

## **SOCIAL IMPACT OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT ON STUDENTS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY OF SELECTED BOYES SCHOOLS IN MULTAN DISTRICT**

Safdar Hussain\*  
Niaz Muhammad\*\*

### **Abstract**

The study was conducted on investigating the impacts of corporal punishment on students, with major emphasis on its nature, kinds and effects on students, with special focus on grades 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> students of the selected boys' schools in district Multan. The major objective of the study was to identify the social and other impacts of the corporal punishment on the students of the above mentioned classes. This study is first of its nature in district Multan. The total sample size taken from students, teachers and parents were 607. It was found that corporal punishment remained a hurdle in developing good teacher-student relationship, character building; increased dropout rate, discouragement of learning environment, hatred impression for teachers, impaired interest in their students study. Moreover, corporal punishment became the major cause for creating aggressive attitude, nervousness among students; it lowered their academic achievement and created psychological trauma. The study recommends the abolition of corporal punishment and strict implementation of the existing law. Teachers need to be made aware of the negative results of corporal punishment through training programs.

**Keyword:** Corporal punishment, social impact, students, Multan.

### **Introduction**

Children have been playing a pivotal role in the process of development. They are confronting serious problems in the world particularly in developing countries. These problems include child abuse, child labor and corporal punishment. Among them, corporal punishment is such a serious problem that generates most of the

---

\*Safdar Hussain, Deputy District Education Officer, Education Department, Multan, Pakistan, E-mail: wahgagee@yahoo.com

\*\*Niaz Muhammad, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Peshawar, E-mail: niaz@upesh.edu.pk

discomforts of a child. When we look around, Corporal Punishment has never been proactive towards the better personality development of a child; rather it has increased the negative effects on his personality. Corporal punishment is being practiced in its diverse forms in almost all parts of Pakistan, mostly in public sector schools in spite of banishment by the government which has caused a great national loss. Nevertheless, the governmental and nongovernmental organizations launched different programs in this regard but did not reach the required results. Croby (2000) observed that corporal punishment makes negative physical and psychological effects on children. Corporal punishment can be exercised through different means like pinching, cracking fingers, slapping, pushing, ear pulling and wrestling holds.

Corporal punishment involves physical punishment that includes intentional infliction of torture and perhaps retribution for doing wrong or else intended to chastising or transforming a wrong doer or to put off behaviors believed to be undesirable. Basically, this concept is meant to punish the wrongdoer with an open hand or with an implement in domestic, educational or judicial settings. The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child(2006) defines corporal punishment as: *“Any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light.”*

This study is first of its nature to probe into the social, cultural, economic and psychological impacts of corporal punishment. It is expected to unearth some hidden realities at the back of the issue and that could further be utilized by the concerned quarters looking for the cogent resolution of it. punishment This study can provide an insight to the researchers and social scientists to undertake studies on similar issues from different angles and thus add to the existing body of knowledge on the subject. This study basically focuses on the effects of corporal punishment on scholl students. It is worth-underscoring that the studycontains the view points of children, teachers and parents on the issue.

### **Objectives of the Study**

- To investigate into the nature, kinds and motives of physical punishment against students in sampled district;

- To identify multidimensional impacts of corporal punishment on the affected children, from educational, academic, social, cultural, and psychological aspects;
- To ascertain the socio-economic profile of the teachers inflicting corporal punishment on the students at the sampled schools;
- To investigate the teachers and parents' viewpoint on corporal punishment of students at schools.
- To seek the opinion of victim students on corporal punishment;

### **Research Questions**

- What are the nature, kinds and motives of physical punishment against students in sampled district?
- What are the multidimensional impacts of corporal punishment on students in public schools?
- Are academically and economically weak teachers involved in punishing their students?
- Is corporal punishment socially supported?
- What is the opinion of victim students on corporal punishment?
- Why are the policy and relevant law silent on repeated violation over corporal punishment?

### **Methodology**

This study was designed with the aim to identify the overall impact of corporal punishment in public schools in Pakistan, with a focus on Multan district of the Punjab province. Research method depends on the nature of research problem as well as aim, audience, resource limitations and the personal experiences of the researcher (Creswell, 2003). It means that various methods of research could be used in various studies in social sciences.

The researcher used the quantitative methodology in this study. Quantitative methodology means to collect numerical data for the purpose to explain, predict and control a phenomenon.

