form of punishment	1	2	3	4	5
10. The pupils' fear of corporal punishment helps to create an environment of learning	1	2	3	4	5
11. Teachers should discipline pupils in a calm manner	1	2	3	4	5
12. Corporal punishment makes pupils more aggressive	1	2	3	4	5
13. Approaching the school counsellor is an effective way of solving behaviour problems	1	2	3	4	5
14. Corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view	1	2	3	4	5
15. It is morally correct that a person who has done wrong be punished for it	1	2	3	4	5
16. If the teacher gives pupils interesting and challenging work, there will be less discipline problems in class	1	2	3	4	5
17. If a teacher is liked, pupils tend to be better behaved in class	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B

PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study is to document pupils' attitudes towards classroom discipline.

Discipline refers to the control of pupils' behaviour in a school environment.

Punishment refers to a penalty imposed upon a person for some fault (e.g. withdrawal of privileges, detention, extra homework).

Corporal punishment refers to any form of punishment directed at the body (e.g. caning, hitting student with a ruler).

Verbal punishment refers to any punitive and/or derogatory remark aimed at the student (e.g. name calling).

1. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Gender:

   Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Age:

   _____ Years

3. Grade/Standard:

   _____

6. Do you agree/disagree with the legal abolishment of corporal punishment in South African schools? Tick the appropriate box
Agree ☐ Disagree ☐

If you agree, give reasons: _____

_____

If you disagree, give reasons: _____

_____

Suggest alternative methods to corporal punishment

_____

_____

7. Any additional comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(18) Give a slap or hit in passing?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(19) Give a daily report of behaviour to head/parent?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(21) Other (specify)

_____ _____

_____

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

3. Do you feel that you were adequately trained in classroom discipline in your teacher training programme? **Tick the appropriate box**

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, give examples: _____

_____

If no, state concerns: _____

_____

4. Do you feel the need for In Service Training (during your teaching job) on methods of classroom discipline? **Tick the appropriate box**

Yes ☐ No ☐

Specify: _____

_____

5. Do you feel there are adequate structures within your school to deal with the discipline problems? **Tick the appropriate box**

Yes ☐ No ☐

If yes, state what they are: _____

_____

If no, what procedures do you feel are needed: _____

_____

(10) Approach school counsellor/social worker/psychologist to resolve conflict between pupil and teacher?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(11) Use a contract system?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(12) Give positive reinforcement?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(13) Give extra homework?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(14) Give physical tasks around the school (e.g. clean up the rubbish in the school)?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(15) Make pupils stay in at break/after school?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(16) Deprive pupil of an enjoyable activity?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(17) Make the pupil look foolish?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(3) Send an unfavourable report home?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(4) Send pupil out of class?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(5) Reason with pupil during the lesson?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(6) See or phone parents?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(7) Give the pupil a "good talking to" in private?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(8) Administer corporal punishment (jacked; hit with cane) yourself?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(9) Send pupil to head for corporal punishment?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

Question 1 (continued)

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
18. Corporal punishment teaches pupils to fear the teacher	1	2	3	4	5
19. Consulting with parents is not an effective way of solving pupils' misbehaviour in class	1	2	3	4	5
20. Corporal punishment teaches pupils to respect the teacher	1	2	3	4	5
21. Discipline problems should be solved together with pupils in order to teach them to take responsibility for the problem	1	2	3	4	5
22. Fear and learning don't mix well (i.e. when children are afraid they don't learn)	1	2	3	4	5
23. Appointing a classroom monitor to report to the teacher about misbehaviour is effective	1	2	3	4	5
24. Corporal punishment enhances the teacher-pupil relationship	1	2	3	4	5
25. Pupils prefer authoritarian teachers (where very strict measures of discipline are used)	1	2	3	4	5
26. corporal punishment should be used as a last resort, when all other methods of discipline have failed	1	2	3	4	5
27. Corporal punishment is the best form of punishment because it is over quickly	1	2	3	4	5
28. Female pupils should not be caned (corporal punishment)	1	2	3	4	5

2. Which of the following forms of classroom discipline do you use? Mark the box corresponding to your answer. Rate the effectiveness of the approach even if you have never used it.

