

TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AS A METHOD OF DISCIPLINE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Songül KİLİMCİ*

Abstract

Schools are meant to be the one of the safest places where students fulfill their educational practices. However many studies show that corporal punishment is adopted worldwide in many schools. This article briefly examines corporal punishment as a tool for providing discipline in education: tendency of the elementary school teachers and administrators to resort to corporal punishment as a method of discipline, why they consider it as a primary discipline method and what they suggest to eliminate corporal punishment. Based on the observations and interviews, the result of the research revealed that children are the victims of corporal punishment at elementary schools. Both the observations and the interviews proved that children's rights were abused. Results are discussed in theoretical and educational implication.

Key Words: Corporal Punishment, Discipline in Education, Teachers' Perceptions

The Convention on the Rights of the Child is the first legally binding international instrument to incorporate the full range of human rights—civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. The Convention sets out these rights in 54 articles and two optional protocols. It voices the basic human rights that children everywhere have: the right to survival; to develop to the fullest; to protection from harmful influences, abuse and exploitation; and to participate fully in family, cultural and social life. The four core principles of the Convention are non-discrimination; devotion to the best interests of the child; the right to life, survival and development; and respect for the views of the child. Every right stated in the Convention is inherent to the human dignity and harmonious development of every child. The Convention protects children's rights by setting standards in health care; education; and legal, civil and social services (Unicef, 2009).

On the other hand, it is widely believed that discipline is required for students in order for them to be successful in education, especially during the compulsory education period. Rosen (1997) defines discipline as either a branch of knowledge-training that develops self-control, character, efficiency and strict control to enforce obedience- or as a treatment that controls and punishes as a system of rules. Eggleton (2001) defines it as a training which corrects molds or perfects the mental faculties, or moral characters, obedience to authority or rules, punishment to correct poor behaviors. However, discipline does not necessarily have to involve corporal punishment. Corporal Punishment is usually related to school discipline with the term *discipline* itself which is problematic and has several ramifications for all actors in education (Slee 1995, Rosen 1997). Generally, school discipline is defined as school policies and actions taken by school personnel to prevent students from unwanted behaviors, primarily focusing on school conduct codes and security methods, suspension from school, corporal punishment, and teachers' methods of managing students' actions in class (Cameron, 2006).

The use of discipline is necessary to provide obedience to school rules. However the use of corporal punishment to provide discipline might bring more harm than benefit. Gordon (1981) discusses that disciplining children is damaging their physical, emotional, and social well being. He also points out the frequency of physical punishment in the public schools in Dallas where an average of 2000 incidents were reported per month of using corporal punishment. Almost double that number was reported by the Houston School District. Gordon also mentions the research of Reardon and Reynolds (1979) which shows that from 60% to 89% of parents support the legal use of corporal punishment on their own kids by the schools. The results of several studies (Scarr,1995; Flynn,1996; Ramsburg,1997) indicate that corporal punishment or spanking is usually considered as a primary discipline method in most countries,

* Dr. Cukurova University, Turkey; Uppsala University, Sweden, songul.kilimci@gmail.com
Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi
The Journal of International Social Research
Volume 2 / 8 Summer 2009

including the USA. Teachers and school administrators resort to corporal punishment to correct poor behaviors.

Agbenyega (2006) reports on the practice of corporal punishment in two basic schools in the Greater Accra District in Ghana. The findings reveal that an overwhelming majority of the teachers [94 and 98 percent] use corporal punishment to enforce school discipline. The results further indicate that the majority of the teachers in both school sites administer corporal punishment to students who perform poorly in academic work. This implies that students with special learning problems who are not officially identified may be punished often for poor performance. Another surprising aspect of this result is that a large number of teachers from all the schools indicate their unwillingness to discontinue corporal punishment in their schools.

Robinson et al (2005) question the effectiveness of corporal punishment and underline the side effects of corporal punishment such as running away, fear of teacher, feelings of helplessness, humiliation, aggression and destruction at home and at school, abuse and criminal activities. Gershoff (2002) also attributes corporal punishment to increased aggression and lower levels of moral internalization and mental health and adds that adults who were corporally punished when children are more likely to be criminals, be violent with their sexual partner, and spank their own children. The Psychiatric News (as cited in Cryan, 1995) states that the psychological effects may be as harmful as the physical effects are.