### **Tools of Data Collection**

Interviews schedule and questionnaire were developed to gather data from respondents. The researcher selected interview schedule for the parents and the students and questionnaire for teachers. Students and parents were interviewed through the instrument of interview schedule as they were unable to understand the questionnaire being less or even uneducated,

whereas questionnaire was distributed among the teachers. Questions were divided into three parts. Part “A” included questions regarding demographic information such as gender, age, residential area, occupation, monthly income and education status of the respondents. Part “B” was related to questions regarding general information on corporal punishment. Suggestions for ceasing the corporal punishment in public schools were included in part “C” of the semi structured interview sheet.

### Conceptual Framework of the Study

Independent Variable	Dependent Variables
Corporal Punishment	Social Impact
	Academic Impact
	Educational Impact
	Psychological Impact
	Legal Impact
	Medical Impact

### Universe of the Study

The present study was confined to 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students of Government High/Higher Secondary Schools for boys in three Tehsils of Multan district: Tehsil Multan, Tehsil Shuja Abad and Tehsil Jalal PurPirwala. There were total 170 schools in the sampled district with 55 schools having above 200 students in 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> Classes at each school. All such 55 schools were difficult to approach for the interview, so 03 schools from each tehsil were randomly selected for interview. The rationale behind selecting the students of secondary classes was the age factor as they were able to cognize the questions and answers accurately. The parents of the students and teachers were also interviewed in order to reach the depth of reality about the impact and consequences of corporal punishment.

### Sampling/Sample Size

The total strength of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> class students in sampled schools was 2149 and as per analogy of Sekaran (2003), a sample size of 327 was determined: and then the sampled students were selected/ interviewed under the Proportional Allocation Method. At first instance progressive sampling technique was used by

identifying out the students of 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> classes in the sampled schools and then stratified proportional allocation method was used towards determining the samples of each class from total number of enrolled students. The total number of teachers in the sampled schools was 199 and the same analogy of Sekaran (2003) was applied for selecting 140 teachers as respondents. The same number of samples was also kept for interviewing the parents of the students under the same strategy. So, the composite sample size of three stakeholders became 607.

## Results

Table-1

Bivariate Analysis Based on Students Perception Regarding Social Impact of CP

Statements	Response	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Total	Statistic
CP leads to Quarrelsome behavior Emerged	Agree	206(96.3)	79(95.2)	24(80)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=13.90$ $P=0.008$
	Disagree	6(2.8)	3(3.6)	5(16.7)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	2(0.9)	1(1.2)	1(3.3)	4(1.2)	
Due to Disrupting the class by talking or playing	Agree	204(93.6)	80(97.6)	25(92.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=6.488$ $P=0.166$
	Disagree	12(5.5)	0(0.0)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	2(0.9)	2(2.4)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
Due to Challenging/threatening the teachers	Agree	205(95.8)	79(97.5)	25(78.1)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=20.377$ $P=0.000$
	disagree	6(2.8)	2(2.5)	6(18.8)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.1)	4(1.2)	
Due to Not abiding by discipline	AGREE	200(93.5)	79(97.5)	30(93.8)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=3.188$ $P=0.527$
	Disagree	11(5.1)	2(2.5)	1(3.1)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.1)	4(1.2)	
Perceiving CP as a source of disciplined behavior	Agree	195(92.9)	86(100)	28(90.3)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=19.563$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	12(5.7)	0(0.0)	2(6.5)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.2)	4(1.2)	
CP badly affects child's morality	Agree	195(94.2)	89(95.7)	25(92.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=20.046$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	8(3.9)	4(4.3)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	4(1.9)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
CP leads children to use of alcohol and other drugs	Response	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	Total	$\chi^2=21.052$ $P=0.000$
	Agree	201(95.3)	75(92.6)	33(94.3)	309(94.5)	
	Disagree	9(4.3)	4(4.9)	1(2.9)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	1(0.5)	2(2.5)	1(2.9)	4(1.2)	
CP makes children vulnerable to sexual abuse	Agree	204(93.6)	81(98.8)	24(88.9)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=19.724$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	13(6.0)	0(0.0)	1(3.7)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	1(0.5)	1(1.2)	2(7.4)	4(1.2)	

CP helps in character building	Agree	205(95.8)	79(97.5)	25(78.1)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2 = 20.37$ 7 $P = 0.000$
	Disagree	6(2.8)	2(2.5)	6(18.8)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.1)	4(1.2)	

