

Impact of Leadership Training Programme on Teachers' Attitude towards giving Corporal punishment to Students

*** K Rajamohan Rao**

**** Gopal M. Gokhale**

Abstract

An attitudinal change is required to be promoted amongst teachers to prevent them from giving corporal punishment to the students and it is desirable to see whether it is possible to bring about such an attitudinal change through a training and development intervention. In the entry survey conducted at the beginning of the training programme, 41.7 per cent of teacher participants expressed the opinion that punishment should be given to the students to prevent the recurrence of mistakes. After one year of training, 63.2 per cent of the respondents expressed the opinion that corporal punishment is not a method of disciplining the students and stated that punishment should not be given. 84 per cent of respondents as against 40.3 per cent one year ago, stated that they did not give corporal punishment even once in the post training period. It may be concluded that the Leadership Training Programme has succeeded in causing a shift of mind in teachers from 'giving corporal punishment' to 'not giving corporal punishment' for the purpose of disciplining the students.

Key words: *Attitudinal Change, Corporal punishment, Leadership Training*

* Principal, Govinda Dasa First Grade College, Surathkal, Karnataka - 575 014

** Head, Dept. of Statistics, Govinda Dasa First Grade College, Surathkal, Karnataka

Introduction

Disciplining the students is an integral task of a teacher. There is a general belief that giving corporal punishment is an inevitable part of this disciplining process. 'Spare the rod and spoil the child' is the usual chant of many who believe in giving corporal punishment to discipline the students. "Dandam Dasha Guna Bhaveth" which means that corporal punishment results in internalizing ten good qualities in the child is a universally accepted statement among the teaching community. Some teachers believe that corporal punishment should be given to the students for breaking the social norms. Some others believe that it should be given for preventing the recurrence of mistakes. Some believe that corporal punishment should be given to the students to reform them. There are also teachers who feel that corporal punishment should not be given.

Corporal punishment occurs when a parent or educator hits a child with the purpose of educating him. It usually consists of a light blow with the open hand on the buttocks or hand because the child has misbehaved, deviated from the right path or failed to comply with the wishes and instructions or accept the authority of the parents or educator.

In most countries of the world, light corporal punishment is permitted as a way of disciplining and correcting a child. In schools it is less acceptable as a means of discipline and in many countries teachers are not allowed to corporally punish their students. Corporal punishment has been banned in about 90 countries (Benjamin Shmueli 2010).

In order to make learning more interesting and effective, the fear of punishment should be removed from the minds of students. For that purpose, teachers' habit of giving corporal punishment should be changed. A mere legal provision banning corporal punishment will not serve the purpose. It requires an attitudinal change in the teachers

and it is desirable to see whether it is possible to bring about such an attitudinal change through a training and development intervention. This study on the 'Impact of Leadership Training Programme on Teachers' attitude towards giving corporal punishment to students' is an attempt to measure whether a training programme is capable of bringing about an attitudinal change amongst the teachers regarding their habit of giving corporal punishment to the students.

Objective of the Study

The objective of this Study is to assess the impact of Leadership Training Programme on Teachers' attitude towards giving Corporal punishment to Students in the Post Training Period.

Literature Review

Alex Grecu (2006) made a study of corporal punishment in schools by using a panel of data on 50 U.S. States and Districts of Columbia. He observed that corporal punishment has a negative effect on student performance as measured by eight and fourth grades NAEP mathematics test scores.

Benjamin Shmueli (2010) who made a comparative study of corporal punishment given by teachers and parents suggests that parental corporate punishment should be banned by civil law and corporal punishment by teachers should be totally and criminally banned.

Gershoff (2002) reviewed 88 corporal punishment studies conducted over 6 decades. She states that more than half of the studies supported that even common forms of physical punishment are detrimental to childrens' development in a number of areas.

The Report of the South Asia Regional Consultation on the Study of Violence against children prepared by the U.N. Secretary General (UN 2005) categorically states – 'Hitting people is wrong – and children are people too. Corporal punishment of children breaches

their fundamental rights to respect for their human dignity and physical integrity. Its legality breaches their right to equal protection under law'.