(1) Send pupil to detention?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(2) Send pupil to headmaster/headmistress?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

1. Here are a selection of controversial statements on classroom discipline. Show your agreement or disagreement by circling the appropriate number:

   1 = Strongly Agree
   2 = Agree
   3 = Undecided
   4 = Disagree
   5 = Strongly Disagree

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Giving extra homework as a punishment only results in the pupils hating the subject	1	2	3	4	5
2. Sending pupils out of the class removes the problem but doesn't solve it	1	2	3	4	5
3. Organised teachers have less discipline problems	1	2	3	4	5
4. Corporal punishment is necessary in order to maintain discipline at school	1	2	3	4	5
5. Pupils tend to disregard teacher's threats of punishment	1	2	3	4	5
6. Corporal punishment prepares pupils to become victims of abuse	1	2	3	4	5
7. Detention is an effective way of preventing pupils from misbehaving	1	2	3	4	5
8. A good teacher is one who does not use corporal punishment to discipline pupils	1	2	3	4	5
9. Keeping pupils in during break is not an effective form of punishment	1	2	3	4	5
10. The pupils' fear of corporal punishment helps to create an environment of learning	1	2	3	4	5
11. Teachers should discipline pupils in a calm manner	1	2	3	4	5
12. Corporal punishment enhances aggression in pupils	1	2	3	4	5
13. Approaching the school counsellor/other is an ineffective way of solving behaviour problems	1	2	3	4	5
14. Corporal punishment can be justified from a religious point of view	1	2	3	4	5
15. It is morally correct that a person who has done wrong be punished for it	1	2	3	4	5
16. If the teacher gives pupils interesting and challenging work, there will be less discipline problems in class	1	2	3	4	5
17. If a teacher is liked, pupils tend to be better behaved in class	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX A

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this study is to document teachers' attitudes towards classroom discipline.

Discipline refers to the control of pupils' behaviour in a school environment.

Punishment refers to a penalty imposed upon a person for some fault (e.g. withdrawal of privileges, detention, extra homework).

Corporal punishment refers to any form of punishment directed at the body (e.g. caning, hitting student with a ruler).

Verbal punishment refers to any punitive and/or derogatory remark aimed at the student (e.g. name calling).

1. PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. Gender:

   Male ☐ Female ☐

2. Age:

   _____ Years

3. Years of teaching experience:

   _____

4. Training:

   University ☐
   College of Education ☐
   Other (please specify) ☐

   _____

Wolfgang, C.H., & Glickman, C.D. (1986). Solving discipline problems: Strategies for classroom teachers. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Ziegert, K.A. (1983). The Swedish prohibition of corporal punishment: A preliminary report. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45(4), 917-925.

Zimbardo, P.G., Ebbesen, E.B., & Maslach, C. (1977). Influencing attitudes and changing behaviour. London: Addison-Wesley.

APPENDIX G

Teachers cp attitude response across years of experience

			n	%
Experience	Question	Response		
< 5 Years	(8) Good teacher doesn't use cp	Strongly Agree	8	14.29
		Agree	8	14.29
		Undecided	13	23.21
		Disagree	22	39.29
		Strongly Disagree	5	8.93
		Total	56	100.00
5-9 Years	(8) Good teacher doesn't use cp	Strongly Agree	9	15.00
		Agree	18	30.00
		Undecided	10	16.67
		Disagree	19	31.67
		Strongly Disagree	4	6.67
		Total	60	100.00
10-20 Years	(8) Good teacher doesn't use cp	Strongly Agree	14	20.00
		Agree	26	27.14
		Undecided	9	12.86
		Disagree	16	22.86
		Strongly Disagree	5	7.14
		Total	70	100.00
>20 Years	(8) Good teacher doesn't use cp	Strongly Agree	15	28.85
		Agree	17	32.69
		Undecided	10	19.23
		Disagree	5	9.62
		Strongly Disagree	5	9.62
		Total	52	100.00

Teachers cp attitude response across training (cont.)

			n	%
Training	Question	Response		
University	(20) CP teaches pupils respect	Strongly Agree	7	4.46
		Agree	38	24.20
		Undecided	25	15.92
		Disagree	68	43.31
		Strongly Disagree	19	12.10
		Total	157	100.00
	(24) Cp enhances teacher-pupil rel.	Strongly Agree	5	3.18
		Agree	27	17.20
		Undecided	33	21.02
		Disagree	66	42.04
		Strongly Disagree	26	16.56
		Total	157	100.00
	(28) Females should not be caned	Strongly Agree	66	42.04
		Agree	38	24.20
		Undecided	16	10.19
		Disagree	28	17.83
		Strongly Disagree	9	5.73
		Total	157	100.00