The reasons for student behavior problems should be examined in depth to solve this problem because many factors contribute to student behavior problems apart from the poor school and classroom management. Jenson, Reavis and Rhode (1998) point to the importance of positive support with the difficult students because they usually have a history of punishment to which they have grown immune and they state that permanent behavior changes are maintained only by basic positive procedures. Similarly, Ramsburg (1997) notes that spanking, used as a primary discipline method, may have some potentially harmful effects such as increasing the chances of misbehavior. Punitive behavior management methods have been shown to be ineffective and in some cases harmful to students (Cameron, 2006). Verbal reprimands, persistent nagging of students about their behaviors may be effective in the short run but they do not work and students suffer from violence in the long run (Hyman and Perone, 1998), as it would cost more (Clark, 2004), cause aggression and violence (Straus, 1991). Abebe and Hailemariam, (2007) note that the student behavior problems must be viewed as "complex and multilevel" and add that

Society's number one goal should be to prevent the development of less than positive behaviors in children. Policy makers must give priority to prevention and proactive practices in the form of mandated child development and parenting classes for parents and enrichment and intervention programs for children (p. 16).

Leach (2003) agrees with Abebe and Hailemariam stating that schooling is more than just teaching subject knowledge and employable skills. She suggests that subjects such as citizenship and democracy, life skills, guidance and counseling, and personal and social education should be included in the curriculum.

If corporal punishment may adversely affect a student's self-image and school achievement and may contribute to disruptive and violent student behavior, why, then, do the teachers, administrators and other school staff, in the name of discipline, often contribute to students' misbehavior and aggression? This study aims to seek answer to this question.

The present study is a follow-up to an earlier investigation. The purpose of the earlier study was to determine the attitudes of teachers and administrators towards the students at schoolyards as far as children's rights were concerned. The investigation was conducted in 2004-2005 academic year, in 7 elementary schools at Seyhan and Yuregir districts in Adana, Turkey. The data obtained through observations and interviews were thematically categorized, analyzed within the framework of the principles of content analysis, evaluated, and discussed in terms of children's rights. The findings of the earlier study revealed that students with Low Socio Economic Level (L-SEL) were maltreated by teachers and administrators to handle discipline and establish the rules.

The purpose of the current study is to assess the violence issue from the perspective of teachers and to determine why school teachers and administrators resort to violence as a method of discipline and how they think corporal punishment can be eliminated at schools

Method

Sample

This follow up study was conducted at 7 elementary (the first eight years of free and compulsory education) public schools in 2005-2006 academic year, where the earlier study was conducted at Seyhan and Yuregir districts, in Adana, Turkey.

In total, 7 principals and 105 teachers were interviewed. In each school 15 teachers were interviewed. All of the randomly selected teachers gave their consent to participate in the interview. The majority of the teachers (70 percent) had had more than 15 years of teaching experience. The 7 elementary schools differed significantly in term of socio-economic status; 3 schools served a student population that was from low-economic level neighborhood (L-SEL); 3 schools served a student population from middle socio-economic level (M-SEL) and 1 school served a student population from higher socio-economic level (H-SEL). The ages of students subject to corporal punishment, ranged from 6 to 16 years. Since It was assumed that no corporal punishment was adopted at schools in higher socio-economic level, only one school was taken as a sample from this level to make sure whether this assumption was grounded or not.

Procedure

The present study adopting a qualitative research method employed a semi-structured interview schedule in which interviews lasted between 10 minutes and 30 minutes. Teacher interviews were conducted in teacher rooms on different days. The principal interviews were conducted in their respective offices. The questions for the interview were based on the observation that took place the previous year. The questions were designed to elicit:

- the reasons why teachers and principals adopt corporal punishment,
- what teachers and principals suggest for alternative ways of maintaining discipline in classrooms and at school.

The interview notes were coded and the responses were classified as *the opinions and suggestions of the principals and the teachers from Low Socio-Economic Level (L-SEL), Middle Socio-Economic Level (M-SEL) and Higher Socio-Economic Level (H-SEL)* and presented in tables. Frequencies were presented to describe the data.

