

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2015

The Diverse Nature Of Corporal Punishment: An Investigation Of The Relationship Between Students' Perceptions Of The Discipline Method, Academic Performance, And Social Behaviors

Demeka Lashun Smith
University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Smith, Demeka Lashun, "The Diverse Nature Of Corporal Punishment: An Investigation Of The Relationship Between Students' Perceptions Of The Discipline Method, Academic Performance, And Social Behaviors" (2015). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 510.

<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/510>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

THE DIVERSE NATURE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE DISCIPLINE METHOD,
ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

A Dissertation
Presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree
in Educational Leadership
The University of Mississippi

by

DEMEKA SMITH

MAY 2015

Copyright © 2015 by Demeka L. Smith
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The use of corporal punishment has been debated due to linkage to decreased academic performance (Hickmon, 2010) and negative social behaviors (Hicks-Pass, 2009). Disparities exist in who has received corporal punishment (Rollins, 2012). Although there is much research pertaining to corporal punishment, there have been few studies conducted where students' opinions of it have been obtained (Holden, 2002). Thus, there is a need to examine students' perceptions of corporal punishment.

The purpose of this study is to determine the relationship between academic performance, social behaviors, and previous experience with corporal punishment at school and perceptions of corporal punishment among elementary and middle school students in a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. The study particularly considers the implications associated with race, gender, SES, grade level, and previous experience with corporal punishment at home. Participants (n=162) include third through eighth grade students who received corporal punishment at least once during the 2013-2014 school year.

Using the independent t-test, the study finds no differences in gender, type of student, and students who received corporal punishment at home and those who did not pertaining to measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Using an ANOVA, the study finds no significant differences in race and SES pertaining to measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Using the Pearson product-moment correlation, the study finds no significant relationships for academic performance and level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school pertaining to measures of student perception of corporal punishment. For

the ten social behaviors measured, the study finds no significant relationships pertaining to measures of student perception of corporal punishment except for the measure, “I destroy my own things”.

Due to the findings of the study, the following recommendations are put forward: 1) Revisit the school district’s corporal punishment policy; 2) Examine the use of other methods of discipline that have proven to be effective in decreasing student misbehavior; and 3) Explore how the usage of corporal punishment affects classroom management. Proceeding forward with these recommendations provides an opportunity to further investigate the diverse nature of corporal punishment and student discipline as a whole.

DEDICATION

Claudine Campbell Smith
my mother, my biggest supporter

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, and foremost, I would like to thank God for allowing me to fulfill all necessary requirements to complete this doctoral degree. He is the source of my life and blessings, and to Him I forever grateful. To my mother, Claudine, you have always believed in me and supported me in everything. Words cannot express how much I love you and appreciate all you have done for me. To my father and pastor, Richard, I am grateful for how you have helped me to grow spiritually over the years. Much faith was needed throughout this process, and you definitely helped me to stay hopeful and encouraged along the way. I love you and am as proud to be your daughter as you are to be my dad. To my sister from another mother, Dr. Katina Leland, and my cousin, Dr. Yolanda Campbell, thank you both for motivating me to strive for a level of distinction that only a small number achieve. You both have impacted my life more than you will ever know. I love you both dearly. To my fellow doctoral buddy, Dr. Wilner Bolden, thanks for your encouraging words, and support throughout this entire process. Sometimes I truly wanted to give up, but watching you succeed helped me to keep going. To my friends, Carrie Skelton and Summer Pannell, I am glad we decided to go through this journey together. Our friendship has blossomed over these years, and I look forward to accomplishing much more with you ladies in the future.

To my dissertation chair, Dr. RoSusan Bartee, thank you for pushing me like I have never been pushed before. You spent countless hours, including many early mornings and late nights, guiding me through this process. Words cannot express the gratitude I have for you. You are a very accomplished individual, and I hope greater blessings for you in the years to come. To Dr.

Larry Hanshaw, a member of my doctoral committee, thank you for agreeing to serve on my committee even through your retirement from The University. I appreciate your statistical expertise throughout this process. To Dr. Doug Davis, a member of my doctoral committee and professor, thank you for sharing your knowledge over the years and during this process. To Dr. Ryan Neimeyer, a member of my doctoral committee, thank you for your availability and sharing your legal expertise on corporal punishment with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
General Overview.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	5
Research Questions.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	6
Limitations of the Study.....	7
Summary of Chapter One.....	8
Organization of the Dissertation.....	8
II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Historical and Current Perspectives of Corporal Punishment.....	10
Historical Viewpoints.....	10
Legal Viewpoints.....	13
Current Viewpoints.....	15
Perceptions of Corporal Punishment.....	16

Authoritative Centered Viewpoints.....	16
Non-authoritative Centered Viewpoints.....	19
Effects of Corporal Punishment.....	26
Classroom Management.....	26
Academic Performance.....	27
Social Behaviors.....	29
Summary of Chapter Two.....	31
III: RESEARCH METHODS.....	32
Design of the Study.....	32
Research Sites and Participants of the Study.....	34
Instruments in the Study.....	40
Procedures for Data Collection.....	42
Research Hypotheses.....	45
Data Analysis.....	46
Theoretical Framework.....	48
Mississippi Code.....	50
Corporal Punishment Policy.....	52
Summary of Chapter Three.....	53
CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS.....	54
Hypothesis One Results Summary.....	56
Hypothesis Two Results Summary.....	57

Hypothesis Three Results Summary.....	62
Hypothesis Four Results Summary.....	64
Hypothesis Five Results Summary.....	66
Hypothesis Six Results Summary.....	68
Hypothesis Seven Results Summary.....	69
Hypothesis Eight Results Summary.....	71
Summary of Chapter IV.....	73
V: RESEARCH SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	74
Summary of the Research Study.....	76
Conclusions of the Research Study.....	79
Implications of the Research Study.....	82
Recommendations of the Research Study.....	84
VI: LIST OF REFERENCES.....	88
VII: LIST OF APPENDICES.....	98
Appendix A Student Survey of Corporal Punishment.....	99
Appendix B Permission to use the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment.....	107
Appendix C Student Survey of Social Behaviors.....	109
Appendix D Consent Letters.....	113
Appendix E IRB Letter of Approval.....	118
VIII: VITA.....	120

LIST OF TABLES

1. Demographics of Elementary Schools.....	35
2. Corporal Punishment Infractions for Elementary Schools.....	36
3. Demographics of Middle Schools.....	37
4. Corporal Punishment Infractions for Middle Schools.....	38
5. Demographics of Entire District.....	39
6. Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient.....	46
7. Descriptive Findings of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	55
8. Correlation Coefficient for Academic Performance and Corporal Punishment.....	57
9. Number of Students Responding by Level of Agreement.....	59
10. Correlation Coefficients for Measures of Social Behavior and Corporal Punishment.....	61
11. Descriptive Analyses for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	63
12. ANOVA F Ratio Score Distribution for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	64
13. Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	65
14. Independent t-test Results of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment...	65
15. Descriptive Analyses for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	66
16. ANOVA F Ratio Score Distribution for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	67
17. Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	68
18. Independent t-test Results of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment....	69

19. Pearson Results for Level of Previous Experiences with Corporal Punishment at School and Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	70
20. Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment.....	71
21. Independent t-test Results of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment....	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General Overview

With the negativity surrounding the usage of corporal punishment, it is surprising that the discipline method is still practiced in schools today. Corporal punishment has been linked to lower academic performance and negative social behaviors in students. Corporal punishment refers to either paddling or spanking a child with the intent of inflicting physical pain as a punishment for inappropriate behavior (Rollins, 2012). Schools usually have procedures for when and how corporal punishment can be administered. In spite of these procedures, several possible injuries can result such as bruising, cuts, muscle injuries, hematoma, whiplash damage, and hemorrhages (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). Regardless of the potential injuries from corporal punishment, it is still used in schools today and students strive to behave in socially appropriate ways (follow established rules) to avoid receiving it.

Corporal punishment is often chosen because of the capacity to be delivered quickly. The convenience of corporal punishment often appears more important than the effects the discipline method has upon children. Students receive a certain number of swats with a paddle and are immediately sent back to the classroom. If another method such as suspension is to be used on students, however, they would be made aware of the consequence and have to wait until going home to serve it. By this time, they would have possibly forgotten why they were being

punished. Thus, it is important to understand the initial purpose and pursued outcome for corporal punishment.

The most recent school data revealed 223,190 children received corporal punishment in public schools in 2006-2007, usually with wooden paddles (Wasserman, 2010). Each year the punishments have led to injuries causing roughly 10,000 to 20,000 students to seek medical treatment. Twenty-nine states in the United States currently have banned corporal punishment while 21 states, primarily in the southeastern and southwestern parts of the country, still allow it to be practiced (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). Disparities, too, exist in who receives corporal punishment. African American students comprised 17.1% of the nation's student population in elementary and secondary schools in 2009, but received 35.6% of the corporal punishment (Rollins, 2012). Boys also receive corporal punishment more often than girls since they typically engage in more serious offenses such as fighting. Boys are seen as tougher than girls and are thought to be less likely to be injured while girls are seen as fragile. Additionally, students with disabilities received corporal punishment twice as much as the general student population in some states. Sometimes teachers do not know these children's conditions as stated in their individual educational plans and link students' actions to behavior. Corporal punishment is often used to try to get the students under control because teachers do not know what else to do.

Corporal punishment has been linked to decreased student achievement and negative social behaviors. Research has shown in states where corporal punishment is used often, schools have performed worse academically than those in states that ban corporal punishment on such measures as the American College Testing (ACT) Assessment (Hickmon, 2010). Since corporal punishment in schools has been related to lower academic performance on the ACT, similar effects could possibly be seen with other measures of student achievement. Corporal punishment

has also been associated with various negative social behaviors. According to the Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003), many students who have experienced corporal punishment have reported problems with depression, fear, and anger. These students often withdraw from school activities and lose interest in academics. Additionally, the Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003) found that recipients of corporal punishment frequently develop deteriorating relationships with peers, difficulty with concentration, lowered school achievement, antisocial behavior, intense dislike of authority, somatic complaints, a tendency for school avoidance, and school drop-out. Thus, it is important to exhaust all other methods of discipline before resorting to corporal punishment in school contexts.

Statement of the Problem

Debates are ongoing today about the use of corporal punishment. Studies have shown the discipline method is beneficial to improving student behavior (Larzelere, 2000) while other studies support that it has harmful effects on students (Gershoff, 2010). Research has shown parents who received corporal punishment as children are likely to use corporal punishment with their own children (Kennedy, 1995). Those who support corporal punishment claim that among families with positive parent-child relationships and adaptive communication patterns, physical discipline does not have any negative long-term consequences for the child and is viewed by the child as appropriate (Rohner, Bourque, & Eldori, 1996; Larzelere, 2000). Therefore, it is important for parents to discuss misbehavior with children and expected behavior as opposed to using only corporal punishment.

Studies have also shown when used as a back up to time out, corporal punishment has caused increased compliance in children and reduced the number of escapes from time out (Larzelere, 2000). Children complied with parents' expectations and remained in time out more

often to avoid corporal punishment. It has been found corporal punishment combined with reasoning is linked to a longer delay until the next recurrence of misbehavior than when reasoning or punishment was used separately. As a result, children need to know why they are receiving physical punishment in order to decrease the likelihood of repeating the same inappropriate actions. It remains clear from previously mentioned studies that proponents of corporal punishment recommend using the discipline practice in conjunction with more positive techniques as opposed to it being the only consequence to misbehavior.

More importantly, empirical data from approximately forty-years of studies was investigated by Hicks-Pass (2009) and positively associated corporal punishment with negative social behaviors such as antisocial behavior, child to parent violence, and diminished cognitive development in children. Other potential effects of corporal punishment, according to Hicks-Pass (2009), are an increased likelihood a child will become involved in some type of delinquent behavior, will respond with more aggression than children whose parents use other discipline methods, or will become engaged in criminal activity and displaying aggression towards others. Corporal punishment was also positively linked to maladaptive actions later in life such as animal cruelty and psychiatric indications such as depression, alcohol abuse, and suicidal ideations (Hicks-Pass, 2009). With corporal punishment being connected to negative social behaviors, the use of this form of punishment in schools could possibly lead to disruptions in the instruction and learning of students.