*Note: Values within the parenthesis indicate percentage.*

It was empirically concluded from the above table that the variables challenging the teachers, quarrelsome behavior emerged, perceiving as a source of disciplined behavior, badly affecting child's morality, leading children to use of alcohol and other drugs, CP made children vulnerable to sexual abuse, losing interest in school and dropout increases are found to be significant at 5% level of significance with corporal punishment. While disrupting the class by talking or playing and not abiding by discipline was found to be non-significant at 5% level of significance with corporal punishment. Challenging the teachers was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. However, quarrelsome behavior emerged was not found significant ( $p=0.008$ ) with corporal punishment. Disrupting the class by talking or playing was not found significant ( $p=0.148$ ) with corporal punishment. Not abiding by discipline was found not significant ( $P = 0.527$ ) with corporal punishment. Perceiving as a source of disciplined behavior was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Badly affecting child's morality was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Leading children to use of alcohol and other drugs was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ). CP made children vulnerable to sexual abuse was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ). CP helps in character building was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Losing interest in school and dropout increases was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment.

Table-2

### Bivariate Analysis Based on Students Perception Regarding Negative Educational Impact of CP

Statement	Response	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	Total	$\chi^2 = 20.441$ $P = 0.000$
CP discourages learning environment	Agree	208(95.9)	77(93.9)	24(85.7)	309(94.5)	
	Disagree	6(2.8)	4(4.9)	4(14.3)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	1(1.2)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
CP ensures regularity of children in school	Agree	206(94.9)	79(95.2)	24(88.9)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2 = 3.368$ $P = 0.498$
	Disagree	8(3.7)	4(4.8)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.7)	4(1.2)	
CP decreases	Agree	207(95.0)	77(93.9)	25(92.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2 = 3.850$

absenteeism	Disagree	7(3.2)	5(6.1)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	$P=0.427$
	Don't Know	4(1.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
CP leads to Leaving school before the day ends	Agree	204(93.5)	79(97.5)	26(92.9)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=18.379$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	13(6.0)	0(0.0)	1(3.6)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	1(0.5)	2(2.5)	1(3.6)	4(1.2)	
	Total	218(100)	81(100)	28(100)	327(100)	
CP lowers the learning capability of children	Agree	205(95.8)	80(93.0)	24(88.9)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=21.041$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	6(2.8)	5(5.8)	3(11.1)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	1(1.2)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	

*Note: Values within the parenthesis indicate percentage.*

The above table showed that discouraging learning environment, leaving school before the day ends, lowering the learning capability of children, not interested in education were found to be significant at 5% level of significance with corporal punishment. However, CP ensures regularity of children in school, decreases absenteeism were not found significant with corporal punishment. Discouraging learning environment was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Leaving school before the day ends was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Lowering the learning capability of children was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Not interested in education was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. However, CP ensured regularity of children in school was not found significant ( $p=0.0498$ ). However, CP ensured regularity of children in school was not found significant ( $p=0.0498$ ). Decreasing absenteeism was not found significant ( $p=0.427$ ) with corporal punishment.

Table – 3  
Bivariate Analysis Based on Students Perception Regarding Academic Impact of Corporal Punishment

Statement	Response	Agree	DisaAgree	Don't Know	Total	
CP promotes low grades in exams	Agree	206(94.9)	78(94.0)	25(92.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=1.244$ $P=0.871$
	Disagree	8(3.7)	4(4.8)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	1(1.2)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
Physical punishment helps child perform better in class	Agree	168(95.5)	86(90.5)	55(98.2)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=6.769$ $P=0.149$
	Disagree	5(2.8)	8(8.4)	1(1.8)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.7)	1(1.1)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
Physical punishment corrects child's behavior in class	Agree	173(95.1)	101(92.7)	35(97.2)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=2.635$ $P=0.621$
	Disagree	6(3.3)	7(6.4)	1(2.8)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.6)	1(0.9)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
Physical punishment is a successful way to	Agree	207(93.7)	78(97.5)	24(92.3)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=8.467$
	Disagree	13(5.9)	0(0.0)	1(3.8)	14(4.3)	

control the class	Don't Know	1(0.5)	2(2.5)	1(3.8)	4(1.2)	$P=0.076$
	Total	221(100)	80(100)	26(100)	327(100)	
Physical punishment compels child to maintain teachers' respect	Agree	204(93.6)	81(98.8)	24(88.9)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=14.724$ $P=0.005$
	Disagree	13(6.0)	0(0.0)	1(3.7)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	1(0.5)	1(1.2)	2(7.4)	4(1.2)	
	Total	218(100)	82(100)	27(100)	327(100)	
CP makes the children more study oriented	Agree	207(96.3)	74(89.2)	28(96.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=7.840$ $P=0.098$
	Disagree	7(3.3)	6(7.2)	1(3.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	1(0.5)	3(3.6)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	