APPENDIX F

Teachers corporal punishment attitude response across training

			n	%
Training	Question	Response		
College	(20) CP teaches pupils respect	Strongly Agree	7	8.75
		Agree	18	22.50
		Undecided	7	8.75
		Disagree	37	46.25
		Strongly Disagree	11	13.75
		Total	18	100.00
	(24) Cp enhances teacher-pupil rel.	Strongly Agree	5	6.25
		Agree	19	23.75
		Undecided	15	18.75
		Disagree	32	40.00
		Strongly Disagree	9	11.25
		Total	80	100.00
	(28) Females should not be caned	Strongly Agree	29	36.25
		Agree	15	18.75
		Undecided	12	15.00
		Disagree	15	18.75
		Strongly Disagree	9	11.25
		Total	80	100.00

Teachers cp attitude response across school type (cont.)

			n	%
Type	Question	Response		
Private Schools	(4) CP maintains discipline	Strongly Agree	7	10.94
		Agree	10	15.63
		Undecided	16	25.00
		Disagree	19	29.69
		Strongly Disagree	12	18.75
		Total	64	100.00
	(10) Fear of cp = env. of learning	Strongly Agree	1	1.56
		Agree	9	14.06
		Undecided	12	18.75
		Disagree	28	43.75
		Strongly Disagree	14	21.88
		Total	64	100.00
	(12) Cp enhances aggression	Strongly Agree	7	10.94
		Agree	17	26.56
		Undecided	17	26.56
		Disagree	19	29.69
		Strongly Disagree	4	6.25
		Total	64	100.00
	(14) Cp relig. justifiab.	Strongly Agree	5	7.81
		Agree	14	21.88
		Undecided	9	14.06
		Disagree	23	35.94
		Strongly Disagree	13	20.31
		Total	64	100.00
	(28) Females should not be caned	Strongly Agree	34	53.13
		Agree	13	20.31
		Undecided	5	7.81
		Disagree	6	9.38
		Strongly Disagree	6	9.38
		Total	64	100.00

Teachers cp attitude response across school type (cont.)

			n	%
Type	Question	Response		
Public Schools	(4) CP maintains discipline	Strongly Agree	18	23.08
		Agree	33	42.31
		Undecided	7	8.97
		Disagree	11	14.10
		Strongly Disagree	9	11.54
		Total	78	100.00
	(10) Fear of cp = env. of learning	Strongly Agree	12	15.38
		Agree	30	38.46
		Undecided	7	8.97
		Disagree	20	25.64
		Strongly Disagree	9	11.54
		Total	78	100.00
	(12) Cp enhances aggression	Strongly Agree	10	12.82
		Agree	23	29.49
		Undecided	12	15.38
		Disagree	24	30.77
		Strongly Disagree	9	11.54
		Total	78	100.00
	(14) Cp can be justif. by religion	Strongly Agree	11	14.10
		Agree	31	39.74
		Undecided	14	17.95
		Disagree	14	17.95
		Strongly Disagree	8	10.26
		Total	78	100.00
	(28) Females should not be caned	Strongly Agree	17	21.79
		Agree	15	19.23
		Undecided	14	17.95
		Disagree	22	28.21
		Strongly Disagree	10	12.82
		Total	78	100.00

APPENDIX E

Teachers corporal punishment attitude response across school type

			n	%
Type	Question	Response		
Community Schools	(4) CP maintains discipline	Strongly Agree	23	23.47
		Agree	37	37.76
		Undecided	12	12.24
		Disagree	20	20.41
		Strongly Disagree	6	6.12
		Total	98	100.00
	(10) Fear of cp = env. of learning	Strongly Agree	6	6.12
		Agree	23	23.47
		Undecided	9	9.18
		Disagree	42	42.86
		Strongly Disagree	18	18.37
		Total	98	100.00
	(12) Cp enhances aggression	Strongly Agree	0	0
		Agree	17	17.35
		Undecided	18	18.37
		Disagree	47	47.96
		Strongly Disagree	16	16.33
		Total	98	100.00
	(14) Cp relig. justifiab.	Strongly Agree	18	18.37
		Agree	31	31.63
		Undecided	19	19.39
		Disagree	15	15.31
		Strongly Disagree	15	15.31
		Total	98	100.00
	(28) Females should not be caned	Strongly Agree	44	44.90
		Agree	25	25.51
		Undecided	10	10.20
		Disagree	17	17.35
		Strongly Disagree	2	2.04
		Total	98	100.00

Teachers corporal punishment attitude response (cont.)