There is a link between corporal punishment and decreased cognitive ability (Hicks-Pass, 2009), which contributes to the ongoing need for teachers to help behaviorally-challenged students master content necessary for them to be successful throughout their academic careers. The implications of gender and geography for discipline discrepancies too, encourage the need to

reconsider the rationale for corporal punishment. The recurring negative findings about corporal punishment make it difficult to support continued use of the discipline method.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this quantitative study is to determine the relationship between academic performance, social behaviors, and previous experience with corporal punishment at school and perceptions of corporal punishment among elementary and middle school students in a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. The study particularly considers the implications associated with race, gender, SES, grade level, and previous experience with corporal punishment at home for students in a public, rural school district. The independent variables are race, gender, categories of SES, grade level, levels of previous experience with corporal punishment at school, previous experience with corporal punishment at home, and academic performance and measures of social behaviors. The dependent variable is measures of student perception of corporal punishment.

Research Questions

The following research questions guide the study:

1. Is there a significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
2. Is there a significant relationship between measures of social behaviors and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?

3. Is there a significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by race at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
4. Is there a significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by gender at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
5. Is there a significant difference between categories of socioeconomic status and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
6. Is there a significant difference between elementary students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment and middle school students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
7. Is there a significant relationship between levels of previous experience with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
8. Is there a significant difference between the mean of scores of previous experience with corporal punishment at home and the mean for measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?

Significance of the Study

Despite all the investigation into corporal punishment and its effects, students, the recipients of the discipline method, have been for the most part overlooked by researchers (Holden, 2002). Examining corporal punishment and its implications for academic performance

and social behaviors through the eyes of children rather than adults, is an important research need. In K-12 educational settings today, rules as well as consequences for breaking those rules are usually created and put in place by adults, and students are expected to accept what the adults decide. Since students are the ones experiencing the direct effects of the consequences of corporal punishment, then there is a need to include their opinions toward the discipline method.

Today, with an increased focus on accountability in schools, increased student achievement is expected from each school district. If corporal punishment is associated with decreases in academic performance, the use of the discipline method needs to be reconsidered. Also, if corporal punishment does cause negative social behaviors in children, which would take time away from teaching them, but focusing on disciplining them instead, then other techniques need to be integrated as mechanisms to modify student behavior. Obtaining students' input supports the idea that all stakeholders need to be involved in decision-making. School district personnel and school board members may then use students' perceptions of corporal punishment to influence discipline practices.

Limitations in the Study

There are limitations to the study and its focus on the relationships between student perceptions, academic performance, and social behaviors. This study is limited to third through eighth grade students in a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. Since the study is restricted to one school district, it may not be generalizable to any other district in the state or country. Only students who have received corporal punishment at least one time as defined by the corporal punishment policy will be asked to complete the survey. The study does not target those students who have not experienced corporal punishment. The only measure of academic performance will be each student's language arts score from the Case Assessment.

Summary of Chapter I

The usage of corporal punishment in schools has decreased throughout the nation but has not been abolished completely and its usage has continued despite the many damaging effects (Gershoff, 2010). However, there are supporters of the discipline method that claim it has benefits (Vockell, 1991). The statement of the problem indicates the viewpoints of proponents as linked to corporal punishment as an immediate consequence for students. The statement of the problem also shows how opponents identify implications for schools involved with corporal punishment and its implications for lower academic performance (Straus & Paschall, 2009; Hickmon, 2010) and negative social behaviors in children (Straus & Kantor, 1994; Straus & Mouradian, 1998). In spite of all the data that is available on corporal punishment, the significance of the study is the opportunity to gain student perspectives on corporal punishment. Since students are on the receiving of corporal punishment, they need to be given a voice in determining whether the practice needs to continue.

Organization of the Dissertation

Chapter I includes a general overview, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, significance of the study, and limitations of the study. The chapter concludes with a summary of the chapter and organization of the study. Chapter II is the literature review and begins with historical and current perspectives of corporal punishment followed by effects and perceptions of corporal punishment. The next sections include the relationships between academic performance and corporal punishment as well as social behaviors and corporal punishment. Chapter III is the methods section and includes design of the study, research sites and participants of the study, and the theoretical framework of the study. The chapter concludes with instruments in the study, procedures for data collection, research hypotheses, data analysis,

and a summary.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review provides a helpful viewpoint on the historical and current perspectives of corporal punishment from the beginning of its use until today (Firmin & Castle, 2008; Dupper & Dingus, 2008). Both short-term and long-term effects of corporal punishment are explored (Gershoff, 2010). Some intended effects and unintended effects of corporal punishment are discussed. Once effects of corporal punishment are shared, perceptions of corporal punishment are investigated (Bower & Knutson, 1996; Ashton, 2001; Basci & Dilekmen, 2009). Perceptions of both adults and children are discussed. Next, the relationship between academic performance and corporal punishment is explored. Information from studies is shared which shows effects of corporal punishment on academic performance. Lastly, the relationship between social behaviors and corporal punishment is explored.

Historical and Current Perspectives of Corporal Punishment

Historical Viewpoints

According to Firmin and Castle (2008), generational theories imply that parents discipline their children based upon methods used by their parents. The authors shared that Bower-Russa et al. (2001) came to the conclusion that people, when asked to score whether a specific action like hitting or slapping was abusive/non-abusive, those who had received the same type of discipline themselves as children were not as likely to score the action as abusive.

Hitting or slapping was viewed as non-abusive because their parents had disciplined them in the same manner. Also, the authors reported that Vasquez (2006) and Kennedy (1995) showed significant relationships between corporal punishment usage and whether it was also administered by an individual's parents. Individuals who had received corporal punishment from their parents indicated they would possibly use it with their own children.

The use of corporal punishment began in the Victorian Era when the notion of *in loco parentis* was first recognized and implemented within schools (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). Parents during this era deemed disobedience as separating oneself from God. For this reason, they considered teachers as being in the ideal position to lead children away from ignorance and sin. Thus, schools were charged with having educational and moral responsibilities to children. *In loco parentis* was introduced to protect teachers who considered corporal punishment necessary (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). The principle legally gave teachers and other school personnel parental rights of children.

Changes in how Americans approached spanking began with the emergence of research on child development and Freudian psychiatry in the 1920s and 1930s (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). During these years, the effects of spanking on child development were explored, and parents began to realize the influence of effective parenting on children. In the 1940s, child development literature contested the widespread public support for corporal punishment suggesting many of the behavior problems that had called for corporal punishment in the past were truly part of normal developmental stages. The pediatric literature of the 1940s documented the threats of corporal punishment due to ideas, which came about from the child development research. In the 1960s, research on child maltreatment played a massive role in increasing pediatric and public awareness of the thin line between child abuse and excessive

physical discipline. It was during this time corporal punishment became defined as socially abnormal by the pediatric literature, and objections to *in loco parentis* emerged as courts began considering the legal rights of students (Dupper & Dingus, 2008).

By 1972, Massachusetts and New Jersey had officially banned corporal punishment as a discipline method, and in the same year, the American Civil Liberties Union sponsored a convention on corporal punishment (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). In 1974, the American Psychological Association (APA) approved a resolution, which prohibited corporal punishment and American Psychological Association (NEA) published a report disapproving corporal punishment. The APA and NEA formally recommended for corporal punishment to be abolished from school systems. In 1975, *Ingraham v. Wright* brought the matter of corporal punishment in schools to a legal and national level for the first time (Wasserman, 2010). In this crucial case, two students claimed the use of force upon them violated the Eighth Amendment's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment and the substantive and procedural components of the Due Process Clause. The United States Supreme Court held that the students had no realistic claim under the Cruel and Unusual Punishment Clause of the Eighth Amendment. Also, the Court held that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment does not require notice and a hearing prior to the administration of corporal punishment on a child in a public elementary or secondary school. Thus, the infliction of corporal punishment on public school students was permitted (Wasserman, 2010). Educators were given the legal right to administer the consequence for inappropriate behavior if they deemed it necessary.

During the 1980s, more formal efforts to ban the use of corporal punishment emerged. In 1984, the National Association of Social Workers Delegate Assembly approved a policy opposing corporal punishment in schools (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). In 1987, the National

Coalition to Abolish Corporal Punishment in Schools was created and obtained support from other prominent organizations such as the National Center on Child Abuse Prevention, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American Medical Association (Dupper & Dingu, 2008). These organizations strived to prohibit the use of corporal punishment because it was seen as causing harm to children such as physical injuries as opposed to being beneficial.

Legal Viewpoints

In *Ingraham v. Wright* (Alexander & Alexander, 2003), the United States Supreme Court stated that educators might impose reasonable but not excessive force to discipline a student. Reasonableness has been generally determined by assessing a child's age, maturity, past behavior, nature of the offense, the amount and type of harm inflicted on the child, the instrument used to administer the punishment, and the motivation of the person imposing the punishment (Wasserman, 2010). Factors that are considered in excessive force claims usually include the need for the application of force, the relationship between the need and the amount of force that was used, the extent of injury inflicted, and whether force was applied in a good faith effort to maintain or restore discipline or maliciously and sadistically for the purpose of causing harm (Wasserman, 2010).

Ingraham v. Wright set the legal precedent for future cases, which concerned corporal punishment. A case that involved excessive force was *Garcia v Miera* (10th Cir. 1987) (Wasserman, 2010). A nine-year old girl was held upside down and struck five times with a broken wooden paddle. The paddling led to bleeding and permanent scarring. The girl was paddled again three months later causing severe bruising. The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed a summary judgment of a lower court providing that school officials are shielded from liability and found that school officials had used excessive force in administering corporal punishment that they violated the student's federal constitutional right of substantive due

process. Both the school district and the administrators were liable for damages suffered by the student and attorney fees.

Other court cases have been based upon the idea of shocking the conscience. In 1980 in *Hall v. Tawney*, the Fourth Circuit became the first circuit court to recognize a claim for a substantive due process violation when a school official abuses his or her official power through the unauthorized use of force on a public school child (Alexander & Alexander, 2003). Adopting the standard used in police brutality cases, the Fourth Circuit decided that the substantive due process inquiry in school corporal punishment cases must be whether the force applied caused injury so severe, was so disproportionate to the need presented, and was so inspired by malice or sadism rather than a merely careless or unwise excess of zeal that it amounted to a brutal and inhumane abuse of official power literally shocking the conscience.

In *Jones v. Witinski* (M.D.Pa.1996), a teacher became angry with a disruptive student (Alexander & Alexander, 2003). The teacher grabbed the student's arm and pulled him across a desk. The student ended up on the floor. The Court ruled that pulling a student by the arm was not a brutal and inhumane abuse of official power literally shocking the conscience. However, in *Neal v Fulton County Board of Education* (11th Cir. 2000), the court found a teacher/coach's action was a violation of substantive due process (Alexander & Alexander, 2003). The student, a member of the varsity football team, was slapped by a teammate. The student told the coach and was instructed to handle his business. Therefore, the student took a weight lock and hit his teammate. The two began to fight and the coach did not intervene. Later, the coach hit the student knocking his eye out of the socket leaving it destroyed and dismembered. The court ruled that this was corporal punishment that violated substantive due process shocking the conscience.

Current Viewpoints

Proponents of corporal punishment argue there are advantages to using the discipline method (Vockell, 1991). One advantage is students perceive corporal punishment as unpleasant. Thus, they do not misbehave to avoid receiving it. Another advantage of corporal punishment is it is given quickly and ends quickly. Therefore, those who administer it are able to deliver an immediate consequence for misbehavior and then return to normal interactions more easily. Those who oppose the use of corporal punishment have pointed out disadvantages using it. One disadvantage is corporal punishment is not realistically related to the misbehavior. Also, corporal punishment shows students socially inappropriate behavior, may cause harm, and could lead to litigation.

According to Gershoff (2010), there are intended and unintended effects of corporal punishment. Some short-term intended effects of using corporal punishment are to get children to obey, to get their attention, or to quickly communicate to them that the adult is in charge. A couple of unintended short-term effects are physical injury and abuse. It is common for students to experience redness or bruising immediately after receiving corporal punishment. Gershoff (2010) also identified long-term effects of using corporal punishment. A couple of long-term intended effects of using corporal punishment are it decreases the probability that a child will repeat an undesirable action and increases the probability that a child will act in a socially appropriate manner. Children do not like the pain they experience as a result of the punishment. Thus, they are less likely to repeat the misbehavior and behave in socially acceptable ways to avoid receiving corporal punishment. Some long-term unintended effects are mental-health troubles, poor relationships between children and parents or authority figures, reduced cognitive ability, increased aggression, and antisocial behavior (Gershoff, 2010). In other words, children

who receive corporal punishment often experience depression, show anger towards their parents, exhibit lower levels of cognitive functioning when compared to those who have not received the discipline, and often physically and verbally attack family members and peers.