Results

The results of the earlier study investigating the teachers' and administrators' attitudes towards the students at schoolyards as regards children's rights revealed that the administrators and teachers using violence such as hitting, spanking, kicking, scolding, and insulting as a disciplinary tool. The students who were interviewed believed that all the administrators and teachers in education area were using corporal punishment as disciplinary measure and therefore they considered it "natural" to receive such treatment. It was also observed that violence was more widely resorted to at the schools in low income neighborhoods when compared with that in middle and high income neighborhoods.

Table 1 shows the observed violence types from the earlier study that the students were exposed to.

Table 1. Forms of Violence in Schools Distributed over Socio-Economic Levels

| Violence | Schools | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---|---|-------|---|-------|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | L-SEL | | | M-SEL | | H-SEL | |
| Slapping | + | + | + | - | - | - | - |
| Ear Pulling | + | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hitting with a rod | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Battering | + | - | + | - | + | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Pushing | + | + | + | + | + | + | * |
| Punching | + | + | - | + | - | - | - |
| Two students slapping each other | + | - | + | - | - | - | - |
| Hair Pulling | - | + | - | - | - | - | - |
| Kicking | + | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Verbal assault (such as swearing) | + | + | + | + | + | + | - |
| Total | 9 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

(+): Observed. (-): Not Observed. (*): Partly Observed. (Gömlüksiz, Kilimci, Vural, 2005)

The results in the earlier study showed violence against children that violated the rights of children in schools, was that exerted by teachers' upon students, in the name of school discipline. With these results obtained, we asked the teachers' and school principals' opinions about the reasons why they adopt corporal punishment, what teachers' and principals' opinions and beliefs on corporal punishment were and what they suggest for alternative ways of providing discipline in classrooms and schools.

The result of the interview with the school principals

The principals' problem definitions and suggestions to solve the problems defined are given in Table 2.

Table 2. Problem Definition and Suggestions of School Principals

| Principal | Problem Definition | Suggestion |
|-----------|---|---|
| 1.L-SEL | Misbehavior of the students | Vocational education centers |
| | Language problems | Social security |
| | Lack of facilities | Economic security |
| | Ignorant families | Education in the family |
| | Restless children | Reduce the number of students |
| | Insecure neighborhood | Sports centers |
| | Number of students | |
| | Economic problems | |
| 2.L-SEL | Violence a communication tool | |
| | Lack of education | Reduce the number of students |
| | Lack of social security | Educate parents |
| | Lack of tolerance in the family | Sports centers |
| | Lack of facilities | Integration of the immigrants |
| | Number of students | Birth control |
| | Economic problems | |
| 3.L-SEL | Violence a communication tool | |
| | Number of students | Educate the family |
| | Ignorant parents | Economic security |
| | Growing up style | Reduce the number of students |
| | Lack of education | Sports centers |
| | Economic problems | Arts centers |
| 4.M-SEL | Violence a communication tool | |
| | Lack of respect | Little kids in separate buildings from the older ones |
| | Misbehavior of students | Guidance, counselors |
| | Need to keep the students under control | |
| 5.M-SEL | Older students with little ones | |
| | Misbehavior of students | School- parent collaboration |
| 6.M-SEL | Lack of school education | Teacher training |
| 7.H-SEL | Motivation to be successful | School-parent collaboration |
| | | Educated people |

Principals interviewed stated that they were against any kind of violence and they were aware that it is not legal in Turkey (Turkey put signature under the Convention on the Rights of Child in 1990). However, the principals of all three schools from L-SEL also stated that it was the only method that could be effective to discipline the students in those areas, and so they had to resort to violence when necessary.

The main reasons the principals put forward for the adoption of violence were mainly based on the overpopulation in the classrooms where they had difficulty to provide discipline and parents, who apparently used corporal punishment as a method of discipline. The principals claimed that the parents and the students had integration problems and also there was violence in the family and therefore students were brought up as exposed to violence, which they consider to be part of education. Besides, the principals believed that there was expectancy of adopting corporal punishment in education both by the parents and by the students. The neighborhood in which the kids were growing up was also blamed as they were considered to be liable to violence and therefore the students were constantly misbehaving and disturbing friends or the small kids and also damaging school property. The principals drew attention to the fact that the students were not interested in the education or the benefits of school instruction.