		n	%
Question	Response		
(14) CP religiously justifiable	Strongly Agree	34	14.17
	Agree	76	31.67
	Undecided	42	17.50
	Disagree	52	21.67
	Strongly Disagree	36	15.00
	Total	240	100.00
(20) CP teaches pupils to respect teacher	Strongly Agree	14	5.83
	Agree	57	23.75
	Undecided	33	13.75
	Disagree	106	44.17
	Strongly Disagree	30	12.50
	Total	240	100.00
(24) CP enhances teacher-pupil relationship	Strongly Agree	10	4.17
	Agree	47	19.58
	Undecided	49	20.42
	Disagree	99	41.25
	Strongly Disagree	35	14.58
	Total	240	100.00
(26) CP as a last resort	Strongly Agree	78	32.50
	Agree	108	45.00
	Undecided	13	5.42
	Disagree	23	9.58
	Strongly Disagree	18	7.50
	Total	240	100.00
Overall	Strongly Agree	249	11.53
	Agree	612	28.33
	Undecided	323	14.95
	Disagree	650	30.09
	Strongly Disagree	326	15.90
	Total	2160	100.00

APPENDIX D

Teachers' corporal punishment (cp) attitude response

		n	%
Question	Response		
(4) CP necessary to maintain discipline	Strongly Agree	48	20.00
	Agree	80	33.33
	Undecided	35	14.58
	Disagree	50	20.83
	Strongly Disagree	27	11.25
	Total	240	100.00
(6) CP prepares pupils for abuse	Strongly Agree	16	6.7
	Agree	18	7.50
	Undecided	34	14.17
	Disagree	114	47.50
	Strongly Disagree	58	24.50
	Total	240	100.00
(8) Good teacher doesn't use CP	Strongly Agree	46	19.17
	Agree	70	29.17
	Undecided	42	17.50
	Disagree	63	26.25
	Strongly Disagree	19	7.92
	Total	240	100.00
(10) Fear of CP creates environ. of learning	Strongly Agree	19	7.92
	Agree	62	25.83
	Undecided	28	11.67
	Disagree	90	37.50
	Strongly Disagree	41	17.08
	Total	240	100.00
(12) CP enhances aggression	Strongly Agree	17	7.08
	Agree	57	23.75
	Undecided	47	19.58
	Disagree	90	37.50
	Strongly Disagree	29	12.08
	Total	240	100.00

Division of Specialised Education

UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, JOHANNESBURG

Private Bag 3, WITS 2050, South Africa • Telegrams 'Univits' • Telex 4-27125SA • Telephone (011) 716-1111

Fax: (011) 339 3844
Tel: (011) 716 5286
Date: 3 October 1995

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

This serves to introduce Sheryl Cohen. She is a student in the Division of Specialised Education at the University of the Witwatersrand, and is currently reading for the master's degree in educational psychology. The Research Report forms part of the course requirements.

For this purpose, Sheryl is investigating the attitudes of teachers and pupils to classroom discipline.

Your school is one of those which has been carefully selected as part of the sample. Your support is earnestly requested. Following the completion of the study, we will be happy to furnish you with the overall findings, should you wish to receive them.

Please be assured that the name of your school will not appear anywhere in the Report, and will be kept strictly confidential. Further, the respondents' names will not be required, as the Questionnaires will be answered anonymously.

Thank you for your co-operation and support.

Yours faithfully

MERVYN SKUY PhD
Clinical and Educational Psychologist
Professor of Specialised Education and
Head of the Division.

c/hmc149

The University of the Witwatersrand rejects racism and racial segregation. It is committed to non-discrimination particularly in the constitution of its student body, in the selection and promotion of its staff, and in its administration.

APPENDIX C

GAUTENG DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Telephone: 011 408 9214
Fax: 011 403 2055

Reference: EDCENT WILLIAMS
Date: 13 October 1995

8th Floor
Educon Building
cnr Stiemen & Simmonds Street
BRAAMFONTEIN
2017

The Principals of selected schools
GAUTENG

Dear Sirs / Madams

RESEARCH TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY SHERYL COHEN

Please be informed that the Gauteng Department of Education has no objection to the above ntentioned person carrying out research at the school under you principalship.

We base our position on an understanding that:

The management of the school supports the research
The involvement of teachers is a voluntary one
The participation of pupils is on a voluntary basis
The normal programme of work at the school is not unduly disrupted.