Perceptions of Corporal Punishment

Authoritative Centered Viewpoints

Some research exists in which adults' perceptions (authoritative centered viewpoints) of corporal punishment were assessed. Ashton (2001) investigated how employees' attitudes toward corporal punishment affected their perceptions of child maltreatment. The participants in the study were 325 beginning level social workers. The participants answered vignettes in multi-item scales which scored their support of parental discipline involving corporal punishment; scored the seriousness of occurrences of possible maltreatment; and noted whether or not they would report the occurrences of maltreatment to child protective services. Correlation analyses and multiple regression procedures were used to analyze the data. The results showed participants with higher ratings for support of corporal punishment were less likely to perceive maltreatment; participants with higher ratings for support of corporal punishment were less likely to report maltreatment. The likelihood a participant would report maltreatment was a joint function of his/her perception of the seriousness of an occurrence and support of corporal punishment. It was concluded attitudes toward corporal punishment are significant predictors of reporting behavior.

The attitudes of classroom teachers were analyzed concerning corporal punishment in terms of several variables (Basci & Dilekmen, 2009). The participants included a sample of 200 primary school teachers from twelve schools all of which had a mixture of socioeconomic levels. A scale developed by Gozutok (1993) was used to measure the teachers' attitudes toward

corporal punishment. Also, a Personal Information Form was used to obtain additional information about the teachers. A One-Way ANOVA and t-tests were the statistical analyses used. A significant difference was found between the teachers' attitudes toward corporal punishment in relation to the socioeconomic status of the schools in which they worked and their years of teaching experience. There was no significant difference between the attitudes of teachers toward corporal punishment in relation to variables such as the programs they graduated from, whether they had children or not, how many children they had, how many students they had in their classrooms, and whether they worked in public or private schools.

A study was carried out by Bower and Knutson (1996) in which they investigated the relationship between childhood experience with punitive discipline, perceptions of a punitive childhood history, and adult attitudes toward appropriate discipline. A group of 1359 undergraduates from a university completed a screening questionnaire to evaluate their childhood disciplinary histories and their perceptions of the history. A second examination was given to 207 of the screened participants who reported an assorted range of childhood disciplinary histories. This test assessed the participants' attitudes pertaining to appropriate discipline. Findings from the study showed among participants with severely punitive histories, those who did not label themselves as abused were less likely to categorize events as physically abusive than those who labeled themselves abused. Participants with less severe punishment histories were similar to those with severely punitive histories who also labeled themselves abused. Also, participants who had experienced a certain method of physical discipline as a child were less likely to label the method of discipline abusive.

Education majors' beliefs about corporal punishment were measured before and after the students read research about the effectiveness and side effects of corporal punishment (Robinson,

Funk, Beth, & Bush, 2005). Students who changed their beliefs concerning whether they would use corporal punishment as parents increased their knowledge about its ineffectiveness. This resulted in greater uniformity between their moral and informational beliefs. Also, students who were likely to change from supporting corporal punishment to opposing it considered it as being not very pleasant but necessary. Corporal punishment was now seen as essential as a discipline method for misbehavior but was view as unpleasant due to the pain it causes.

A study was conducted by Kennedy (1995) to find out if teachers, student teachers, paraprofessionals, and young adults had different attitudes about the acceptability of corporal punishment; decide if college students' attitudes about corporal punishment were related to their majors; and investigate the relationship between attitudes toward corporal punishment and factors such as being a parent, age, grade taught, and corporal punishment history. The participants for the study were 256 teachers in K-12 settings, 60 paraprofessionals, 241 student teachers, and 480 college students. Each participant completed a six-scenario questionnaire, which measured his or her viewpoints toward corporal punishment. The results showed paraprofessionals were more likely than other participants to approve using corporal punishment. The author noted the most significant predictor for the use of corporal punishment was a history of corporal punishment administered by parents, particularly for paraprofessionals.

Laurence and Yuan (2011) examined elementary school teachers' perceptions and concerns on the matter of banning corporal punishment and on alternative discipline practices. The authors used stratified random sampling to survey 323 teachers from 42 different schools and interviewed five teachers to obtain data. The results showed most teachers understood the policy and supported it but had concerns about the effect of the ban of corporal punishment in schools. One concern was with the difficulty in disciplining students teachers would face

without the option of corporal punishment. Also, an overwhelming concern was that some teachers might ignore students' misbehavior to cope with the new rule.

Non-authoritative Centered Viewpoints

A limited number of studies exist in which students' (non-authoritative centered) thoughts on discipline and corporal punishment have been conducted. Geldenhuys and Doubell (2011) performed a case study to determine South African students' thoughts on how involved they are in school discipline and ideas for alternative methods of discipline. Also, the authors planned to form guidelines for better student participation in the process of school discipline and possible alternative discipline methods. The authors used a mixed method study to collect data through questionnaires from 40 students, ten each from grades eight to eleven. Results of the study showed that 33 of the 40 students were not involved in developing classroom rules, and 87.5% said they would be more likely to adhere to rules if they helped to make them. Students felt they should be more actively involved in policymaking on discipline especially since they knew which methods worked to deter misbehavior. Students chose detention as an effective means of discipline. They suggested detention should be held on weekends and students should write essays about ways they could improve their behavior or participate in group discussions about improving their behavior. Additional suggestions students wanted teachers to consider were being consistent in punishing them as opposed to threats with no follow through and counseling for students.

Children's assessments of spanking, reasoning, withdrawing privileges, and time-out were explored by Vittrup and Holden (2010). The participants were 108 children who ranged from six to 10 years old and 108 parents. The children watched videos, which showed a child receiving discipline. Then, the children scored each discipline practice. The method scored most fair was

reasoning while spanking was scored least fair. The children considered spanking to be the most effective in parents obtaining immediate compliance but not for long-term changes in behavior. Children who had been exposed to spanking in medium high levels were more likely to consider it to be the best discipline practice when compared with children who had low or high exposure levels. Older children scored spanking as being less fair than younger children. African-American and Anglo-American children's assessments showed no differences after controlling for exposure to spanking and socioeconomic status. Parents completed basic demographic surveys and the Parental Response to Child Misbehaviors questionnaire, which included ten questions pertaining to the frequency with which parents had used different discipline practices. No significant differences were found in parental use of any discipline methods.

Children's perceptions of whether certain discipline methods are acceptable tend to vary according to gender, age, race, SES, and prior exposure to a particular method. Children who have experienced corporal punishment in the home are more likely to approve of its use at school (Vittrup & Holden, 2010). They usually do not have a problem with receiving the physical discipline because it is a normal discipline practice. Also, children who often see or hear about a sibling or peer getting spanked will more than likely perceive the discipline as normative (Gershoff, 2010). Since they witness the corporal punishment frequently, the children consider it to be acceptable. This attitude is consistent with social cognitive theory, which emphasizes the role of observational learning through both direct and vicarious experiences (Bandura, 1986). Through this theory, children learn what is desirable and undesirable by observing others.

As it pertains to gender, children often believe harsher types of physical punishment are more appropriate and effective for boys than for girls. In a study by Barnett et al. (1996), participants listened to transgression scenarios and watched a series of videotapes showing a

father's or mother's possible responses to the transgressions committed by their son or daughter. The discipline methods fathers and mothers chose from were power assertion, love withdrawal, and induction. After watching each videotape, the participants were asked to complete a ten-item questionnaire. The first eight questions assessed the participants' perceptions of the parent's approach to discipline and the immediate impact of the discipline on the child. The last two questions assessed the participants' perceptions of the effectiveness of the parent's discipline style.

Following the completion of the questionnaire, participants watched the videotape again and were asked to rate how likely their own fathers and mother would be to respond to them in a manner similar to that depicted in each videotape if they had been caught acting unkindly to others. The participants indicated induction would be more effective in suppressing a daughter's misbehavior in the future as opposed to a son's in the parent's absence. A son was expected to be more responsive to the use of power assertion than a daughter. Participants rated a father's use of induction as more favorable when it was used with a daughter, but a father's use of power assertion was rated more favorable when used with a son. Male participants rated power assertion and love withdrawal as showing more parental sensitivity and fairness while female participants rated induction as more favorable.

Sorbring et al. (2003) assessed children's perceptions of parental discipline methods as well as their perceptions of child gender differences in their parents' choices of discipline methods. The participants were presented with five scenarios (where a child either hit a sibling, played with the stove after being forbidden to do so, refused to go to school, refused to eat, or refused to go to bed) and asked what the mother and father would do for discipline in each situation (low use of authority, reasoning/explanation, coercive verbal control, behavior

modification, physical restraint, or physical punishment). Also, the participants were asked to tell what they thought their mother or father would do if the child in the scenario was of the opposite sex. Both boys and girls perceived that boys encountered harsher discipline methods than girls. Children also perceived fathers as using more strict discipline methods and mothers as using milder discipline methods.

When it comes to age, younger children are often more accepting of harsher physical punishments. Also, they are usually less verbal than older children about whether or not a certain type of discipline method is appropriate or too harsh. These children accept that adults are the authority figures and that their rules cannot be changed. However, as children become older, they tend to be more discriminative concerning which punishments are more acceptable in certain situations (Barnett et al., 1996; Siegal & Cowen, 1984; Stern & Peterson, 1999). Older children use reason and examine available options for punishment. They do not accept established rules as unchangeable.

Due to the fact preschool aged children are just beginning to develop cognitive processing and emotional regulation abilities as well as experiencing more frequent punishments for misbehavior, their reactions to corporal punishment situations are understandably accepting and simple (Catron & Masters, 1993; Gershoff, 2002). Preschool aged children and fifth graders participated in a study by Catron and Masters (1993). The participants were asked to respond to six vignettes so the researchers could assess how the type of transgression and type of authority figure influenced their judgment of corporal punishment. Transgressions in the vignettes were classified as prudential (lighting matches and opening a bottle of poison), moral (hitting a friend and stealing money), and social convention (eating lunch with one's fingers and staying up past bedtime). Authority figures who could possibly administer corporal punishment were teachers,

mothers, and babysitters. The findings showed that preschool children viewed corporal punishment as acceptable and felt it should be severe for any of the transgressions and administered by any of the authority figures. Fifth graders viewed corporal punishment as acceptable and appropriately severe only for prudential and moral violations and as more acceptable when administered by a teacher.

As children grow older, they become more proficient at expressing their thoughts and feelings verbally, causing induction to be a more appealing disciplinary method over corporal punishment (Stern & Peterson, 1999). Stern and Peterson (1999) assessed the perceptions of parental disciplinary methods of four to eleven year old children, and the researchers found, as children grow older, inductive punishments progressively become the preferred discipline method. Likewise, Siegal and Cowen (1984) examined the perceptions of five to 17 year olds and found acceptance of physical punishments decreased as children advanced in age.

Participants in the study included preschool children, third graders, sixth graders, ninth graders, and twelfth graders. Preschool children and third graders listened to stories and responded verbally while sixth, ninth, and twelfth graders completed a questionnaire, which included the same stories the younger children heard. Situations that the participants judged included belligerently refusing to clean up one's room, punching and hurting another child, ignoring calls not to place one's hand on top of a stove, making fun of a crippled person, and breaking a lamp when skipping through the house. Possible consequences for misbehavior were induction, physical punishment, love withdrawal, and permissiveness. Preschool children unlike all other grade groups regarded physical punishment as more favorable than induction.

Younger children usually consider reprimands as a right that adults have, and for that reason accept punishment more willingly across situations (Mancuso & Lehrer, 1986; Turiel,

1983). As the cognitive abilities of children increase, their reasoning skills also improve, their sense of independence grows, and they are likely to view adults as less fearful and having less authority (Catron & Masters, 1993). Therefore, older children are less likely to consider spanking and other methods of coercion to be fair forms of discipline.

Different ethnic groups often have conflicting beliefs about child discipline. One group's view of appropriate discipline methods may be attributed to the history of unique struggles they experienced as well as by their current economic, social and political obstacles. Different types of discipline within a culture may serve to foster values that are adaptive and preferred in one's ethnic group. For that reason, discipline techniques, which are common and well accepted by young children's ethnic groups, may affect how they perceive or accept different types of discipline. Consequently, children who are from two diverse ethnic backgrounds may have differing opinions of the same parental behavior.