When asked their suggestion to avoid corporal punishment the principals suggested that the number of students in classes should be reduced; the students should be provided with an economically, psychologically and physiologically secure life; they should be made aware of the importance of education in their future and be advised to act accordingly. They also pointed to the necessity of family education and integration programs.

The principals and teachers' assumptions towards violence at home should be investigated in a further study. Children are the segments of the society and their conception that corporal punishment is a tool for providing discipline and belief in this concept might bring some unexpected results such as becoming the victims and/or hostages of physical or emotional violence. Alekseeva (2007) discusses the child abuse in the home and states that 25, 000 Russian children ran away from home to avoid abuse. Eggleton (2001) draws attention to the fact that corporal punishment is an ineffective technique to discipline students because (as cited in Hyman, 1996), it negatively affects self concept. Corporal punishment may be used as a tool to suppress negative behavior temporarily. However, it does not teach a new behavior. In order to avoid corporal punishment, Eggleton (2001) suggests the principals and other administrators that they need to be seen regularly, establish mutual support with the teachers and also develop strategies for reducing school discipline which must be assessed continuously for their impact on school climate.

Teacher beliefs about the misbehavior of students and reasons for adopting corporal punishment at schools in Lower SEL.

The teachers were asked to define the problems and make suggestions as solutions. The total frequency of the problem definitions and solutions of the teachers from L-SEL are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Problem Definition and Suggestions of Teachers at L-SEL schools

| | Problem definitions | f | Suggestions | f |
|--------------|--|------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| L-SEL | Problems with their own family | 45 | Reduce number of students in class | 45 |
| | Cultural background | 45 | Parental education | 39 |
| | Expectancy of punishment | 45 | Integration courses | 33 |
| | Number of students in classes | 45 | Division of school buildings | 31 |
| | Number of the people in families | 42 | Supports from civil organizations | 23 |
| | Lack of respect to each other or to elders | 42 | Economic support | 22 |
| | Lack of parent-school collaboration | 38 | Individual meetings | 21 |
| | Lack of concentration | 35 | Parent-School collaboration | 21 |
| | Violence in family and school | 32 | Psychological support | 18 |
| | Parent Demand | 31 | Preparatory courses (before school) | 16 |
| | Lack of ideal in life | 29 | Sports and art centers | 14 |
| | Language problems | 27 | School campus | 9 |
| | Work pressure | 15 | Teacher training courses (in-service) | 6 |
| | Total perceptions | 471 | | 295 |

Teachers at schools in low-economic background had lots of reasons why they had to adopt corporal punishment as a way of providing discipline. All of the teachers (45) agreed that students had some problems with their own families and the poor cultural background of the students. The teachers complained about violence from students to students in addition to violence from elders to the younger ones and even violence from student to teacher (32). They also pointed out there is demand request from the parents to punish their children when they misbehaved even out of school (31). One interesting problem identified by some of the teachers (15) was that students work out because they were financially in need and they apparently came to school to rest. Some teachers drew attention to the problem that most parents could not communicate with the teachers effectively due to language problems (27) because they were from different ethnic backgrounds which resulted in the lack of parent-teacher collaboration (38).

All of the teachers working in the L-SEL neighborhood complained about the number of the students (70 students in some classes). The teachers were aware that any kind of violence or corporal punishment was forbidden in the Republic of Turkey, which put signature under the Convention on the Rights of the Child, articles 17, 29, 30. Yet, teachers complained about having difficulty in maintaining silence and instruction in these classrooms. That was the reason they put forward for using corporal punishment as a solution as they said it was seen as the only solution because it kept the students silent and concentrated (35) at least for a few seconds. The teachers mainly complained about experiencing hoarseness and they said that they sometimes had to resort to corporal punishment because that was the only language that they could understand.

When the teachers were asked what the solutions for these problems could be, they indicated that these students needed love and affection, which they claimed to be struggling to achieve in a neighborhood with L-SEL. Yet, they also indicated that they did not have enough time to do so all the time in such sentences "We are also human and have a limited capacity". All the teachers interviewed in L-SEL schools (45) pointed out the importance of reducing the number of the students in the classrooms because there apparently was a cultural conflict in L-SEL areas and this must be solved first by integrating these people into city life. They also suggested that this should be done by educating the parents because prevention of violence must start within the family and the root causes of violence must be solved (39). They indicated that individual meetings (21) sometimes worked, so they tried to resort to talking with the students individually to solve the problems, but that wouldn't help most of the time because of overpopulation in classes (45).