*Note: Values within the parenthesis indicate percentage.*

The above table showed that the variables remaining hurdle in the way of establishing good teacher student relation, contributing towards problems of dropout, increasing absenteeism, promoting low grades were found to be significant at 5% level of significance with corporal punishment, however promoting low grades in exams, making the children more study oriented, physical punishment helped child perform better in class, correcting child's behavior in class, successful way to control the class were not found significant at 5% level of significance with corporal punishment. Remaining hurdle in the way of establishing good teacher student relation was found highly significant ( $P=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Contributing towards problems of dropout was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Increasing absenteeism was found significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Promoting low grades in exams was found not significant ( $p=0.079$ ) with corporal punishment. Making the children more study oriented was found not significant ( $p=0.078$ ) with corporal punishment. Physical punishment helped child perform better in class was also not found significant ( $p=0.149$ ) with corporal punishment. Correcting child's behavior in class was not found significant ( $p=0.621$ ) with corporal punishment. Successful way to control the class was not found significant ( $p=0.076$ ) with corporal punishment.

Table – 4

Bivariate Analysis Based on Students Perception Regarding  
Psychological Impact of CP

Statement	Response	Agree	Disagree	Don't Know	Total	$\chi^2=22.651$
CP remains hurdle in	Agree	205(94)	78(96.3)	26(92.9)	309(94.5)	



the way of establishing good teacher student relation	Disagree	9(4.1)	3(3.7)	2(7.1)	14(4.3)	$P=0.000$
	Don't Know	4(1.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
Depression in the students developed	Agree	206(94.1)	78(96.3)	25(92.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=20.054$ $=0.000$
	Disagree	9(4.1)	3(3.7)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	4(1.8)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
	Total	219(100)	81(100)	27(100)	327(100)	
Lowers self esteem in the student	Agree	206(94.9)	78(95.1)	25(89.3)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=19.181$ $P=0.005$
	Disagree	8(3.7)	4(4.9)	2(7.1)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.6)	4(1.2)	
Student develops aggressive behavior	Agree	206(94.9)	78(94.0)	25(92.6)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=21.244$ $P=0.005$
	Disagree	8(3.7)	4(4.8)	2(7.4)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	1(1.2)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
CP brings fear and anxiety	Agree	205(95.8)	79(97.5)	25(78.1)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=20.377$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	6(2.8)	2(2.5)	6(18.8)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.4)	0(0.0)	1(3.1)	4(1.2)	
Trust defiance	Agree	170(93.4)	110(96.5)	29(93.5)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=2.087$ $P=0.720$
	Disagree	9(4.9)	3(2.6)	2(6.5)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	3(1.6)	1(0.9)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
CP promotes nervousness	Agree	203(94.4)	80(95.2)	26(92.9)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=20.912$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	11(5.1)	1(1.2)	2(7.1)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	1(0.5)	3(3.6)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
Students behavior aggressive behavior	Agree	109(96.5)	158(93.5)	42(93.3)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=20.561$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	4(3.5)	7(4.1)	3(6.7)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	0(0.0)	4(2.4)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	
CP Promotes deviant behavior	Agree	167(96.5)	89(92.7)	53(91.4)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=19.682$ $P=0.005$
	Disagree	4(2.3)	6(6.2)	4(6.9)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	2(1.2)	1(1.0)	1(1.7)	4(1.2)	
CP is a hurdle for children in self expression	Agree	290(96.7)	15(68.2)	4(80.0)	309(94.5)	$\chi^2=27.730$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	6(2.0)	7(31.8)	1(20.0)	14(4.3)	
	Don't Know	4(1.3)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	4(1.2)	

*Note: Values within the parenthesis indicate percentage.*

The above mentioned table described the association of corporal punishment with psychological impacts on student. The results showed that the variables Corporal punishment was emerging as a tool of violent behavior among children, CP was hurdle for children in self expression, CP decreased deviant behavior, corporal punishment promoted deviant behavior, Leading to family tension/disintegration, declining feelings of sympathy, suicidal feelings increases, promoting nervousness, bringing fear and anxiety, deficiency in confidence development, talking behind the teacher's, depression in the students development, lowering self esteem in the student, student