Thank you

Yours sincerely

.....
EDCENT WILLIAMS
DIRECTOR: SUPPORT SERVICES

(18) Given a daily report of behaviour to head?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(19) Other (specify)

_____

_____

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 wee'	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

3. Do you agree/disagree with the legal abolishment of corporal punishment in South African schools? **Tick the appropriate box**

Agree ☐ Disagree ☐

If you agree, give reasons:

_____

_____

If you disagree, give reasons:

_____

_____

Suggest alternative methods to corporal punishment

_____

_____

4. If you have been caned/jacked, what kind of misdemeanour was this used for?

_____

_____

5. Any additional comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(11) Given positive reinforcement?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(12) Given extra homework?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(13) Given physical tasks around the school (e.g. clean up the rubbish in the school)?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(14) Stayed in at break/after school?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(15) Deprived of an enjoyable activity?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(16) Made to look foolish in class by the teacher?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

(17) Given a slap or hit by the teacher in passing?

Never (0)	Seldom (1 year)	Sometimes (1 month)	Often (1 week)	Always (Every day)

Is this approach effective?

Yes	No	Sometimes

APPENDIX N

Pupils' experience of corporal punishment across gender

		n	%
Gender	Response		
Female	Never	133	62.74
	Seldom	39	18.40
	Sometimes	16	7.55
	Often	7	3.30
	Always	17	8.02
	Total	212	100.00
Male	Never	48	32.00
	Seldom	45	30.00
	Sometimes	30	20.00
	Often	19	12.67
	Always	8	5.33
	Total	150	100.00

APPENDIX M

Pupils' experience of corporal punishment across standard

		n	%
Standard	Response		
6	Never	7	50.00
	Seldom	6	42.86
	Sometimes	1	7.14
	Often	0	0
	Total	14	100.00
7	Never	46	69.70
	Seldom	6	9.09
	Sometimes	8	12.12
	Often	3	4.55
	Always	3	4.55
	Total	66	100.00
8	Never	16	44.44
	Seldom	10	27.78
	Sometimes	2	5.56
	Often	6	16.67
	Always	2	5.56
	Total	36	100.00
9	Never	77	48.73
	Seldom	43	27.22
	Sometimes	17	10.76
	Often	10	6.33
	Always	11	6.96
	Total	158	100.00
10	Never	35	39.77
	Seldom	19	21.59
	Sometimes	18	20.45
	Often	7	7.95
	Always	9	10.23
	Total	88	100.00

APPENDIX L

Pupils' experience of corporal punishment across school type

		n	%
School type	Response		
Community	Strongly Agree	69	53.49
	Agree	40	31.01
	Undecided	13	10.08
	Disagree	7	5.43
	Total	129	100.00
Public	Strongly Agree	38	33.93
	Agree	19	16.96
	Undecided	20	17.86
	Disagree	12	10.71
	Strongly Disagree	23	20.54
	Total	112	100.00
Private	Strongly Agree	74	61.16
	Agree	25	20.66
	Undecided	13	10.74
	Disagree	7	5.79
	Strongly Disagree	2	1.65
	Total	121	100.00

APPENDIX K

Pupils' corporal punishment attitude response across gender

			n	%
Gender	Question	Response		
Female .	(28) Females should not be caned	Strongly Agree	108	50.94
		Agree	40	18.87
		Undecided	22	10.38
		Disagree	19	8.96
		Strongly Disagree	23	10.85
		Total	212	100.00
Male	(28) Females Should not be caned	Strongly Agree	54	36.00
		Agree	19	12.67
		Undecided	16	10.67
		Disagree	16	10.67
		Strongly Disagree	45	30.00
		Total	150	100.00

Pupils' corporal punishment attitude response (cont.)

		n	%
Question	Response		
(28) Female pupils should not be caned	Strongly Agree	162	44.75
	Agree	59	16.30
	Undecided	38	10.50
	Disagree	35	9.67
	Strongly Disagree	68	18.78
	Total	362	100.00
Overall	Strongly agree	592	13.63
	Agree	841	19.36
	Undecided	681	15.68
	Disagree	1035	23.83
	Strongly disagree	1195	27.51
	Total	4344	100.00

Pupils' corporal punishment attitude response (cont.)