Some of the teachers in L-SEL schools (9) suggested that a school campus for students living in that area should be built and that younger children should be in a separate building from the elder children to prevent negative influence of the elders on the younger ones. They (14) also suggested some theatre or arts activities so that students might not see school as a burden, and they could spend their energy in such centers. In this way, they would be away from the neighborhood, which provoked them. They also suggested some economic support (22) to be provided for these children because they had to work to help the family financially. They (23) invited all the civil organizations to be in collaboration as they felt that they were somehow alone in trying to teach the children in such a difficult situation.

Teachers at schools in L-SEL had a lot to say. They repeated the necessity to separate the younger ones from the elder students (31) and reduce the classroom population several times (45). They drew attention to the necessity to educate parents both in terms of integration and child education. They (23) also pointed out that civil organizations must be involved in the education issue. They found it necessary to provide some facilities such as sports or arts centers distract students from misbehavior. It was also suggested to improve physical conditions of the school and implement family consciousness raising courses (39).

The total frequency of the reasons why they adopted corporal punishment was 471 while the frequency of suggestions for the solutions was only 295. It was interesting to find out how few perceptions and suggestions there were regarding the education of the teachers to cope with this problem. The teachers mainly put the blame on the social and economic handicaps and they believed that the problems could be solved only when were these handicaps eliminated.

Teacher beliefs about misbehavior of students and reasons for adopting corporal punishment at schools in Middle SEL

Table 4 presents how teachers define problem behaviors and their suggestions to solve the problem.

Table 4. Problem Definition and Suggestions of Teachers at M-SEL schools

| | Problem definitions | f | Suggestions | F |
|--------------------------|---|----------|------------------------------|----------|
| M-SEL | Desire to get good grades without efforts | 38 | Parent-School collaboration | 35 |
| | Teasing hard working students | 38 | Guidance (mentors) | 33 |
| | Lack of concentration | 32 | Teacher in-service training | 29 |
| | No homework, no assignment done | 30 | More responsibility | 24 |
| | Expectancy of punishment | 23 | More tolerance | 16 |
| | Lack of respect to each other & to elders | 18 | Division of school buildings | 16 |
| | Lack of parent-school collaboration | 17 | Individual meetings | 14 |
| | Love affairs | 6 | More sport centers | 8 |
| Total Perceptions | 202 | | 175 | |

There were 202 problem definitions and 175 suggestions to solve the problems at M-SEL. Teachers at M-SEL claimed that the students who had behavior problems were in an effort to get better grades without studying (38) and devoted their energy to loafing and making fun of hardworking students (38) and so they sometimes had to punish the students when they ridicule their friends. They (18) also pointed out to the fact that students sometimes quarrel or hit each other. It was also highlighted by some of the teachers (6) to the fact that the older students give importance to love affairs more than they do to their lesson. The teachers said that they had to resort to punishment when the students insisted on misbehaving, when they don't study or when they always appeared in class without having done their homework (30). The teachers also pointed out that the punishments were not corporal punishment; rather, it was warning, scolding or calling their parents to school although they thought parents did not seem to have enough time for their children's achievements or problems in school (17).

Teachers in M-SEL (35) pointed on the importance of parent-school cooperation. They said teachers should be in cooperation with not only parents but also with the guidance consultants or mentors (33). They drew attention to the fact that there were not enough consultants although mentoring could be very important for the students. The teachers in M-SEL agreed with the teachers in L-SEL in that the older students must be in different buildings from the little ones (16), and family-school collaboration must be mandatory and that parents must spare some more time for their own children's development (35).

The teachers at schools in M-SEL also suggested that students be given more responsibility (24) and more tolerance (16) in their lack of concentration, especially for those in the adolescence period.

Teacher beliefs about misbehavior of students and reasons for adopting corporal punishment at school in Higher Socio Economic Levels

Table 5 shows teachers' definition of problem behaviors and their suggestions to solve the problem.