developed aggressive behavior were found significant with corporal punishment while, forgetting books or any of the class materials, student started disobeying teachers order, beating unrelated to student, trust defiance in student, damaging IQ of student, scratching on wall were not found significant with corporal punishment. The above mentioned table described the association of corporal punishment with psychological impacts on student. Corporal punishment was emerging as a tool of violent behavior among children was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ). Moreover, CP was a hurdle for children in self expression was found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ). Furthermore, CP decreased deviant behavior was found highly significant ( $p=0.00$ ). In addition, corporal punishment promoted deviant behavior was found significant ( $p=0.05$ ). Leading to family tension/disintegration was also found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Declining feelings of sympathy was found significant ( $p=0.00$ ) with corporal punishment. Suicidal feelings increases was found significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Promoting nervousness was found highly significant ( $p=0.00$ ) with corporal punishment. Bringing fear and anxiety was found significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Deficiency in confidence development was found significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Talking behind the teacher's was also found significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Depression in the students development found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Lowering self esteem in the student was found significant ( $p=0.005$ ) with corporal punishment. Student developed aggressive behavior was found significant ( $p=0.005$ ) with corporal punishment. However, Forgetting books or any of the class materials was not found significant ( $p=0.079$ ) with corporal punishment. Student started disobeying teachers order was not found significant ( $P=0.079$ ) with corporal punishment. Moreover, beating unrelated to student was not found significant ( $P=0.182$ ) with corporal punishment. Trust defiance in student was found not significant

( $P=0.720$ ) with corporal punishment. Damaging IQ of student was not found significant ( $P=0.562$ ) with corporal punishment. Scratching on wall was also not found significant ( $P=0.024$ ) with corporal punishment.

Table-5  
Bivariate Analysis Based on Students Perception Regarding Medical Impact of Corporal Punishment

Statements	Response	Agree	Disagree	Don't know	Total	Statistic
Have you got a severe punishment in school?	Agree	149(48.2)	101(32.7)	59(19.1)	309(100)	$\chi^2=61.846$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	0(0)	0(0)	14(100)	14(100)	
	Don't Know	0(0)	0(0)	4(100)	4(100)	
Have you ever been getting medical treatment due to CP?	Agree	94(30.4)	171(55.3)	44(14.2)	309(100)	$\chi^2=81.417$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	0(0)	0(0)	14(100)	14(100)	
	Don't Know	0(0)	0(0)	4(100)	4(100)	
Have you ever been admitted in hospital after getting CP?	Agree	25(8.1)	284(91.9)	0(0)	309(100)	$\chi^2=1.577$ $P=0.455$
	Disagree	0(0)	14(100)	0(0)	14(100)	
	Don't Know	0(0)	4(100)	0(0)	4(100)	
Do you think that severe CP damages your overall learning capacity?	Agree	169(54.7)	116(37.5)	24(7.8)	309(100)	$\chi^2=77.314$ $P=0.000$
	Disagree	0(0)	5(35.7)	9(64.3)	14(100)	
	Don't Know	0(0)	0(0)	4(100)	4(100)	

The above mention table described the association of corporal punishment regarding medical impact on student. Getting severe CP, getting medical treatment, damaging mental ability overall, overall damaging learning capacity, damaging physical health and not providing medical facility after getting CP were found highly significant ( $p=0.000$ ) with corporal punishment. Furthermore admitting in hospital after CP was found not significant ( $p=0.455$ ).

### Discussions

Majority of the sampled students (63%) belonged to the age group of 14 to 15 years and 56.5% of the respondents were studying in 9<sup>th</sup> Class. Majority respondents (47.4%) told that corporal punishment started at secondary level. Similarly in their study (Giles & Starus, 1997) concluded that corporal punishment is a deliberate infliction of pain to control or correct a child who commits an offense. It normally takes place at secondary level. Majority 64.2 percent of the respondents told that they got

punishment due to disciplined behavior. Kennedy (1995) mentioned that corporal punishment must be used for the purpose of obedience. Majority 28.4% of the respondents told that CP badly affected child morality. The study of Straus & Gimpel (1992) is in line to this finding of the current study. They have also reported that corporal punishment makes a child vulnerable to shameful and abnormal behavior. Majority of respondents (63.3 %) told that CP led to children to use alcohol and other drugs. Study findings of Strauss and Gimple (1992) are in consonance with the results of the current study. Majority 66.7 percent of the respondents told that CP made children vulnerable to *sexual abuse*. Dopper & Bingus (2008) are of the view that the corporal punishment creates the cycle of child abuse. Majority 66.4percent of the respondents told that CP was not the way to make the students regular in school. The study of United State Development of Education opposes such methods that produce fear in the minds of children that they feel difficulty in expressing themselves in the class room. But it is important to maintain good relation between students and teachers on the base of ethics and care (U.S. Department of Education, 1993). Majority 66.7 percent of the respondents told that CP increased leaving school before the day ends. The study findings of Zigler and Hall (1989) are in line with the current study findings. They declared that use of physical punishment in the schools is an ambiguous matter. It is futile activity not only in teaching but also discipline process. Majority 65.4 percent of the respondents told that CP lowered the learning capability of students. The study finding of (Gravan, 1991) are in line with this current study in which he concluded that if the child is punished in very early age his conscious memory may be lost. Majority 91.4 percent of the respondents told that CP was a major source of dropout. In the findings of (SPARC, 2005) confirms that in Pakistan every year almost 35000 students leave their schools due to corporal punishment. Majority 53.8 percent of the respondents disagreed that CP helped child's performance be better in class. The findings of