		n	%
Question	Response		
(14) CP religiously justifiable	Strongly Agree	39	10.77
	Agree	77	21.27
	Undecided	123	33.98
	Disagree	64	17.68
	Strongly Disagree	59	16.30
	Total	362	100.00
(18) CP teaches pupils to fear teacher	Strongly Agree	87	24.03
	Agree	106	29.28
	Undecided	36	9.94
	Disagree	86	23.76
	Strongly Disagree	47	12.98
	Total	362	100.00
(20) CP teaches pupils to respect teacher	Strongly Agree	33	9.12
	Agree	61	16.85
	Undecided	51	14.09
	Disagree	118	32.60
	Strongly Disagree	99	27.35
	Total	362	100.00
(24) CP enhances teacher-pupil rel.	Strongly Agree	20	5.52
	Agree	50	13.81
	Undecided	70	19.34
	Disagree	111	30.66
	Strongly Disagree	111	30.66
	Total	362	100.00
(26) Cp as last resort	Strongly Agree	121	33.43
	Agree	103	28.45
	Undecided	52	14.36
	Disagree	48	13.26
	Strongly Disagree	38	10.50
	Total	362	100.00

APPENDIX J

Pupils' corporal punishment attitude response

		n	%
Question	Response		
(4) CP necessary to maintain discipline	Strongly Agree	41	11.33
	Agree	72	19.89
	Undecided	51	14.09
	Disagree	86	23.76
	Strongly Disagree	112	30.94
	Total	362	100.00
(6) CP prepares pupils for abuse	Strongly Agree	65	17.96
	Agree	69	19.06
	Undecided	64	17.68
	Disagree	96	26.52
	Strongly Disagree	68	18.78
	Total	362	100.00
(8) Good teacher doesn't use CP	Strongly Agree	118	32.60
	Agree	96	26.52
	Undecided	54	14.92
	Disagree	65	17.96
	Strongly Disagree	29	8.01
	Total	362	100.00
(10) Fear of CP creates environment of learning	Strongly Agree	45	12.43
	Agree	81	22.38
	Undecided	53	14.64
	Disagree	99	27.35
	Strongly Disagree	84	23.20
	Total	362	100.00
(12) CP enhances aggression	Strongly Agree	114	31.49
	Agree	87	24.03
	Undecided	65	17.96
	Disagree	57	15.75
	Strongly Disagree	39	10.77
	Total	362	100.00

APPENDIX I

Teachers' practice of corporal punishment across gender

			n	%
Gender	Question	Response		
Female	(8) Administer CP	Never	121	72.02
		Seldom	21	12.50
		Sometimes	23	13.69
		Often	3	1.79
		Always	0	0
		Total	168	100.00
	(9) Send to Head for CP	Never	63	37.50
		Seldom	57	33.93
		Sometimes	39	23.21
		Often	7	4.17
		Always	2	1.19
		Total	168	100.00
Male	(8) Administer cp	Never	24	34.29
		Seldom	20	28.57
		Sometimes	23	32.86
		Often	3	4.29
		Always	0	0
		Total	70	100.00
	(9) Sent to head for cp	Never	31	44.29
		Seldom	21	30.00
		Sometimes	16	22.86
		Often	1	1.43
		Always	1	1.43
		Total	70	100.00

Teachers' practice of corporal punishment across training (cont.)

			n	%
Training	**Question**	**Response**		
University	(8) Administer CP	Never	108	69.23
		Seldom	20	12.82
		Sometimes	24	15.38
		Often	4	2.56
		Always	0	0
		Total	156	100.00
	(9) Send to head for CP	Never	56	35.67
		Seldom	56	35.67
		Sometimes	38	24.20
		Often	6	3.82
		Always	1	0.64
		Total	157	100.00
	(18) Slap or hit in passing	Never	56	35.67
		Seldom	56	35.67
		Sometimes	38	24.20
		Often	6	3.82
		Always	1	0.64
		Total	157	100.00

APPENDIX H

Teachers' practice of corporal punishment across training

			n	%
Training	Question	Response		
College	(8) Administer CP	Never	37	46.84
		Seldom	18	22.78
		Sometimes	22	27.85
		Often	2	2.53
		Total	79	100.00
	(9) Send to head for CP	Never	37	47.44
		Seldom	20	25.64
		Sometimes	17	21.79
		Often	2	2.56
		Always	2	2.56
		Total	78	100.00
	(18) Hit or slap in passing	Never	37	47.44
		Seldom	20	25.64
		Sometimes	17	21.79
		Often	2	2.56
		Always	2	2.56
		Total	78	100.00

Author: Cohen,s.
Name of thesis: Teachers and pupils attitudes and practices regarding the abolishment in schools in the gauteng area

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2015

LEGALNOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page)for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.