Table 5. Problem Definition and Suggestions of Teachers at H-SEL schools

| | Problem definitions | f | Suggestions | f |
|--------------------------|---|-----------|--------------------------------------|-----------|
| H-SEL | Spoiled Kids | 15 | Parent-School collaboration | 15 |
| | Lack of respect to each other & to elders | 14 | Guidance (mentors) | 15 |
| | Show off | 14 | Give more responsibility to students | 12 |
| Total Perceptions | | 43 | | 42 |

Although there was no corporal punishment observed in school at H-SEL, the teachers were interviewed and asked to define problem behaviors in their schools and make suggestions. Teachers at H-SEL schools thought students were usually spoiled (15) and relied on their parents' money, which also cause them to have lack of respect to their elders and friends (14). They claimed that students could get private tutors if they did not understand a subject and parents instead of inquiring the reasons for their children's failure, provided this opportunity, which makes things worse because most students like to show off (14) and so do their parents.

The teachers at schools in H-SEL mostly complained about the caprice of the students and their impertinence. They suggested that families must give their children more responsibility (12) in order to make them understand the importance of the school and support the teachers in their efforts to make the students more successful instead of hiring private tutors immediately when their children do poorly at school as this would encourage them not to take school seriously (15). The necessity of providing mentors in schools was also highlighted (15).

Discussion

The findings have revealed that there are more incidents of violence in the first three schools located in L-SEL than there are in the other four schools. The large student population, financial problems of the family, education problems in the family, neighborhood, and ethnic minority are put forward for the main causes of discipline problems in these schools.

Given the seriousness of these behaviors, teachers claim to spend most of their time on behavior problems not instruction. The results show that children are the victims of corporal punishment at school. In districts with low socio-economic level, violence is still used in education and teachers try to defend it by relating the problem with environment problems, family problems, integration problems and so on. Some researchers focused on educating persons regarding the ineffectiveness of corporal punishment regardless of whatever reason causes for it (e.g., Robinson, Funk, Beth and Bush, 2005). Teachers working in L-SEL might have a difficult job to do. It might be difficult to deal with the behavior problems, language problems, integration problems, family problems in one hand and give instruction in overpopulated classrooms on the other. The result of a study (Konstantopoulos, 2008) indicates that students benefit more from being in small classes. Hence, the number of pupils in classrooms should be reduced to a reasonable number.

Also, mentoring would help significantly. More counselors should be appointed to the schools in L-SEL and more in-service training should be provided. Psunder (2005) identifies discipline violation as disruptions of lessons. He indicates that "behaviors causing disruption closely affect teachers and students because they interrupt lessons or even make them impossible" (p.339). This view also supports that teachers should be prepared for potential discipline problems via wide professional knowledge.

Teaching the students with behavior problems must be part of the education so that the teacher candidates might practice such training in their departments starting from the very beginning of their education. Special education courses were put in the initial teacher training curriculum in Turkey, starting from 2005-2006 academic year, which will hopefully help the teacher candidate understand and learn the ways of teaching students with behavior problems. Some researchers are convinced that (e.g., Matsumura, Slater, Crosson, 2008) more respectful behavior on the part of teachers is associated with more positive interactions among students, whereas disrespectful teacher behavior promotes negative behaviors (p.310). The results of this study also add to research suggesting that teachers are powerful models for students. Therefore, teachers should be aware of these reflective violence problems and act accordingly.

Providing arts and sports centers are one of the important elements teaching people how to behave in society. Students should acquire some social skills that are necessary for successful interaction. Some researchers (e.g., Mc Ginnis and Goldstein, 1997) highlight the importance of teaching social skills to help students overcome misbehaviors. This would also help students being motivated. Motivation in education (Beck, 1996) indicates that motivation can be re-directed by modeling (examples) and teaching (explanation). It is important that children be shown positive directions and taught what correct behavior is.

The collaboration of education faculty teacher training departments and such schools would also be beneficial. Such collaboration would help the classroom teachers handle the instructions in the classroom and cope with behaviors that they believe cause corporal punishment. Also, the students could receive instruction in a more peaceful environment. It would be a good experience for the candidate teachers before they start teaching profession as well. A “student management” course would also be helpful for the candidate teachers who might face with such problems when they start teaching. Such a course would prepare the students how to act when they come across such problems and solve them without resorting corporal punishment. One limitation of this research was that family involvement in corporal punishment was not included. A further study could be carried out to provide some insights as to how to avoid corporal punishment.