this study do not support the conclusion of (Middleton, 2008) wherein he has found out that corporal punishment is used for improving academic excellence of students. Majority 55.7 percent of the respondents told that Physical punishment did not correct student's behavior in class. This is a contradiction to the study findings of (Dodson, 1970) whereby he has seen spanking as a source of behaviors correction. Majority 67.6 percent of the respondents told that CP was not a successful way to control the class. It does not support the study of Middletown (2008) who quoted educational theories as saying that without threat of infliction of CP, a student cannot come on true track. Majority 65.7 percent of the respondents told that CP did not make the students study oriented. Majority 66.7 percent of the respondents told that CP remained hurdle in the way of establishing teacher student good relation. It does not support the study of Wisch Hover (2011) who quoted that teachers are required to educate the children and also to maintain a good relation with their students. The use of CP will not let them do so and they will lose their trust the students. Majority 67.0 percent of the respondents told that CP led students to depression in students. Majority 66.4 percent of the respondents told that CP developed aggressive behavior in students. Majority 65.7 percent of the respondents told that CP promoted nervousness in students. Majority 58.7 percent of the respondents responded that CP led students to suicidal feelings. Majority 66.7 percent of the respondents told that CP declined feelings of sympathy. Majority 51.7 percent of the respondents told that CP led to family tension. Majority 52.9 percent of the respondents agreed that CP promoted deviant behavior. Majority 91.7 percent of the respondents agreed that CP was a hurdle for children in self expression. Majority 45 percent respondents told that they received severe punishment in school by teachers. Majority 51.9 percent of respondents disagreed about getting medical treatment after CP. Majority 92.4 percent of respondents were not admitted for treatment in hospital after receiving corporal punishment. Majority 51.9 percent respondents

reported that severe punishment damaged overall learning capacity. Majority 55 percent respondent did not have any scars on their body due to corporal punishment. Majority 51.9 percent respondents believed that corporal punishment damaged physical health. Majority 67.2 percent respondents told that they had not received any kind of medical treatment from school after receiving punishment. It was concluded that CP in all forms was observed as a discouraging force for secondary education. The study reflected that the negative effects of CP mainly included dropout, tense relation between students and teachers damaged learning environment, students' aggressive behavior, children indulgence in intoxicative drugs and other criminal activities, immorality, absenteeism from classes, poor academic performance and threatening behavior towards teachers etc. Apart from these effects psychological worries, sense of loss of self esteem and loss of confidence also crippled mental capabilities of the studying students. In the nutshell, corporal punishment was observed as detrimental act to the growth of education and no concrete legal steps prescribed in the ordinance regarding the banishment on CP by the GOP were seen in letter and spirit.

### **Recommendations/Suggestions**

Teachers of all levels i.e. from primary to secondary classes must be made aware of the negative bearings of CP through seminars, workshops, interactive discussions and other thought provoking programs, so as they could voluntarily stop the practice of CP.

Parent Teacher Councils (PTCs) are morally under obligation to play their role in establishing the working relationship between teachers and students, and move forward to readress all other emerging issues at the schools. Regular meetings of the parent teacher councils are a need of the day and positive steps should be taken towards ensuring the holding of meetings on regular basis.

It is suggested that sociologists may be engaged for identifying the loopholes in the Education Department at each district for the

purpose to address all problems/ issues arising out of human behavior. CP is practiced not only because of poor academic performance by students, but teachers professional inefficiency, sex-appealing behavior, disgruntled/humiliating behavior and family related tension are also the pushing forces behind CP by the teachers.