A report by Save the Children (Jabeen F 2004) cites a study relating to the prevalence of corporal punishment in India. In the study titled 'Butterflies 2003, My Name is Today: A Dossier on Children and Children's Rights Vol II: Children and Protection Issues, New Delhi, India: Butterflies Advocacy and Research Centre' carried out in Chandigarh in 1986-87 it was found that 98.3 per centage of parents were in favour of physical punishment and out of 187 school going children aged 6-10 years, 85.5 per centage reported receiving beatings at home.

A 1996 Study (Mode 1996) supported by UNICEF found that 66 per centage of children in the State of Maharashtra reported being regularly punished by their teachers in class. In Tamil Nadu the corresponding figure was 87 per centage with similar prevalence figures in urban and rural schools. Thus there is empirical evidence to show that there is wide spread ill treatment of children in India, not only in schools but also within the family.

Randa Mahmoud Youssef et.al. (1998), in their study undertaken to reveal the prevalence and determinants of corporal punishment in middle and high schools in Alexandria, indicate that corporal punishment is used in schools extensively to discipline the students whose behavior doesn't conform with the desired standard of educational institutions.

Richard Dubanoski et.al. (1983) discovered that corporal punishment can lead to more problems than it appears to solve. They are of the opinion that in a classroom characterized by positive mutual regard, teachers can maximize their effectiveness as teachers and students can maximize their effectiveness as learners.

A review of literature indicates that the studies on corporal punishment do not emphasize the relevance of a training programme for bringing about an attitudinal change in the teachers towards corporal punishment in schools. The present study overcomes this limitation by assessing the impact of a Leadership Training Programme on the attitude of teachers towards giving corporal punishment to the students and by assessing their perception about corporal punishment during the pre-training and post-training period. It also analyses the extent of corporal punishment given by the teachers in the pre training and post training period. For that purpose, the following methodology is adopted.

Methodology

In order to make an in depth analysis, the Leadership Training Programme organized by the College for Leadership and Human Resource Development at Mysore for school administrators of Mysore, Mandya, Hassan and Kodagu Districts from 22nd to 26th December 2008 was selected as the number of participants registered for training was more in that region. In all 291 school administrators participated in the training programme spread over 5 days, from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. The participants were informed about the significance of the study and were assured of the confidentiality of the information furnished by them. One year after the conclusion of training, Questionnaires eliciting information regarding giving corporal punishment to students were sent to all the participants. However only 144 duly filled in questionnaires were received back. Hence the study is based on the information furnished by 144 School administrators. The data was analysed by using the SPSS software. The Leadership Training Programme included a concept on 'punishment' to the students. Case studies were presented to the participants to form a judgment regarding the effect of punishment.

This study analyses the opinion of the participants about punishment before and after attending the Leadership Training Programme.

Opinion about giving Corporal Punishment

The Participants' opinion about giving punishment to students 'before attending' and 'after attending' the Leadership Training Programme is disclosed in Table 1.

Table 1 : Attitude towards giving punishment to students (before Training and after Training) (N 144)

Sl. No.	Opinions	Male		Female		Total	
		Pre-Trg. period	Post Trg. period	Pre-Trg. period	Post Trg. period	Pre-Trg. period	Post Trg. period
		No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
1	Punishment should be given for breaking social norms	25 23.8%	12 11.4%	09 23.1%	05 12.8%	34 23.6%	17 11.8%
2	Punishment should be given for preventing recurrence of mistakes	45 42.9%	16 15.3%	15 38.5%	09 23.1%	60 41.7%	25 17.4%
3	Punishment should not be given	29 27.6%	71 67.6%	12 30.8%	20 51.3%	41 28.5%	91 63.2%
4	Any Other	06 05.7%	06 5.7%	03 7.6%	05 12.8%	09 6.2%	11 7.6%
	Total	105 100%	105 100%	39 100%	39 100%	144 100%	144 100%