Spanking is often a widely used discipline method by African American parents (Jackson, 1997). In the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, Giles-Sims, Straus, and Sugarman (1995), found African American mothers reported the highest levels of spanking when compared to mothers from all other ethnic groups. When Heffer and Kelley (1987) compared middle-income mothers, they found 67% of the African American mothers agreed spanking is an acceptable method of discipline while only 25% of European American mothers found it to be acceptable. The African American mothers reported more exposure to spanking as children than any other mothers. Therefore, their being more accepting of spanking for their own children was not shocking. Furthermore, Deater-Deckard et al. (1996) presented participants with hypothetical vignettes of children misbehaving and found African American mothers rated the parent who spanked as the most positive while European American mothers rated the parent who used

reasoning as the most positive. African American mothers used more spanking with their children and could relate more to the parent in the vignette that spanked while European American mothers identified with the parent who used reasoning in the vignettes because communication was the discipline method they used most often.

The widespread use of spanking within African American families can be partly credited to historical experiences with oppressive societal conditions and current concerns about survival (Whaley, 2000). Due to the fact a larger proportion of African American families are living below the poverty level than European American families, African Americans are disproportionately exposed to dangerous environmental risk factors which characterize an urban setting, such as crowding, violent crime, economic, and racial prejudice. Thus, parents within African American families often view physical punishments as a means of teaching their children how to respect authority as well as the importance of self-control and self-regulation. These attributes are seen as instrumental in preventing future criminal behavior and legal troubles (Whaley, 2000).

Although African American parents tend to use more punitive discipline methods, this does not necessarily mean their children feel the physical punishments are harsh or rejecting. According to Deater-Deckard et al. (1996), African American parents regularly pair the use of physical punishment with reasoning, and within the African American culture, a lack of physical punishment may be indicative of abandonment of the parenting role. Therefore, the nurturing that is often paired with physical punishment may protect African American children from the negative effects of the punishment (Ferrari, 2002). African American children may view their parents as showing concern for their well-being. For socioeconomic status (SES), lower SES parents tend to support harsh disciplinary methods such as spanking, more often than higher SES

parents (Vittrup & Holden, 2010).

Effects of Corporal Punishment

Classroom Management

Managing student behavior in classrooms in order to increase student achievement has always been and continues to be of concern to teachers and educational personnel (Little & Akin-Little, 2008). Therefore, teachers use various classroom management techniques to establish and maintain an orderly environment that is conducive to learning. The techniques used by teachers vary depending upon the make up of their classrooms. Little and Akin-Little (2008) conducted a study in which 149 teachers from school districts in the Midwestern, Southern, and Southwestern parts of the United States completed a survey of classroom management practices. Participants were asked to identify how rules are developed and shared as well as respond to how they reinforce appropriate behavior, class disruptions, and chronic offenders. The only time teachers noted usage of corporal punishment was for chronic offenders (10%). The majority of the teachers reported using the following procedures: revoking privileges (63%), sending notes home to parents (62%), and sending students to the principal's office (56%). Fewer teachers reported removing students from the classroom to the hallway (39%), using detention (38%) loss of reward (32%), and assigning extra work (10%). Teachers were also asked to rank which techniques were the most effective and corporal punishment was ranked last.

In the Connecticut court case *Andreozzi vs Rubano* (1958), a 15-year-old student named Mickey delighted in causing disruptions in the classroom because he knew that physical punishment was forbidden. One day his teacher led him outside of the room by force. Mickey resisted vigorously, and the teacher struck him in the face to regain control of the situation.

Later, Mickey's parents sued for damages. The teacher did not have to pay anything. The court ruled that he acted not for the purpose of inflicting punishment but to restore order and discipline. Furthermore, it was stated that had he not acted promptly, the teacher would have been humiliated in the eyes of the pupils, and the order and discipline of the school would have been seriously afflicted.

Academic Performance

Corporal punishment has been linked to decreased academic performance in students. A study conducted by Straus and Paschall (2009) to determine if corporal punishment usage by mothers resulted in restricted cognitive ability. The participants in the study were 806 two – four year olds, 704 five – nine year olds, and their mothers. The cognitive ability of the children as well as corporal punishment usage by their mothers were assessed in 1986 and then again in 1990. The Body Part Recognition, Memory for Locations, and Motor and Social Development tests were used to measure cognitive ability in 1986. The Peabody Individual Achievement Tests (PIAT) for Math and Reading were used in 1990. The score for each child was the mean of the standardized scores for the cognitive tests completed by the child. The resulting scores indicated how far above or below the mean level of cognitive ability each child was relative to other children in the study of approximately the same age.

Straus and Paschall (2009) assessed corporal punishment usage by recording whether or not the mothers hit or spanked their children during the interviews. Also, mothers were asked had they spanked their children during the past week. If they had spanked their children, they were asked how many times. For the study, children were grouped as those who did not experience corporal punishment, those who experience one instance, those who experienced two instances, and those who experienced three or more instances. Straus and Paschall (2009)

controlled for child's birth weight, child's age, female children, Euro-American children, African American children, Hispanic children, number of children in home, mother's age at birth of child, mother's education, and father living with mother.

Multiple regression and ANCOVA were statistical tests run by Straus and Paschall (2009) to analyze the data. Corporal punishment was used with 93% of the two – four year olds and 58.2% of the five – nine year olds. Children, who were two – four years old and did not experience corporal punishment, gained an average of 5.5 points more than children who had been hit. Children, who were five – nine years old and did not experience corporal punishment, gained an average of almost two points when compared with children who were hit. These findings of the study by Straus and Paschall (2009) add to the argument that corporal punishment should not be used with children because it can hinder the development of their cognitive ability which in turn effects academic performance.

Corporal punishment has also been linked to lower academic performance as it relates to the American College Testing (ACT). A recent study by Hickmon (2010) found that in states where corporal punishment is used often, schools have performed worse academically than those states that ban corporal punishment. While most states demonstrated improvements in their ACT scores from 1994 to 2010, as a group states that paddled frequently improved their scores the least. These states also showed the least improvement in their scores over the previous 18 years. There were 75% of spanking states that scored below average on the ACT composite, and half had improvement rates that fell beneath the national trend. On the other hand, 75% of thirty non-paddling states posted 2010 ACT scores above the national average and approximately two thirds of these states had above average rates over the prior 18 years. The ten states with the longest histories of prohibiting corporal punishment improved the most with improvement rates

four times higher than those states that reported frequent use of corporal punishment. With corporal punishment being associated with lower ACT scores, it could possibly be linked to decreased academic performance on other measures.

Social Behaviors

Research has shown positive associations between corporal punishment and negative social behaviors in children. Straus and Mouradian (1998) performed a study to test the hypothesis that corporal punishment, such as spanking or slapping a child for the purpose of correcting misbehavior, is associated with antisocial behavior and impulsiveness by the child. Antisocial behaviors (ASB) generally involve children acting out against other people including their family members, teachers, and peers. Data was obtained through interviews with a sample of 993 mothers of children ages two – 14. Analysis of variance testing found that the more corporal punishment experienced by the child, the greater the tendency for the child to engage in ASB and to act impulsively. These relationships held true even after the researchers controlled for family socioeconomic status, the age and sex of the child, nurturance by the mother, and the level of non-corporal interventions by the mother. There were also significant interaction effects of corporal punishment with impulsiveness by the mother. When corporal punishment was carried out impulsively (with little to no thought and control, hot tempered actions, acting without planning or reflection, failing to resist urges), it was most strongly related to child impulsiveness and ASB. However, when corporal punishment was done when the mother was under control, the relationship to child behavior problems was reduced but still present.

Straus and Kantor (1994) carried out a study to investigate the possibility of corporal punishment putting adolescents at an increased risk of developing mental health and social relationship problems later in life. Participants included 4,500 families who were studied as part

of the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. Either the husband or wife of each household was taken part in a 35-minute interview. Respondents were asked to think back to when they were teenagers to answer questions, which included if they had ever been physically punished and if so how many times it had occurred in the past 12 months before the interview. The Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) was used to measure physical abuse of children and spouses. The CTS requires respondents to think of situations in the past year when they had a disagreement or were angry with a certain family member and to indicate how often they engaged in acts included in the CTS. The actions for the CTS include discussed the issue and proceed to items such as insulted or swore at him/her. These are followed by acts such as slapping, punching, and kicking.

Child abuse was measured using the CTS Severe Violence Index which assesses whether one or more of the following acts by a parent, each of which is almost universally regarded as abusive, occurred during the 12 months prior to the interview: kicking, biting, punching, beating up, scalding, and attacks with weapons. The CTS Assault Index was used to measure wife assault assessing whether one or more of the following acts occurred during the preceding 12 months in the course of an argument: threw something at her; pushed, grabbed or slapped her; kicked, bit, hit with fist; hit with object; beat-up; choked; threatened with a knife or gun; and used a knife or gun. The Depressive Symptoms Index was used to measure depression. To assess suicidal thoughts, researchers asked respondents if they had thought about taking their lives in the past 12 months. Researchers used the Drinking Index to assess the frequency and consumption of alcohol by respondents. Logistic regression analysis, which controlled for low socioeconomic status, found that children who experienced corporal punishment during adolescence, had an increased risk later in life of depressive symptoms, suicidal thoughts, alcohol abuse, physical abuse of children, and wife beating.

Summary of the Literature Review

Historically, the use of corporal punishment has dwindled through the years (Dupper & Dingus, 2008). Many researchers and organizations have called for its ban in schools due to the detrimental effects it has on children. At the same time, proponents of the discipline method claim there are benefits to its usage (Vockell, 1991). Even with negative associations being made between corporal punishment, academic performance, and social behaviors in children, its still used in school today (Straus & Paschall, 1999; Hickmon 2010; Straus & Mouradian 1998). With all the data that is available on the topic, limited research focuses on what students' beliefs are about corporal punishment (Holden, 2002). Due to the fact that they are the recipients of corporal punishment, their voices should be heard to help determine if the practice should continue.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

Chapter III includes specific steps taken to complete the research study on students' perceptions of corporal punishment, academic performance, social behaviors, and previous experience with corporal punishment at school. The methods section includes the following components: the design of the study, the research sites and participants, the instruments in the study, procedures for data collection, research hypotheses, and data analysis. The design of the study explains the type of study and includes purpose statements. The research sites and participants provide a demographic breakdown for students of each school. A description of the research instruments is presented. The data collection portion details how the researcher will gather data from all schools. Eight hypotheses are included for the study. Chapter III concludes with a discussion of the statistical tests necessary to execute the study and the data analysis required to achieve accurate results.

Design of the Study

This study uses the correlational design. According to Creswell (2012), correlational research designs are procedures in quantitative research in which investigators determine the degree of association (or relation) between two or more variables using the statistical procedure of correlational analysis. This degree of association, expressed numerically, indicates whether the two variables are related or whether one can predict another. Only a single group of

participants is studied. Although a correlational design is used for the study, survey methods are used to determine students' perceptions of corporal punishment in a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. Surveys are administered to a sample or an entire population of people to describe the attitudes, opinions, behaviors, or characteristics of the population (Creswell, 2012). In using surveys, quantitative, numbered data is collected using questionnaires or interviews. Then, the data is analyzed to describe trends about responses to questions and to test research questions or hypotheses.

Nonprobability sampling is the type of sampling used in the study. In nonprobability sampling, the researcher chooses individuals because they are available, convenient, and represent some characteristic the investigator seeks to study (Creswell, 2012). In particular, convenience sampling is being used. Convenience sampling is a type of nonprobability sampling in which the researcher chooses participants because they are willing and available to be studied (Creswell, 2012). With this type of sampling, the researcher cannot say with confidence that the participants are representative of the population.

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationships between students' perceptions of corporal punishment, academic performance, social behaviors, and previous experience with corporal punishment at school for students in grades three through eight in a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. The study also investigates whether there are statistically significant relationships or statistically significant differences in perceptions of corporal punishment for students based upon previous experience with corporal punishment at school and at home, grade level, age, gender, race, socioeconomic status (SES), academic performance, and social behaviors.

Research Sites and Participants

The participants in this study include third through eighth grade students from a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi who have received at least one corporal punishment infraction. The total number of students in the population for this study is 201. Thus, the targeted sample for this study is 132 students (Gay, 2006).

The district consists of ten schools with seven of these having students in grades three through eight. The seven schools have various grade range assortments. However, for the purpose of this study, schools will be grouped as elementary schools containing grades three, four, and five and middle schools containing grades six, seven, and eight. Thus, there are eight schools which house the student population for this study. The schools are labeled Schools A - H. Schools A-D are elementary Schools with grades three, four, and five while Schools E-H are middle schools containing grades six, seven, and eight.