Legislation regarding ban on corporal punishment should be implemented immediately. The teacher involved in the use of physical punishment must be punished according to law "The Prohibition of the Corporal Punishment Act 2013"

## References

- Arcus, D. (2002). School shooting fatalities and school corporal punishment; Alook at The states. *Aggressive Behavior*, 28; 173-183.
- Agbonyega, J. S. (2006). Corporal punishment in the schools of Ghana; Does inclusive Education suffer. *The Australian Educational Researcher* 33(3), 107-122.
- Albert Bandura, Dorothea Ross, and Sheila A. Ross. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models :*Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 575-582.
- Allinsmith, B. B. (1954). Parental discipline and children's aggression in two social Classes. 1(1), p. 708.
- Baumrind, D and A.E Blank. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38:291-327.
- Bentham, J. 1983. *Chestomathies* (Martin J. Smith and Wyndham H. Burston, eds. Pros and cons of corporal punishment, Clarendon Press, Oxford. Vol.106: p. 34.
- Berkowitz. L. (1983). Aversively stimulated aggression. Some parallels and differences In research with animals and humans. *American psychologist*. 38: 1135-1144.
- Bryan, J., Freed, F. (1982). Corporal punishment: Normative Data and sociological and psychological correlates in a community

- college population. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.(4), p. 77-78.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggression models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 575-582.
- Baumrind, D. and A. E. Blank. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38: 291-327.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). The discipline encounter; Contemporary issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 2, 321-335.
- Baumrind, D., R. E. Larzelere and P. A. Cowan. (2002). " Ordinary physical punishment; Is It harmful, *Comment on Gershoff's Psychological Bulletin*. 128(4), 580-589.
- Bitensky, S. (1998). Spare the Rod, Embrace our Humanity; Toward a New Legal Regime prohibiting Corporal punishment of Children. *University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform*.32 (2).
- 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.
- CNN Report. 2008. Committee on the Rights of the child. (2001). General Comment No.1. The Aims of Education. CRC/GC/2001/1, para 8.
- Canter, L. (1989). Assertive Discipline—More than Names on the Board and Marbles in a Jar" in *Phi Delta Kappan*. 71, 57-61.
- Dobson, K. S. (1989). A meta analysis of the efficacy of cognitive therapy for depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(3), 414-419.
- Dupper, D. R., & Dingus, A. E. (2008). Corporal punishment in U.S. public schools: A continuing challenge for school social workers. *Children & Schools*, 30(4), 243-250.
- Dobson, K. S. (1989). A meta analysis of the efficacy of cognitive therapy for depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(3), 414-419.



- Fisher, C.B. and R.M. Learner.(2005). Encyclopedia of Applied Developmental Science. Thousand Oaks, CA.ED.1. Sage Publications. 2005.pp.1037-1039.
- Flynn,C. Regional differences in spanking experiences and attitudes; A Comparison of northeastern and southern college students Journal of Family Violence, 11(1):59-80.
- Forehand R. & McKinney, B. (1993). Historical overview of child discipline in the United States: implications for mental health clinicians and researchers, *journal of child and Family Studies*, 2, 221-228.
- Fridman H. H. & Friedman L. (1979).Endorser effectiveness by product type.*Journal of Advertising Research*, 18, 63-73.
- Gershoff, E. T. and H. Bitensky. (2007). The case against Corporal punishment of Children.Psychology, public policy and Law, 13(4): 231-272.
- Gershoff, E.2002a. "Corporal punishment by parents and Associated child Behaviors And Experiences; A Meta- Analytic and Theoretical Review", *psychological Bulletin*, 128(4):359-579.
- Greydanus, D.E., H. D. Pratt, C.R. Spate, D. A. E. Blake, M.A. Greydanus-Gearhart, and D.R. Patel. (2003). Corporal punishment: position statement of Society for Adolescent Medicine. *J. Adolesc Health*(32): 385-393.
- Garrison, T. (2001). From parent to protector: The history of corporal punishment in American public schools. *Corporal Punishment in Public Schools*, 16, 117.
- Grasmick H. G., Bursik, R. J., Jr., & Kinsey, K. A. (1991). Shame and embarrassment as Deterrents to noncompliance with the law: *The case of an antilittering campaign. Environment Behavior*, 23(2), 233-251.
- Greven, P. (1991). "Spare the child: The religious roots of physical punishment and the Psychological impact of physical abuse". Painful lessons; the politics of Preventing sexual violence and bullying at school. Publisher Knopf London.