Source: Field survey

As stated in Table 1, 41.7 per cent of respondents (42.9 per cent Male and 38.5 per cent Female respondents) expressed the opinion that punishment should be given for preventing the recurrence of mistakes. Another 23.6 per cent of respondents (23.8 per cent Male and 23.1 per cent Female respondents) were of the opinion that punishment should be given for breaking the social norms. 6.2 per cent of respondents (5.7 per cent Male and 7.6 per cent Female

respondents) gave some other reasons such as 'punishment should be given for reforming the students' and 'punishment should be given to deter other students from committing 'wrong deeds'. Only 28.5 per cent of respondents (27.6 per cent Male and 30.8 per cent Female respondents) stated that punishment should not be given to discipline the students. From the above, it may be inferred that, in the pre-training period, majority of respondents were in favour of giving punishment to prevent the recurrence of mistakes. A considerable shift in the opinion regarding 'Punishment' can be observed in the Post-training period of respondents. As stated in Table 1, 63.2 per cent of respondents (67.6 per cent Male and 51.3 per cent Female respondents) expressed the opinion that corporal punishment is not a method of disciplining the students and hence stated that punishment should not be given. The per cent of respondents who expressed that punishment should be given for preventing recurrence of mistakes came down from 41.7 per cent to 17.4 per cent (in the case of Male respondents from 42.9 per cent to 15.3 per cent and in the case of Female respondents from 38.5 per cent to 23.1 per cent). Further, the percentage of respondents who stated that punishment should be given for breaking social norms came down from 23.6 per cent to 11.8 per cent (in the case of Male respondents from 23.8 per cent to 11.4 per cent and in the case of Female respondents from 23.1 per cent to 12.8 per cent). There has been a slight increase in the percentage of participants who gave 'Other Reasons' with regard to the reasons for giving punishment.

A shift in attitude from 'Punishment' to 'No Punishment' can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2: Giving Corporal Punishment to Students – Respondents' opinion before and after attending LTP

Gender of Respondents	Opinion about punishment in the Pre Training Period			Opinion about punishment in the Post Training Period		
	Punishment should not be given	Punishment should be given	Total	Punishment should not be given	Punishment should be given	Total
Male	29 27.6%	76 72.4%	105 100%	71 67.6%	34 32.4%	105 100%
Female	12 30.8%	27 69.2%	39 100%	20 51.3%	19 48.7%	39 100%
Total	41 28.5%	103 71.5%	144 100%	91 63.2%	53 36.8%	144 100%

Source: Field Survey

A considerable shift in attitude from 'Punishment' to 'No punishment' is visible in Table 2. In aggregate, the percentage of respondents who felt that 'punishment should not be given' was only 28.5 per cent in the pre training period. It comprised 27.6 per cent Male and 30.8 per cent Female respondents. 71.5 per cent of the respondents felt that corporal punishment should be given to the students to discipline them. In contrast, in the post training period, 63.2 per cent of respondents felt that corporal punishment is not the way to discipline the students. Likewise, the percentage of respondents who felt that corporal punishment should be given, came down from 71.5 per cent to 36.8 per cent. Thus, the Leadership Training Programme can be considered to be very effective in creating this shift of attitude of respondents.

A chi square test was conducted to assess whether there exists any relationship between Gender and Attitude towards punishment. The data relating to the chi square test is given below:

Table 3: Measurement of Relationship between Gender and Attitude towards Punishment (Pearson's Chi-Square Test)

	Value	df	Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)	Exact sig. (2 sided)	Exact sig. (1 sided)
Before attending LTP	.019	1	.891	1.000	.627
After attending LTP	3.263	1	.071	.082	.054

Source: Field Survey data

It appears from Table 2 that Male respondents are more considerate towards students. However, this conclusion is not proved in the Chi square test. The Null Hypothesis of independence of relationship between Gender and Attitude towards punishment is accepted both at the pre training and post training period. In other words, there does not appear to be a significant relationship between Gender and Attitude towards punishment.

A chi square test was conducted to assess whether there exists any relationship between the Opinion about giving corporal punishment and the Age of respondents. The chi square test reveals the data in Table 4.

Table 4: Relationship between opinion about survey corporal punishment and the age of respondent.

Pearson's Chi-Square Test	Value	df	Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
Before attending LTP	.475	3	.924
After attending LTP	5.849	3	.119

Source: Field Survey data

It appears from the above table that the Null Hypothesis of independence of relationship between the Age of respondents and Opinion about giving corporal punishment is accepted both at the pre training and post training period. Hence it may be concluded that there does not exist any significant relationship between the Age of respondents and the opinion about giving corporal punishment to the students.