REFERENCES

- Abebe, S., Hailemariam, A. 2007. The challenges of managing student behavior problems in the classroom. *ERIC Digest*, Febr., 2007. ED-494910.
- Agbenyega, J. S. 2006. Corporal punishment in the schools of Ghana: Does inclusive education suffer? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 33(3),107-122.
- Alekseeva, L. S. 2007. Problems of child abuse in the home. *Russian Education and Society*, 49 (5), 6-18.
- Beck, S. 1996. Alternatives to Corporal Punishment. Available (online). <http://www.san.beck.org/Punishment-Alternatives.html>
- Cameron, M. 2006. Managing school discipline and implications for school social workers: a review of literature. *National Association of Social Workers*, 28(4), 219- 228.
- Clark, J. 2004. Against the corporal punishment of children. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 34(3), 363-371.
- Cryan, J.R. 1995. The banning of corporal punishment. *Dimensions of Early Childhood*, 23(3), 36-37
- Duran, J. E. 2000. Trends in youth crime and well-being since the abolition of corporal punishment in Sweden. *Youth and Society*, 31, 437-455.
- Eggleton, T. 2001. Discipline in the School. *Eric Digest*, 1-13 (ED451554).
- Flynn, C. 1996. Regional differences in spanking experiences and attitudes: A comparison of northeastern and southern college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11(1), 59-80.
- Gershoff, E. T. 2002. Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 539-579.
- Gomleksiz, M.; Kilimci, S.; Vural, R. 2005. Violence at school yard. *XIV. Symposium of Educational Sciences*, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey.
- Gordon, T. 1981. Crippling our children with discipline. *Journal of Education*, 163 (3), 228-243.
- Hyman, I. A.; Perone, D.C. 1998. The other side of school violence: Educator policies and practices that may contribute misbehavior. *Journal of School Psychology*, 36, 7-24.
- Jenson, W. R., Reavis, H. K., & Rhode, G. (1998). *The tough kid*. Longmont Colorado: Sopris West.
- Konstantopoulos, S. 2008. Do small classes reduce the achievement gap between low and high achievers? Evidence from project STAR. *Elementary School Journal*, 108 (4), 275-291.
- Leach, F. 2003. Learning to be violent: the role of the school in developing adolescent gendered behaviors. *Compare*, 33(3).
- Matsumura, L. C., Slater, S. C., Crosson, A. 2008. Classroom climate, rigorous instruction and curriculum and students' interactions in urban middle schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 108 (4), 293-312.
- McGinnis, E., Goldstein, A. P. 1997. *Skillstreaming the Elementary School Child*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- Psunder, M. 2005. Identification of discipline violations and its role in planning corrective and protective discipline in school. *Educational Studies*, 31 (3), 335-345.
- Ramsburg, D. 1997. The Debate over Spanking. *ERIC Digest*. EDO-PS-97-13(Online). Available: <http://ericece.org/pubs/digests/1997/ramsbu97.html>).

Robinson, D.H., Funk, D., Beth, A., and Bush, A. M. 2005. Changing beliefs about corporal punishment: Increasing knowledge about ineffectiveness to build more consistent moral and informational beliefs. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 14 (2), 117-139.

Rosen, L. 1997. *School Discipline: Best Practices for Administrators*, California: Corwin Press.

Scarr, S. 1995. Southern parents spank children more than northern parents, study finds. [Online]. Available: [gopher://minerva.acc.virginia.edu:70/00/news/prour/Feb1995/ spanking](http://gopher://minerva.acc.virginia.edu:70/00/news/prour/Feb1995/spanking).

Slee, R. 1995. *Changing Theories and Practices of Discipline*, London: Falmer Press.

Straus, M.A. (1991). Discipline and deviance: physical punishment of children and violence and other crime in adulthood. *Social Problems*, 38, 133-154.

UNICEF 2009. Convention on the rights of the child. (Online). Available: <http://www.unicef.org/crc/>.