Table 1 shows the broader demographic information related to the total number of students overall and by grade, gender, and race for the four elementary schools. The elementary schools have a combined student population of 730 students. Table 1 shows the following:

Table 1

Demographics of Elementary Schools

Demographics	School A	School B	School C	School D
3 rd Graders	104	25	51	75
4 th Graders	108	16	65	60
5 th Graders	101	19	58	48
% White	36%	8%	71%	37%
% Black	52%	85%	24%	53%
% Hispanic	12%	7%	5%	10%
Boys	216	35	89	91
Girls	97	25	85	92
Total	313	60	174	183

School A has a larger student population overall and per grade level than any of the other schools. Schools A, B, and D have larger Black student percentages while School C has a larger White student percentage. School B has a noticeably larger Black student percentage than White and Hispanic. School A has a larger male population than female while the male/female ratios at each of the other three schools are close. More specifically the following findings in Table 2 indicate the number of students by race and gender who have received at least one corporal punishment infraction for the academic year 2013-2014:

Table 2

Corporal Punishment Infractions for Elementary Schools

Demographics	School A	School B	School C	School D
3 rd Graders	11	2	19	7
4 th Graders	8	3	3	2
5 th Graders	14	1	0	9
% White	24%	0%	68%	11%
% Black	76%	100%	23%	89%
% Hispanic	0%	0%	9%	0%
Boys	27	6	19	15
Girls	6	0	3	3
Total	33	6	22	18

School A has a larger number of students who have received corporal punishment than the other elementary schools. School B has fewer students who have received corporal punishment. Fourth graders have less corporal punishment infractions than third and fifth graders. Black students have more corporal punishment infractions at each school except School C. Boys have more corporal punishment infractions than girls at each school.

Additionally, Table 3 depicts demographic information pertaining to the four middle schools and includes the total number of students overall and by grade, gender, and ethnic breakdowns. The middle schools have a combined population of 774. Table 3 shows the following:

Table 3

Demographics of Middle Schools

Demographics	School E	School F	School G	School H
6 th Graders	112	15	62	50
7 th Graders	139	23	80	46
8 th Graders	113	23	47	64
% White	34%	8%	59%	36%
% Black	53%	84%	38%	56%
% Hispanic	13%	8%	3%	8%
Boys	163	31	101	86
Girls	201	30	88	74
Total	364	61	189	160

School E has a larger student population overall and per grade level than any of the other schools. Schools E, F, and H have larger Black student percentages while School G has a larger White student percentage. School F has a noticeably larger Black student percentage than White and Hispanic. School E has a larger female population than male while the other three schools have more males than females. More specifically the following findings in Table 4 indicate the number of students by race and gender who have received at least one corporal punishment infraction for the academic year 2013-2014:

Table 4

Corporal Punishment Infractions for Middle Schools

Demographics	School E	School F	School G	School H
6 th Graders	25	1	0	7
7 th Graders	16	4	3	2
8 th Graders	12	4	1	8
% White	15%	0%	100%	18%
% Black	85%	100%	0%	82%
% Hispanic	0%	0%	0%	0%
Boys	39	8	4	15
Girls	14	1	0	2
Total	53	9	4	17

School E has a larger number of students who have received corporal punishment than the other middle schools. Sixth graders have more corporal punishment infractions than seventh and eighth graders. Black students have corporal punishment infractions at each school except School G. More boys have more corporal punishment infractions than girls at each school.

Table 5 shows demographic information related to the total number of students overall and by grade, gender, and race for the entire school district. The public, rural school district has a combined student population of 1,505 students. Table 5 shows the following:

Table 5

Demographics of Entire District

Demographics	Entire District	Corporal Punishment
3 rd Graders	255	39
4 th Graders	249	16
5 th Graders	226	24
6 th Graders	239	33
7 th Graders	288	25
8 th Graders	247	25
% White	40%	25%
% Black	50%	74%
% Hispanic	10%	1%
Boys	812	133
Girls	693	29
Total	1,505	162

For the district, there are more seventh graders than any other students. The Hispanic student population is much smaller than the White and Black student populations. There are more girls than boys in the district. There are more corporal punishment infractions for third graders than any other grade. Black students have more corporal punishment infractions than the other races. Boys have more corporal punishment infractions than girls. Again, the study is inclusive of only students who have received at least one corporal punishment infraction at school, which means the students have experienced corporal punishment at least once for misbehavior.

Instruments in the study

Given that the study is multidimensional in its approach, there are three different instruments used to collect the necessary data. First, the instrument in the study used to measure students' perceptions of corporal punishment is the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment (Appendix A). The instrument, as developed by Jacqueline Beekman Bennett (1984), focuses on investigating the change in children's attitudes toward punishment during the elementary years. Victor Riley later modified Bennett's instrument to assess the attitude and perception of elementary students concerning the use of corporal punishment within the School District of Lancaster. Permission will be obtained from Victor D. Riley to use the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment for the purpose of this study (Appendix B).

The instrument consists of ten scenarios to which the participants have to respond. Each scenario describes inappropriate behavior within the school setting. Participants are asked to circle the picture of the punishment they would choose as appropriate for the misbehavior. The options for punishment include nothing, time out, loss of privilege, suspension, and corporal punishment. A space is provided after each set of pictures for the participant to write in an alternative punishment. The alternative selection is perceived as more appropriate than those choices provided on the instrument. The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment is scored by assigning a numerical value of one to five to each of the possible responses. Measuring the responses across the instrument assesses the perceptions of students toward corporal punishment. The more corporal punishment is chosen as a consequence, the more favorable participants are to the discipline method.

Secondly, the Student Survey of Social Behaviors is used to gather data about student behavior patterns at home and at school as well as their current emotional state (Appendix C).

The survey is informed by the previously developed Youth Self Report (YSR) of Thomas Achenbach (1991). In the YSR, Achenbach (1991) focused on measuring aggression in adolescents (11 years to 18 years) using a standardized format. Subtests and scores on the YSR are obtained from competence scales, somatic complaints, anxious/depressed, social problems, thought problems, attention problems, delinquent rule-breaking behaviors, aggressive behaviors, internalizing, externalizing, total problems, and DSM-oriented scales. The newly constructed Student Survey of Social Behaviors only addresses social and aggressive behaviors in younger children (8 years to 14 years). The survey contains a mixture of 15 questions and statements. The first five questions of the survey are used to obtain general background information about the student. The response to each of these questions is yes or no. The last ten statements are about specific social or aggressive behaviors. A five-point likert scale is used to score each of the last ten items with possible responses including strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neither agree nor disagree (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5).

Thirdly, the instrument used in this study is the Case Assessment. The Case Assessment consists of language arts, mathematics, and science assessments that are aligned with the 2006 Mississippi Language Arts Framework-Revised, the 2007 Mississippi Mathematics Framework-Revised, and the 2010 Mississippi Science Framework. These assessments allow educators to predict with 93% accuracy how students will perform on the Mississippi Curriculum Test, 2nd Edition (MCT2), which is given in May of each school year. The Case Assessments are administered to students in grades three through twelve. The four possible performance levels students can receive are Advanced, Proficient, Basic, and Minimal. Advanced is the highest level and Minimal is the lowest level. Educators use data from the assessments to improve instruction and increase student achievement. For the purpose of this study, only student

performance data for language arts is to be used. This data is to be obtained from the principals of the participating schools.

Procedures for Data Collection

Approval for this study is to be obtained from the Institutional Research Board (IRB) at the University of Mississippi. Upon IRB approval, the researcher is to obtain permission from Victor Riley, the author, to use the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment. Permission is to be obtained via email from the superintendent and principals of the public, rural school district to survey students. The school administrators are contacted directly to obtain a listing of the students who have received one or more corporal punishment infractions. Each third through eighth grade parent of the participating schools, whose child has received corporal punishment at least once, will be sent a letter explaining the purpose of the study and a request for consent to voluntary participation (Appendix D). Incentives will be provided to the students participating in the study. The letter will indicate that students who participate in this study will receive two out of uniform days. This is particularly important because the students who attend this school district are required to wear uniforms. The letter will also indicate snacks will be provided at the administration of the surveys.

Copies of the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment and the Student Survey of Social Behaviors will also be sent. Parents are asked to return written consent letters to the principal of their child's school. The principals are to give the consent letters to the researcher. The researcher is to administer the surveys at a time and place designated by the respective school principal. Make-up sessions are not held for students who are absent when the surveys are administered. Those students who are absent are omitted from the sample. The researcher administers the surveys during Spring 2014. The time it takes each student to complete the

surveys is about 30 minutes. All resulting data are entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and analyzed using the appropriate statistical tests as described later in the study.

Based upon the list of students who have received corporal punishment at least once during the year, as well as the academic performance level of those students, a data codebook is to be developed. The data for whether or not corporal punishment is experienced at home is coded as 1 for yes and 2 for no. The data for the number of corporal punishment infractions per student at school will be coded into an Excel file according to the following: (1-2 infractions =1); (3-4 infractions =2); (5-6 fractions =3); (7 or more infractions = 4). Additionally, in regards to the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment, the data is to be coded using the following: (no option =1); (timeout option =2); (no movie option =3); (suspension option =4); and (spanking option =5). A scale is to be generated based upon how the students respond to the 10 survey items. The scale is as follows: 0-9 = little to no perception of corporal punishment; 10-20 = low perception of corporal punishment; 21-30 = average perception of corporal punishment; 31-41 = above average perception of corporal punishment; and 42-50 = high perception of corporal punishment. The survey items are to be summed according to how the students scored each of the items (i.e. 5 = high perception of corporal punishment; 4 = above average perception of corporal punishment; 3 = average perception of corporal punishment; 2 = low perception of corporal punishment; and 1 = little to no perception of corporal punishment).

The data for academic performance is to be coded into an Excel file based upon Case Assessment data according to the following: (Minimal=1), (Basic=2), (Proficient=3), and (Advanced=4). The scale score ranges for third grade language arts are as follows: (Minimal = 112 – 137); (Basic = 138 – 149); (Proficient = 150 – 161); and (Advanced = 162 – 192). The

scale score ranges for fourth grade language arts are as follows: (Minimal = 110 - 137); (Basic = 138 - 149); (Proficient = 150 - 161); and (Advanced = 162 - 191). The scale score ranges for fifth grade language arts are as follows: (Minimal = 106 - 137); (Basic = 138 - 149); (Proficient = 150 - 163); and (Advanced = 164 - 189). The scale score ranges for sixth grade language arts are as follows: (Minimal = 109 - 136); (Basic = 137 - 149); (Proficient = 150 - 165); and (Advanced = 166 - 192). The scale score ranges for seventh grade language arts are as follows: (Minimal = 114 - 137); (Basic = 138 - 149); (Proficient = 150 - 167); and (Advanced = 168 - 189). The scale score ranges for eighth grade language arts are as follows: (Minimal = 104 - 137); (Basic = 138 - 149); (Proficient = 150 - 166); and (Advanced = 167 - 190).

Additionally, students are asked to complete the Student Survey of Social Behaviors. The data for this likert-scale survey is to be coded into an Excel file using the following information: strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neither agree nor disagree (3), agree (4), and strongly agree (5). The data is to be reported according to the level of agreement expressed by the student. The rating of one represents strongly disagree and the rating of five represents strongly agree.

Demographical information is to be also coded and entered in to an Excel file for race, the groups of Black, White, and Hispanic are coded one, two, and three respectively. For gender the groups of males are coded 1 while females are coded 2. Socioeconomic status is based upon students either receiving free, reduced, or full price meals. They are coded as one, two, and three respectively. Grade level is divided into elementary (grades 3-5) and middle school (grades 6-8) and coded as 1, and 2 respectively.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be investigated:

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between measures of social behaviors and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Three: There is no significant difference between race and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Four: There is no significant difference between gender and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Five: There is no significant difference between categories of socioeconomic status and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Six: There is no significant difference between elementary students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment and middle school students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Seven: There is no significant relationship between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Hypothesis Eight: There is no significant difference between previous experiences with corporal punishment at home and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi.