Extent of corporal punishment given to Students

The respondents were asked to state the number of times the corporal punishment was given by them in the pre training and post training period. The data relating to the same are presented in Table 5, 6 and 7

Table 5 : Corporal Punishment given to Students before and after attending LTP

Pre-Training Period	Male Respondents		Female Respondents		Total Respondents	
	Before Training	After Training	Before Training	After Training	Before Training	After Training
Number of times in a week	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Not even once	40 38.1%	86 81.9%	18 46.2%	35 89.7%	58 40.3%	121 84%
1 to 5 times	47 44.8%	19 18.1%	17 43.6%	03 7.7%	64 44.4%	22 15.3%
6 to 10 times	06 5.7%	0 0%	02 5.1%	01 2.6%	08 5.6%	01 .7%
Over 10 times	12 11.4%	0 0%	02 5.1%	00 0%	14 9.7%	00 0%
Total	105 100%	105 100%	39 100%	39 100%	144 100%	144 100%

Source: Field Survey data

As per Table 5, in the pre training period, out of 144 respondents, 58 (40.3 per cent) stated that they did not give corporal punishment even once. 64 respondents (44.4 per cent) stated that they gave punishment 1 to 5 times, 8 respondents (5.6 per cent) stated that the extent of punishment ranged from 6 to 10 times. 14 respondents felt that the extent of punishment crossed 10 times in a week. It appears from the data that the female respondents were more considerate towards students. 46.2 per cent of female respondents when compared to 38.1 per cent of Male respondents stated that they did not give any

punishment to the students. Again, only 5.1 per cent of them when compared to 11.4 per cent of Male respondents stated that the extent of corporal punishment crossed 10 times in a week. In the post Leadership Training period, out of 144 respondents, 121 forming 84 per cent stated that they did not give corporal punishment even once. 22 (15.3 per cent) stated that they gave corporal punishment 1 to 5 times in a week. Only one respondent stated that the corporal punishment given ranged from 6 to 10 times. In this case also, the Female respondents appear to be more considerate towards the students. A cross verification of data in Table 1 and 5 shows that in the pre-training period, while 103 respondents were of the opinion that punishment should be given, the actual number of respondents who gave punishment numbered only 86. In the post-training period, while 53 respondents stated that corporal punishment should be given, the actual number of respondents who gave punishment was only 23. The fact whether the respondents do not consider minor acts of punishment as real punishment or not is beyond the scope of this study and needs further exploration.

A cross tabulation of Corporal punishment given to the students in the pre training and post training period is made in Table 6. According to Table 6, 58 respondents who were not giving any corporal punishment in the pre training period continued to do so even in the post training period. Out of 64 respondents who used to give punishment 1 to 5 times, 57 constituting 89.1 per cent stopped giving corporal punishment in the post training period. Of the 8 respondents who used to give corporal punishment 6 to 10 times, 2 (25 per cent) stopped giving corporal punishment and 6 (75 per cent) reduced corporal punishment to less than 5 times a week. Of the 14

respondents who used to give punishment over 10 times, 4(28.6 per cent) stopped giving such punishment, 9 (64.3 per cent) reduced it to less than 5 times and 1(7.1 per cent) reduced it to less than 10 times in a week. None reported giving corporal punishment over 10 times in the post training period.

A chi square test was conducted to examine whether there exists any relationship between Corporal punishment given in the pre training and post training period. The results are tabulated below:

Table 7 : Pearson's Chi-Square Test - Relationship between Corporal punishment during pre and post training period

Value	df	Asymp.Sig. (2 sided)
70.017	6	.000

Source: Field Survey data

The Null Hypothesis of independence of relationship between corporal punishment given to students in the pre training and post training period is rejected at .000 level of significance. In other words, there appears to be a significant relationship between corporal punishment given in the Pre training and Post training period.

From the data it appears that the Leadership Training Programme has succeeded in causing a shift of mind from 'giving corporal punishment' to 'not giving corporal punishment' for the purpose of disciplining the students.