- Hyman, I. A. and D. C. Perone, (1998). The other side of school violence; Educator Policies and practices that may contribute to student misbehavior. *Journal of School psychology*. 36(1): 7-27.
- Hendrick. (2003). *Child Welfare: Historical Dimensions, Contemporary Debates: Policy*, 2003, University of Southern Denmark.
- IRIN. (2008). Asia Pakistan Corporal punishment key reason for school dropouts Asia Pakistan Children Education Feature. <http://www.irinnews.org/>.
- Jones, N: Karen Moore: Eliana Villar-Marquez: and Emma Broadbent (2008). *Painful Lessons; the politics of preventing sexual violence and bullying at school* London: ODI.
- Kamal, S. (2001). *Better Days, Better Live: Towards a strategy for implementing the Convention on the rights of the child in Bangladesh*. Publisher University Press, 2001.
- Kennedy, J. H. (1995). Judgment about corporal punishment. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 16(1): 53-64.
- Krugman R. D. & Krugman, M. K. (1984). Emotional abuse in the classroom: The pediatrician's role in diagnosis and treatment. *American journal of diseases of children*, 134, 284-286.
- Laible, D. J. and R. A. Thompson. (2000). "Mother cgukdduscyrse, attachment security, Shared positive" *Child Development*, 71(5): 1424-1440.
- Lane, (1995). Queensland's Social Impact Assessment unit: its origins and prospects. *Queensland Planner* 35(3), 5-10.
- Larzelere R. (1993). Changes in modern psychology: A citation analysis of the kuhnian displacement thesis, *American psychologist*, 48, 658-664.
- McCORD, (1991). Family relationships, juvenile delinquency, and adult criminality: Article first published online: 7 MAR 2006.
- Middleton, J., H. Thomas and Mid-Victorian. (2008). Attitudes to corporal punishment" *History of Education*.
- NGOs' Coalition on Child Rights Pakistan (NCCR). (2001). *Violence against children Within the family and in schools*. Geneva

- Retrieved July 06,2004, From <http://www.crin.org/does/resources/treaties/crc.28/NCCR-2.pdf>.(Accessed on 08 August, 2010).
- Owen, S.S (2005). The relationship between social capital and corporal punishment in Schools; A theoretical inquiry. Edition 37. Oyblisher Youth and society.pp. 85-112.
- Oosterhuis H. J. G. H. (1993), Clinical aspects, MuastnenisGaravis. Boca Raton: CRC Press, pp. 14-42 .
- Rose, T.L. (1989). Corporal punishment with mildly handicapped students; Five year Later. Rare; Remedial and Special Education, 10(i); 43-53.
- Rosen, L. (1997). School Discipline; Best practices for Administrators, Corwin Press.
- Sedlak A. J. and Broadhurst D. D. (1996). The third National incidence study of Child Abuse and Neglect , National center on child abuse and Neglect Washington D. C. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Straus M. A. & Giles-Sims, J. (1997). Spanking by parents and subsequent antisocial behavior of children. Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 151, 761-767.
- SPARC, Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child (2004). *The state of Pakistan's children 2002*. Stock: Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child.
- Steinmetz, S., & Straus, M. A. (1974). Genealintroduction; Social myth and social System in the study of intrafamily violence.In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus (Eds.), Violence in the family. NY: Dodd, Mead.
- Straus, M., Donnelly, D. (1993). Corporal punishment of adolescents. New York: RoutledgePublication.
- SPARC, Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child (2004). *The State of Pakistan's Children 2002*. Stock: Society for the Protection of the Rights of the Child.
- Straus, M., Gimpel, H. (1992).Corporal punishment by parents and economic data. Durham: University of New Hampshire Press

- Thomas S. Langner, C. Joanne Gersten, and G. Jeanne Eisenberg. (1976). "The Epidemiology of Mental Disorders in children; Implications for Community Psychiatry"(Paper presented at the Fourth International Symposium of the Kittay Scientific Foundation, New York. Thousand Oaks, California.
- UNESCO.15 June (2005). "Eliminating corporal punishment. The way Forward to Constructive Child Discipline".
- UNICEF (1998a).*Corporal Punishment in Primary Schools of North West Frontier Province Pakistan*.NGO's Coalition on Child Rights - NWFP. UNICEF, Peshawar.
- UNICEF Asian Report. (2001). Corporal Punishment in schools in South Asia. Katmandu, Nepal. In research Report "to punish or discipline? Teachers Attitudes towards the abolition of corporal punishment", by Loretta Cicognani. University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2004.
- US Department of Education, (1993).Elementary and Secondary School Civil Rights Compliance Report, analysis from the Center for Effective Discipline, <http://www.stophitting.com> (Accessed on 13 June, 2011).
- Youssef, R. M., M. S. Attia, and M. I. Kamel, (1998). Children Experiencing Violence II: Prevalence and determinants of corporal punishment in schools. *Child Abuse And Neglect*. 122(10): 975-985.
- Zigler, E., & Hall, N. (1989). Physical child abuse in America: Theory and research on the Causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect (pp. 38-75). New York: Cambridge University Press.