Data Analysis

Data analysis is conducted to examine the hypotheses of the study. Inferential statistics are used to determine if hypotheses are supported or not supported. The Pearson product-moment correlation test is used for Hypotheses One, Two, and Seven. The test generates a coefficient called the Pearson correlation coefficient, denoted as r (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). This coefficient measures the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two continuous variables. The value of the coefficient can range from -1 for a perfect negative linear relationship to +1 for a perfect positive linear relationship. A value of 0 (zero) indicates there is no relationship between two variables. More specifically, Table 6 shows the rule of thumb for interpreting the size of a correlation coefficient (Creswell, 2012):

Table 6

Rule of Thumb for Interpreting the Size of a Correlation Coefficient

Size of Correlation	Interpretation
.90 to 1.00 (-.90 to -1.00)	Very high positive (negative) correlation
.70 to .90 (-.70 to -.90)	High positive (negative) correlation
.50 to .70 (-.50 to -.70)	Moderate positive (negative) correlation
.30 to .50 (-.30 to -.50)	Low positive (negative) correlation
.00 to .30 (.00 to -.30)	Little if any correlation

According to Creswell (2012), correlation researchers usually present correlation coefficients in a matrix in published research reports. In the current study, the bivariate correlation matrix will be established to determine any significant relationships between all variables. Also, a Bonferroni correction will be applied to prevent any Type I errors. The $p = .05$ level of

significance will be used. More specifically, as it relates to the Pearson r , data is to be generated for the groups of students in each of these categories (i.e. little to no perception of corporal punishment, low perception of corporal punishment, average perception of corporal punishment, above average perception of corporal punishment, and high perception of corporal punishment). Thus, the study is to ascertain any relationships among student perception of corporal punishment, social behaviors, academic performance and previous experience with corporal punishment at school.

Data for Hypotheses Four, Six, and Eight is to be entered into SPSS and analyzed using the t Test to determine the statistical significance for level of perception and gender by students' perceptions of corporal punishment, academic performance, and social behaviors. According to Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007), the t Test is to be used when testing for the significance of the difference between two means. In this study, the t Test is used since there are only two levels of each independent variable for hypotheses one and three. In Hypothesis Four, gender is either male or female. In Hypothesis Six, type of student is either elementary student or middle school student. In Hypothesis Eight, students either respond yes to receiving corporal punishment at home or no for not receiving corporal punishment at home.

Data for Hypotheses Three and Five is entered into SPSS and analyzed using a One-Way Analysis of Variance (One-Way ANOVA) to determine the statistical significance for race and SES. The One-Way ANOVA will be used since there are multiple levels of each of these independent variables. A One-Way ANOVA is a better test to run than multiple t tests on the dependent variables because the more t tests ran consecutively, the increase likelihood of Type I errors (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). An ANOVA controls for these errors so the Type I error remains at 5% and one can be more confident any significant result found is not due to

chance. The ANOVA test shows whether there is an overall difference between groups, but does not tell which specific groups differed. However, post hoc tests do. Post hoc tests are run after the ANOVA to confirm where the differences occurred between groups but should only be run when an overall significant difference in group means is shown (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). Therefore, a post hoc will be run if necessary.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is situated within the socially constructed theories on corporal punishment as justifiable for the purposes of individual retribution, deterrence, and reform. Rich (1989) purports the three-fold approach of retribution, deterrence, and reform as necessary for manifesting a different outcome. Retribution involves the administration of physical punishment while deterrence and reform involve a psychological shift in how individuals think and consequently behave. It becomes important to consider the diverse implications associated with the use of corporal punishment as a discipline measure of students within the school context.

According to Rich (1989), the theoretical construct of retribution theory states that pain or loss should be caused to those who do wrong. "Punishment is not inflicted to achieve another good but only because the person has committed a crime. The amount of punishment should correspond with the moral turpitude of the offender" (Rich, 1989, p. 150). The retributist claims that only the guilty of an inappropriate behavior needs to suffer. For that reason, inflicting pain on the guilty is necessary to achieve a desired and/or reversed outcome. No further justification has to be given for the deliberate infliction of pain. An undergirding assumption of the retributist is that those who commit socially, morally, or legally inappropriate acts do not need to thrive more than those who uphold moral, legal, and social codes. Otherwise, a system of justice would

not prevail and society would be seriously undermined.

Thus, when considering the retribution theory in regards to this dissertation, the fact that participants have experienced physical pain from the use of corporal punishment demonstrates its relevancy to the study. Corporal punishment has been inflicted on these students for some type of misbehavior within the school setting. Additionally, it is interesting to learn more about the students and whether or not they receive corporal punishment at home. Such insight about the discipline patterns at home provide the context to identify any relationships between the perceptions of those who experience this kind of discipline measure in both home and school settings.

Rich (1989) also advocates for the use of deterrence as another justification for corporal punishment. One way to describe the theoretical component of deterrence is in terms of utilitarianism. The utilitarianism principle considers punishment an evil, which should be excluded, except under extreme circumstances. Rich (1989) indicates the immediate ends of punishment are “to control the acts of the offender by making him or her legally incapable of committing further crimes or by rehabilitation and to influence others through example” (p. 150). Deterrence nonetheless provides an opportunity for individuals to choose a discipline measure that is appropriate to the action. Having a choice in the matter is important and the choice does not have to be solely a physical one. The use of deterrence, too, encourages the teaching of and modeling of respect for the individual person and others. Such approach offers a different way for interaction and engagement.

Thus, the deterrence theory is applicable to this dissertation it determines the student perception of corporal punishment as an appropriate response to their inappropriate behavior. While these students have received corporal punishment, the study provides the context to

determine if they prefer an alternative form of punishment to be used toward modifying the behavior.

The theoretical component of reform is the reinforced need to change how individuals respond to situations. The psychological intent of reform is to help them make changes for the better. In effect, reform is successful when it rehabilitates persistent offenders. In serious cases, such as repeated stealing and the use or sell of drugs, schools may be unable to reform an offender, and therefore, must refer children to juvenile courts or outside agencies (Rich, 1989). Notwithstanding on a lesser scale, the demonstration of reform is apparent when individuals show a change in how they behave after receiving corporal punishment. These types of students refrain from engaging in behaviors leading to corporal punishment. Thus, the reform theory is applicable to this dissertation because the behavioral patterns of those students who have received corporal punishment after a one time offense are no longer committing those acts. The students' behavior has changed as he or she responds differently. The Student Survey of Social Behaviors offers the opportunity to determine relationships between students and their engagement with corporal punishment.

Mississippi Code for Corporal Punishment

As it pertains to corporal punishment, school districts within the state of Mississippi must adhere to Mississippi Code Section 37-11-57 of 1972. The guidelines that govern the use of corporal punishment are as follows:

(1) Except in the case of excessive force or cruel and unusual punishment, a teacher, assistant teacher, principal, or an assistant principal acting within the course and scope of his employment shall not be liable for any action carried out in conformity with state or federal law or rules or regulations of the State Board of Education or the local school board regarding the control,

discipline, suspension and expulsion of students. The local school board shall provide any necessary legal defense to a teacher, assistant teacher, principal, or assistant principal acting within the course and scope of his employment in any action which may be filed against such school personnel. A school district shall be entitled to reimbursement for legal fees and expenses from its employee if a court finds that the act of the employee was outside the course and scope of his employment, or that the employee was acting with criminal intent. Any action by a school district against its employee and any action by the employee against the school district for necessary legal fees and expenses shall be tried to the court in the same suit brought against the school employee.

(2) Corporal punishment administered in a reasonable manner, or any reasonable action to maintain control and discipline of students taken by a teacher, assistant teacher, principal or assistant principal acting within the scope of his employment or function and in accordance with any state or federal laws or rules or regulations of the State Board of Education or the local school board does not constitute negligence or child abuse. No teacher, assistant teacher, principal or assistant principal so acting shall be held liable in a suit for civil damages alleged to have been suffered by a student as a result of the administration of corporal punishment, or the taking of action to maintain control and discipline of a student, unless the court determines that the teacher, assistant teacher, principal or assistant principal acted in bad faith or with malicious purpose or in a manner exhibiting a wanton and willful disregard of human rights or safety. For the purposes of this subsection, "corporal punishment" means the reasonable use of physical force, or physical contact or the application of swats with a wooden paddle to the clothed posterior of a student by a teacher, assistant teacher, principal or assistant principal, as may be necessary to maintain discipline, to enforce a school rule, for self-protection or for the protection

of other students from disruptive students.

(3) Corporal punishment shall be an authorized disciplinary alternative in every school district, provided that the use of such punishment complies with subsections (1) and (2) of this section.

(4) In the event that a parent is requested to appear at the school to administer corporal punishment to a child in his or her legal custody, that parent must administer such corporal punishment at the school facility under the supervision of the principal or assistant principal of the school.

Corporal Punishment Policy at the Selected Public, Rural School District

Corporal punishment is permitted as a disciplinary measure for school districts in accordance with Mississippi state law. School district policies pertaining to corporal punishment must adhere to the previously mentioned Mississippi Code. The following regulations shall govern the administering of corporal punishment for the rural, public, school district: (a) it should be administered after other measures have failed to produce the desired results (b) it should be reasonable and not administered in a malicious manner (c) it may be administered by the principal, a member of his/her administrative staff or the teacher and a certified employee will witness the event (d) should be administered away from the view of other students and (e) refusal of corporal punishment by the student will result in other disciplinary action. It is the responsibility of the parent to notify the school in writing if they prefer corporal punishment not to be administered to their child or children. Although Mississippi Law allows corporal punishment as a form of disciplinary measure for students in Mississippi Public Schools, the school district will make an effort to abide by the parent's wishes, but is not legally bound to do so.

According to the policy, corporal punishment is to be used only after other methods have been used but failed to result in improved student behavior. Other methods include teacher conferences with students, loss of privileges by students, teacher conferences with parents, student conferences with administrators, and conferences between parents and administrators. The intent of the corporal punishment should be to deter repeated misbehavior not to cause bodily harm to students. Corporal punishment is always to be administered and witnessed by individuals who are licensed as certified teachers or administrators in the state of Mississippi. Other students cannot be present while corporal punishment is being administered. If students refuse corporal punishment, they can be suspended from school.

Summary of Chapter III

The methods provide a guide for the researcher and others to successfully execute the study. The design of the study is a survey research design, specifically a cross-sectional design in which all data is collected at one time. The null hypotheses are intended to determine if differences exist in students' perceptions of corporal punishment, academic performance, and social behaviors by level of perception, race, gender, SES, grade level, and previous experience with corporal punishment at school. The purpose is to investigate the relationships between corporal punishment, academic performance, and social behaviors. The research instruments for the study were the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment and the Social Behaviors Scale. Chapter III concludes with a description of the statistical tests used to analyze the data.

CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research findings present quantitative data for 162 students from a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi who received corporal punishment at school at least once during the 2013-2014. There were 201 students targeted because they had received corporal punishment at least once. However, 39 parents did not allow their children to participate in the study. The data is composed of students' responses to The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment and The Student Survey of Social Behaviors. Language Arts performance data from the Case Assessment for each student is also used.

The data is examined to answer the following questions: (1) Is there a significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment (2) Is there a significant relationship between measures of social behaviors and measures of student perception of corporal punishment; (3) Is there a significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by race; (4) Is there a significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by gender; (5) Is there a significant difference between categories of socioeconomic status and measures of student perception of corporal punishment; (6) Is there a significant difference between elementary students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment and middle

school students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment; (7) Is there a significant relationship between levels of previous experience with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment; (8) Is there a significant difference between the mean of scores of previous experience with corporal punishment at home and the mean for measures of student perception of corporal punishment?

Table 7 highlights the breakdown of measures of student perception of corporal punishment as determined by how students responded to the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment.

Table 7

Descriptive Findings of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Number of Students	Percent of Students	Number of Times Corporal Punishment was Chosen Per Student
145	90%	Four or less times out of 10
13	8%	Five times out of 10
4	2%	Six or more times out of 10

As indicated by the data in Table 7, there are 145 (90%) students who chose corporal punishment as a discipline method four or less times out of ten having a low perception of corporal punishment. There are 13 (8%) students who chose corporal punishment as a discipline method five out of ten times having an average perception of corporal punishment. There are 4 (2%) students who chose corporal punishment as a discipline method six or more times out of ten having a high perception of corporal punishment.

In this study, three different statistical tests are run. The Pearson product-moment correlation test is used to determine if there is a relationship between two continuous variables. The Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) analyzes whether or not there are differences in the means

of three groups. Once the ANOVA has been used to identify differences, the Tukey's post-hoc test is used to identify where the differences are among the three groups. The independent t-test is used to analyze whether or not there are differences in the means of two groups.

Hypothesis One Results Summary

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis One states there is no significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. Academic performance for the students in this study is the Language Arts score they received on the Case Assessment, which predicts how students will perform on the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2). Student scores can be minimal, basic, proficient, or advanced, with minimal being the lowest and advanced being the highest. The scoring breakdown for students in this study is 55 students as scoring minimal, 65 students as scoring basic, 42 students as scoring proficient, and no students as scoring advanced. Therefore, there are 120 students (74%) scoring below proficient. A proficient score is the goal for each student regardless of grade level to demonstrate adequate mastery of objectives.