It may be concluded that through an effective Training Programme, the School Administrators who also act as Teachers, can be made to realize the evils of giving corporal punishment to students and can be motivated to treat the students in a more humane way.

Findings and Suggestions

The following findings have been made in the course of study:

- The leadership training programme helps the participants to identify several areas of concepts and skills which are useful both for school administrators and teachers.
- When scholastic learning is coupled with experiential learning and is followed by practice, the learning becomes easier.
- The quality of practical performance of leadership in the classroom by the school administrators can be influenced through concept clarification and skill development as shown by the change in attitude of the school administrators about offering corporal punishment to erring students.

The following suggestions are offered in this connection:

- Make leadership training programme mandatory for all teachers.
- Provide such training to the teachers in the beginning of the career.
- Increase the duration of training.
- Conduct follow-up training programmes

Conclusion

It may be concluded that an effective leadership training programme not only helps the school administrators and teachers in understanding the evil effects of punishments but also in motivating them to change their attitude towards giving punishments to the students. However, as revealed by the study, follow-up programmes are required to bring in permanent changes in the attitude of school administrators and teachers in this regard. ■

References

Alex Grecu, Spare the rod? Principals, Agents and Corporal punishment in Public Schools, www.ssrn.com, June 2006.

Benjamin Shmueli, Corporal punishment in the educational system versus corporal punishment by parents: A Comparative view, www.Ssrn.com, Law and contemporary problems, Vol.73, No.281, 2010.

Gershoff, Elizabeth (2002), Corporal punishment by parents and associated Child Behaviors and Experiences: A Meta Analytic and Theoretical Review, *Psychological Bulletin* 128 (4): 539-579

Jabeen F 2004 Corporal/Physical and Psychological punishment of girls and boys in South And Central Asia Region, Denmark: Save the Children, Sweden, 2004.

Mode 1996, Attitudes Study on Elementary Education in India: A Consolidated Report – A study sponsored by UNICEF India cited in Corporal punishment in schools in South Asia: submitted to the Committee on the rights of the child day of General Discussion on violence against children, 28 Sept. 01.

Randa Mahmoud Youssef, Medhat Salah El Din Attia and Mohamed Ibrahim Kamel, Children Experiencing Violence: prevalence and determinants of corporal punishment in schools, www.Sciencedirect.com, Child Abuse and Neglect, Vol .22, Issue 10, Oct.98, P.975-985.

Richard A Dubanoski, Michel Inaba M.S. & Kent Gerkewicz, Corporal punishment in Schools: Myths, problems and alternatives, *Child Abuse and Neglect*, Vol.7, Issue 3, 1983, www.Sciencedirect.com.

U.N.2005, Ending legalized violence against children: report of the South Asia Regional Consultation, Islamabad, Pakistan.

Noe R.A. and Schmitt (1986). The influence of trainee attitudes on training effectiveness: Test of a model. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 497-523, in Elwood F. Holton III. The Flawed Four Level Evaluation Model, *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Spring 1996; 7: 1, ABI/INFORM Global p5.

Dixon N.M. (1990). The relationship between trainee responses on participation reaction forms and post test scores; *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 1, 129-137 in Elwood F. Holton III. The Flawed

Flawed Four Level Evaluation Model, Human Resource Development Quarterly, Spring 1996; 7: 1, ABI/INFORM Global p5.

Stufflebeam, D. L. (2000) The CIPP model for evaluation. In D. L. **Stuffelbaum, G. F. Madaus & T. Kellaghan** (eds) Evaluation models. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 279-317
<http://www.aare.edu.au/04pap/dow/041019.pdf>.)

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1998) Evaluating Training Programs The four levels. (Second Edition) San Francisco Berrett-Koehler
<http://www.aare.edu.au/04pap/dow/041019.pdf>.)

“Education is the Most Powerful Weapon which you can use to Change the World”

- Nelson Mandela

**

“Imagination is more important than Knowledge as it is the Starting Point of Success”

- Albert Einstein

**

“Innovation is the creation of the new or re-arranging of the old in the new way”

- Michel Vance

**

“Without a sense of teamwork it is really hard to build a great institution”

- Anonymous