The Pearson product-moment correlation test is conducted to determine the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two continuous variables. The test generates a coefficient called the Pearson correlation coefficient, denoted as r (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). The value of r ranges from -1 to +1.0. A correlation was run to determine the correlation coefficient for academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Table 8 shows findings for Hypothesis One:

Table 8

Correlation Coefficient for Academic Performance and Corporal Punishment

		Correlations	
		Corporal Punishment	Academic Performance
	Pearson Correlation	1	.093
Corporal	Sig. (2-tailed)		.238
Punishment	N	162	162
	Pearson Correlation	.093	1
Academic	Sig. (2-tailed)	.238	
Performance	N	162	162

As indicated by the data in Table 8, the correlation coefficient for academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment is .093. According to Creswell (2012), there is little if any correlation between two variables if the correlation coefficient ranges from .00 to .30 (.00 to -.30). Therefore, there is little if any correlation between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Since the p-value of .238, is not less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the finding suggests there is no significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment.

Hypothesis Two Results Summary

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis Two states there is no significant relationship between measures of social behaviors and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. General background information was obtained for each participant

through the first section of The Student Survey of Social Behaviors. Students responded to five different questions. The first question was “Do you live with both your parents”. There are 64 (40%) students who responded yes and 98 (60%) students who responded no. The second question was “Is corporal punishment used in your home”. There are 137 (85%) students who responded yes and 25 (15%) who responded no. The third question was “Do you have any siblings”. There are 157 (97%) students who responded yes and 5 (3%) students who responded no. The fourth question was “Do your siblings live at home”. There are 132 (81%) students who responded yes and 30 (19%) students who responded no. The fifth question was “Have you seen a sibling receive corporal punishment”. There are 133 (82%) students who responded yes and 29 (18%) students who responded no.

On the second section of The Student Survey of Social Behaviors, students indicated their level of agreement for 13 statements. The levels of agreement students could choose for each statement are strongly disagree, disagree, neither agree nor disagree, agree, and strongly agree. Table 9 shows each statement and how students responded:

Table 9

Number of Students Responding by Level of Agreement

Statement	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
I argue a lot.	14	25	28	66	29
I destroy my own things.	67	50	10	30	5
I am mean to others.	33	41	35	44	9
I do not get along with other kids.	27	44	35	39	17
I get in many fights.	34	30	27	41	30
I physically attack people.	61	51	19	21	10
I scream a lot.	44	37	24	38	19
I destroy things belongings to others.	57	49	21	24	11
I threaten to hurt people.	50	35	27	28	22
I have a hot temper.	15	10	9	52	76
After I received corporal punishment, my perception of it as a form of discipline changed.	27	40	31	44	20
After I received corporal punishment, my behavior changed completely and now I no longer do that inappropriate act again.	34	29	31	46	22
Although I received corporal punishment as a discipline measure, I would prefer some other approach to be used.	21	13	29	34	65

Based upon responses in Table 9, 58.6% of the students agreed they argue a lot. There are 79% of students who agreed they have a hot temper. Another 61.1% of students would prefer some other approach to be used for a discipline method other than corporal punishment. For all other

statements, the percentage of students that agreed or strongly agreed with a statement was less than 50%.

The Pearson product-moment correlation test is used to obtain coefficients for each measure of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Table 10 highlights all correlation coefficients:

Table 10

Correlation Coefficients for Measures of Social Behavior and Corporal Punishment

Statement	Correlation Coefficients	Sig. (2-tailed)
I argue a lot.	.100	.206
I destroy my own things.	.160	.043*
I am mean to others.	.073	.353
I do not get along with other kids.	.088	.263
I get in many fights.	.114	.147
I physically attack people.	.125	.113
I scream a lot.	.015	.850
I destroy things belongings to others.	.014	.859
I threaten to hurt people.	-.009	.910
I have a hot temper.	.009	.910
After I received corporal punishment, my perception of it as a form of discipline changed.	.070	.378
After I received corporal punishment, my behavior changed completely and now I no longer do that inappropriate act again.	.112	.157
Although I received corporal punishment as a discipline measure, I would prefer some other approach to be used.	-.111	.160

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The data in Table 10 shows correlation coefficients for each measure of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. According to Creswell (2012), there is little if any correlation between two variables if the correlation coefficient ranges from .00 to .30

(.00 to -.30). Therefore, there is little if any correlation between each measure of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment since all correlation coefficients are smaller than .30. Given that the p-value of .043 is less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, the finding suggests there is a significant relationship between the measure of social behavior, I destroy my own things, and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Given that all other p-values for measures of social behavior are greater than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted for each of those measures. Thus, the findings suggest there are no significant relationships between those measures of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment.

Hypothesis Three Results Summary

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis Three states there is no significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by race at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. An ANOVA is used to determine if a difference exists between means of students' perceptions who are Black, White, or Hispanic. An ANOVA is used when there are more than two groups in the independent variable. According to Creswell (2012), it is appropriate to use an ANOVA because repeatedly computing independent t-tests increases the rate of Type I errors. An ANOVA does not specify which groups differ significantly. Thus, a post-hoc test is used to compare groups. Table 11 highlights descriptive analyses for Hypothesis Three:

Table 11

Descriptive Analyses for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Race	N = Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Black	120	1.1500	.42307
White	40	1.0750	.34991
Hispanic	2	1.0000	.00000
Total	162	1.1296	.40400

As indicated in Table 11, the number of Black students in the sample is 120, which is much larger than the number of White and Hispanic students at 40 and two respectively. Despite the disproportionate number of Black students in the sample, there is not much difference in the mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for each race.

The ANOVA is used to determine if there is a significant difference between the three different races of students in terms of mean measures of their student perceptions of corporal punishment. The ANOVA is a parametric test of significance, which produces the F ratio score distribution. The F distribution score represents the ratio of differences and errors (Creswell, 2012). If the between-group variance is significantly higher than the within-group variance, the F ratio is significant. ANOVA results are presented in Table 12:

Table 12

ANOVA F Ratio Score Distribution for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Corporal Punishment	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.203	2	.101	.618	.540
Within Groups	26.075	159	.164		
Total	26.278	161			

Table 12 indicates race has a between group variance mean square of .101. This mean square is a little smaller than the within group mean square of .164. The F ratio score distribution is .618. Since the p-value of .540 is greater than the significance level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, no significant difference exists between each race as it pertains to mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Since there is no significant difference, no post-hoc test is necessary.

Hypothesis Four Results Summary

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis Four states there is no significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by gender at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. An independent t-test is used to determine if a difference exists between means of students' perceptions that are male or female. Table 13 highlights findings for Hypothesis Four:

Table 13

Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Gender	N	M	SD	SE
Male	133	1.1429	.42893	.03719
Female	29	1.0690	.25788	.04789

As indicated in Table 13, the mean (M) measure of student perception of corporal punishment for males is 1.1429 with a standard deviation (SD) of .42893. The data for males suggest that on average their scores on The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment equaled a low perception of corporal punishment, meaning they did not choose it often as a discipline measure for the ten scenarios. The mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for females is 1.0690 with a standard deviation of .25788. The data for females also suggests that on average their scores on The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment equaled a low perception of corporal punishment, meaning they did not choose it often as a discipline measure for the ten scenarios.

An independent t-test is conducted to determine if a difference exists in mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment between males and females. The study finds there is no statistically significant difference in mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment between males and females at the significance level of .05. Table 14 indicates the following:

Table 14

Independent t-test Results of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Corporal Punishment	T	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	Std. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
Equal Variances Assumed	.892	160	.374	.07389	.08285	-.08973	.23751

Since the p-value of .374 is not less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the finding suggests there is no statistical significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment for males and females.

Hypothesis Five Results Summary

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis Five states there is no significant difference between categories of socioeconomic status (SES) and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. An ANOVA is used to determine if a difference exists between means of students' perceptions that receive free lunch, a reduced price, or pay full price. An ANOVA is used when there are more than two groups in the independent variable. According to Creswell (2012), it is appropriate to use an ANOVA because repeatedly computing independent t-tests increases the rate of Type I errors. An ANOVA does not specify which groups differ significantly. Thus, a post-hoc test is used to compare groups. Table 15 highlights descriptive analyses for Hypothesis Five:

Table 15

Descriptive Analyses for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

SES	N = Count	Mean	Standard Deviation
Free	151	1.1391	.41697
Reduced	3	1.0000	.00000
Full Price	8	1.0000	.00000
Total	162	1.1296	.40400

As indicated in Table 15, the number of students who receive free lunch is 151, which is much larger than the number who pay a reduced price or full price at three and eight respectively.

Despite the disproportionate number of students who receive free lunch in the sample, there is not much difference in the mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment by SES.

The ANOVA is used to determine if there is a significant difference between the three different SES categories of students in terms of mean measures of their student perceptions of corporal punishment. The ANOVA is a parametric test of significance, which produces the F ratio score distribution. The F distribution score represents the ratio of differences and errors (Creswell, 2012). If the between-group variance is significantly higher than the within-group variance, the F ratio is significant. ANOVA results are presented in Table 16:

Table 16

ANOVA F Ratio Score Distribution for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Corporal Punishment	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.198	2	.099	.605	.548
Within Groups	26.079	159	.164		
Total	26.278	161			

Table 16 indicates SES has a between group variance mean square of .099. This mean square is a little smaller than the within group mean square of .164. The F ratio score distribution is .605. Since the p-value of .548 is greater than the significance level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, no significant difference exists between the SES categories as it pertains to mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Since there is no significant difference, no post-hoc test is necessary.

Hypothesis Six Results Summary

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis Six states there is no difference between elementary students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment and middle school students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. An independent t-test is used to determine if a difference exists between the mean of two groups in terms of mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Table 17 highlights findings for Hypothesis Six:

Table 17

Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Type of Student	N	M	SD	SE
Elementary	79	1.1772	.44605	.05018
Middle School	83	1.0843	.35630	.03911

As indicated in Table 17, the mean (M) measure of student perception of corporal punishment for elementary students is 1.1772 with a standard deviation (SD) of .44605. The data for these students suggest that on average their scores on The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment equaled a low perception of corporal punishment, meaning they did not choose it often as a discipline measure for the ten scenarios. The mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for middle school students is 1.0843 with a standard deviation of .35630. The data for middle school students also suggests that on average their scores on The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment equaled a low perception of corporal punishment, meaning they did not choose it often as a discipline measure for the ten scenarios.

An independent t-test is conducted to determine if a difference exists in mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment between elementary students and middle school students. The study finds there is no statistically significant difference in mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment between elementary students and middle school students at the significance level of .05. Table 18 indicates the following:

Table 18

Independent t-test Results of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Corporal Punishment	T	Df	Sig.	Mean Difference	Std. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
Equal Variances Assumed	1.468	160	.144	.09288	.06328	-.03208	.21784

Since the p-value of .144 is not less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the finding suggests there is no statistical significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment for elementary students and middle schools students.

Hypothesis Seven Results Summary

Hypothesis Seven

Hypothesis Seven states there is no significant relationship between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. Level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school is defined by the number of times students received corporal punishment at school during the 2013-2014 school year. There are 116 (72%) students who received corporal punishment one or two times. There are 35 (22%) students who received corporal punishment three or four times. There are 7 (4%) students who received

corporal punishment five or six times, and there are 4 (2%) students who received corporal punishment seven or more times.

The Pearson product-moment correlation test is conducted to determine the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two continuous variables. The test generates a coefficient called the Pearson correlation coefficient, denoted as r (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 2003). The value of r ranges from -1 to +1.0. A correlation was run to determine the correlation coefficient for level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Table 19 shows findings for Hypothesis One:

Table 19

Pearson Results for Level of Previous Experiences with Corporal Punishment at School and Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Correlations			
		Corporal Punishment	Level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	1	-.040
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.613
	N	162	162
Level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school	Pearson Correlation	-.040	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.613	
	N	162	162

As indicated by the data in Table 19, the correlation coefficient for level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment is -.040. According to Creswell (2012), there is little if any correlation between two variables if the correlation coefficient ranges from .00 to .30 (.00 to -.30). Therefore, there is little if any correlation between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Since the p-value of .613, is not less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the finding suggests there is no significant relationship between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment.

Hypothesis Eight Results Summary

Hypothesis Eight

Hypothesis Eight states there is no significant difference between the mean of scores of previous experience with corporal punishment at home and the mean for measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. An independent t-test is used to determine if a mean difference exists between previous experiences with corporal punishment at home and measures of student perception of corporal punishment.

Table 20 highlights findings for Hypothesis Eight:

Table 20

Descriptive Statistics for Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

CP at Home	N	M	SD	SE
Yes	137	1.1533	.43539	.03720
No	25	1.0000	.00000	.00000

As indicated in Table 20, the mean (M) measure of student perception of corporal punishment for students who answered yes to receiving corporal punishment at home is 1.1533 with a standard deviation (SD) of .43539. The data for these students suggests that on average their scores on The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment equaled a low perception of corporal punishment, meaning they did not choose it often as a discipline measure for the ten scenarios. The mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for students who answered no to receiving corporal punishment at home is 1.0000 with a standard deviation of .00000. The data for these students suggests each of their scores on The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment was low perception of corporal punishment, meaning they did not choose it often as a discipline measure for the ten scenarios.

An independent t-test is conducted to determine if a difference exists in mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment students who receive corporal punishment at home and those who do not. The study finds there is no statistically significant difference in mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment between students who receive corporal punishment at home and those who do not at the significance level of .05. Table 21 indicates the following:

Table 21

Independent t-test Results of Measures of Student Perception of Corporal Punishment

Corporal Punishment	T	df	Sig.	Mean Difference	Std. Error	95% CI Lower Bound	95% CI Upper Bound
Equal Variances Assumed	1.756	160	.081	.15328	.08730	-.01913	.32569

Since the p-value of .081 is not less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. Thus, the finding suggests there is no statistical significant difference between mean

measures of student perception of corporal punishment for students who receive corporal punishment at home and those who do not.

Summary of Chapter IV

Chapter IV offers research findings about the various variables and whether or not they impact measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The only variable having a significant relationship with measures of student perception of corporal punishment was the measure of social behavior, “I destroy my own things” (p-value .043), which was a part of Hypothesis Two. For all other Hypotheses One, Two, and Seven, there were no significant relationships found between the respective variables and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. For Hypotheses, Three, Four, Five, Six, and Eight there were no significant differences found between the respective variables and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Such findings result in accepting the null hypotheses. Within Chapter V, the summary, conclusions, implications, and future recommendations for the study are provided.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE RESEARCH STUDY

Amongst researchers there continues to be an ongoing debate as to whether corporal punishment should be administered in schools. Some note benefits to the discipline method such as improved behavior (Larzelere, 2000) and increased compliance (Vockell, 1991). Others cite disadvantages to corporal punishment such as physical injuries (Wasserman, 2010), lower academic performance (Straus & Paschall, 2009; Hickmon, 2010), and negative social behaviors (Straus & Kantor, 1994; Straus & Mouradin, 1998). Additionally, Rollins (2012) identifies disparities in the administration of corporal punishment with Black males receiving it more than any other students. Although much research exists concerning the usage of corporal punishment, few studies have been conducted in *which* students' thoughts on the discipline method have been investigated. Since students are the ones who experience corporal punishment, it seems logical to obtain their perceptions of it (Holden 2002). Thus, the limited research in this area and the ongoing debate on the usage of corporal punishment has resulted in this current dissertation study, *The Diverse Nature of Corporal Punishment: An Investigation of the Relationship Between Students' Perceptions of the Discipline Method, and Students' Academic Performance, and Social Behaviors:*

1. Is there a significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
2. Is there a significant relationship between measures of social behaviors and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
3. Is there a significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by race at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
4. Is there a significant difference between mean measures of student perception of corporal punishment by gender at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
5. Is there a significant difference between categories of socioeconomic status and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
6. Is there a significant difference between elementary students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment and middle school students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
7. Is there a significant relationship between levels of previous experience with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?
8. Is there a significant difference between the mean of scores of previous experience with corporal punishment at home and the mean for measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi?

Data is collected from 162 participants through the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment and the Student Survey of Social Behaviors to answer the previously shared questions.

Summary of the Research Study

The results of Hypothesis One indicate there is no significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment at a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. The correlation coefficient for academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment is .093. Therefore, there is little if any correlation between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Since the p-value of .238, is not less than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For Hypothesis Two, results show there are no significant relationships between nine of the measures of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. There is little if any correlation between each measure of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment since all correlation coefficients are smaller than .30. Given that all the p-values for nine of the measures of social behavior are greater than the significance level .05, the null hypothesis is accepted for each of those measures. However, for the measure of social behavior, “I destroy my own things”, the p-value of .043 is less than the significance level .05. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. Such finding suggests there is a significant relationship between this measure of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment.

Results for Hypothesis Three signify there is no significant difference between each race as it pertains to measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The number of Black students in the sample at 120 is much larger than the number of White and Hispanic students at

40 and two respectively. Despite the disproportionate number of Black students, there is not much difference in the mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for each race (M = 1.15, Black; M = 1.08, White; M = 1.00, Hispanic). The between group variance mean square for race is .101. This mean square is a little smaller than the within group mean square of .164. The F ratio score distribution is .618. Since the p-value of .540 is greater than the significance level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference, so no post-hoc test is necessary.

The results of Hypothesis Four show there is no statistical significant difference between measures of student perception of corporal punishment for males and females. There is not much difference in the mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for each gender. For males M = 1.1429 while for females M = 1.0609. The p-value of .374 is not less than the significance level .05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For Hypothesis Five, results indicate no significant difference exists between the SES categories as it pertains to measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The number of students who receive free lunch at 151 is much larger than those who pay a reduced price or full price at three and eight respectively. Despite the disproportionate number of students who receive free lunch in the sample, there is not much difference in the mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment by SES (M = 1.1391, Free lunch; M = 1.0000, Reduced price; M = 1.0000, Full price). SES has a between group variance mean square of .099. This mean square is a little smaller than the within group mean square of .164. The F ratio score distribution is .605. Since the p-value of .548 is greater than the significance level of .05, the null hypothesis is accepted indicating no significant difference for measures of student perception of corporal punishment between SES groups.

Results for Hypothesis Six signify there is no statistical significant difference between measures of student perception of corporal punishment for elementary students and middle schools students. The mean (M) measure of student perception of corporal punishment for elementary students is 1.1772. The mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for middle school students is 1.0843. Thus, there is little difference between the two means. The p-value is .144 and is not less than the significance level .05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

The results for Hypothesis Seven suggest there is no significant relationship between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. There are 116 (72%) students who received corporal punishment one or two times. There are 35 (22%) students who received corporal punishment three or four times. There are seven students or four percent who received corporal punishment five or six times, and there are four students or two percent who received corporal punishment seven or more times. The correlation coefficient for level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment is $-.040$. Therefore, there is little if any correlation between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The p-value of .613 is not less than the significance level .05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

For Hypothesis Eight, results indicate there is no statistical significant difference between measures of student perception of corporal punishment for students who receive corporal punishment at home and those who do not. The mean (M) measure of student perception of corporal punishment for students who answered yes to receiving corporal punishment at home is 1.1533. The mean measure of student perception of corporal punishment for students who

answered no to receiving corporal punishment at home is 1.0000. The p-value of .081 is not less than the significance level .05. Thus, the null hypothesis is accepted.

Conclusions of the Research Study

The results of this study for Hypothesis One reveal that students who receive corporal punishment do have lower academic performance levels. There are 74% of the participants who scored below the proficient level based upon the Case Assessment. This finding is consistent with the arguments that Hickmon (2010) and Strauss and Paschall (2009) have reported. Children who receive corporal punishment have decreased academic performance. There was no correlation between the academic performance level of students on the Case Assessment and their measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The majority of the sample of has a low perception of corporal punishment indicated by 89.5% of the participants choosing it as a discipline method four (4) or less times out of the ten (10) scenarios.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Two indicate that there are no significant relationships between measures of social behaviors and measures of student perception of corporal punishment because the correlation coefficients are greater than the significance level of .05. The only exception is for when students responded by level of agreement to “I destroy my own things”. The correlation coefficient for this measure of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment is .043. Thus, there is a significant relationship. There is other noteworthy information pertaining to the Student Survey of Social Behaviors. There are 58.6% of the students who agree they argue a lot, seventy-nine percent (79%) who agree they have a hot temper, and another 61.1% who prefer some other approach to be used for a discipline method other than corporal punishment. With more than 50% of the students reporting they argue a lot and have a temper, it is necessary for educators to investigate the

causes of these negative behaviors. Such unwanted behaviors could cause disruptions in classrooms. The use of corporal punishment should also be reevaluated since 61.1% of the participants prefer other approaches to be used as methods of discipline. Discussions with students are necessary to determine why they are partial to corporal punishment.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Three show there is no relationship between race and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. For each race Black, White, and Hispanic, the mean score for student perception is 1.1500, 1.0750, and 1.0000 respectively. These findings indicate that all three groups have a low perception of corporal punishment. The mean scores were similar despite Black students comprising 74% of the sample. The large percentage of Black students receiving corporal punishment is consistent with arguments reported by Rollins (2012), which showed that Blacks students receive more corporal punishment than any other race. This data implies Black parents are more approving of corporal punishment than White and Hispanic parents.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Four suggest there is no significant difference in how boys and girls perceive corporal punishment. The mean perception score for boys is 1.1429 while it is 1.0690 for girls. These findings indicate that both groups have a low perception of corporal punishment. These mean scores exist despite the disparity in the number of boys versus girls in the sample. Boys make up 82% of the sample for the study. It is essential to note the large percentage of boys in the study is consistent with arguments shared by Rollins (2012), which showed that boys receive corporal punishment more than girls. Boys typically engage in more serious offenses than girls such as fighting, which cause them to receive more severe discipline.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Five suggest there is no significant difference in

SES for participants and their measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The mean perception score for corporal punishment for students receiving free, reduced, and full price lunch are 1.1391, 1.0000, and 1.0000 respectively. These findings indicate that all three groups have a low perception of corporal punishment. The similarities in perception scores exist despite the difference in the number of students in each category. There are 151 students receiving free lunch, three (3) receiving reduced lunch, and eight (8) paying full price for lunch. According to Vittrup and Holden (2010) parents who are in the lower SES class tend to support harsh disciplinary methods such as spanking, more often than higher SES parents. The findings from this study show that most of the participants are in the lower SES class but have a low perception of corporal punishment, although their parents approved for them to receive it as a discipline method at school.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Six suggest there is no relationship between elementary students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment and middle school students' measures of student perception of corporal punishment. The mean score for elementary students is 1.1772 while it is 1.0843 for middle school students. These findings indicate that both groups have a low perception of corporal punishment. The number of students in each category is similar also with there being 79 elementary students in the sample and 83 middle school students. Students are expected to have more acceptable behavior as they become older. However, the number of middle school students who received corporal punishment is higher than the number for elementary students.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Seven suggest there is no relationship between level of previous experiences with corporal punishment at school and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. Despite the number of times students received corporal

punishment, the majority of them have a low perception of corporal punishment (145, 90%). The majority of the participants received corporal punishment one or two times (116 students, 71.6%) and there are 35(22%) students who received corporal punishment three or four times. There are seven (4%) students who received corporal punishment five or six times, and there are four (2%) students who received it seven or more times. This data shows that the experience of corporal punishment does not deter all students from committing other offenses. Additionally, the data implies corporal punishment usage is sometimes overly abused.

The results of this study for Hypothesis Eight suggest there is no relationship between previous experiences with corporal punishment at home and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. There are 137 students who reported that corporal punishment is used at their homes while 25 reported that it is not used in their homes. It is interesting that the parents of the 25 students gave permission for them to receive corporal punishment at school when they do not administer it themselves at home. These parents could be in support of corporal punishment at school to avoid another serious consequence for their children such as an out of school suspension which would result in a loss of instructional time for the students.

Implications of the Research Study

The use of corporal punishment as a discipline method has been debated for many years and, the discussion is likely to continue beyond this study. Researchers have suggested corporal punishment has negative effects on social behavior (Straus & Kantor, 1994; Straus & Mouradin, 1998) and causes decreased academic performance (Straus & Paschall, 2009; Hickmon, 2010). This quantitative study finds there is no significant relationship between measures of social behavior and measures of student perception of corporal punishment except in the case of the statement “I destroy my own things”. Given such statement, one implication is the need for

schools to conduct a closer examination to determine what participants consider to be the cause of these behavioral problems. If students indicate corporal punishment causes them to display aggressive behavior, using it as a discipline method should be reconsidered. After the cause of the behaviors is determined, educators and parents may use the information in considering how they discipline or interact with students in the future. Some students require behavior modifications and can have such disruptive behavior that Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) are necessary. If educators and parents know what triggers misbehavior in students, this information should be shared during meetings to develop IEPs to ensure students receive the appropriate accommodations to support their academic achievement. This information is valuable as educators continue to seek ways to decrease disruptions and increase student achievement.

Additionally, this quantitative study finds there is no significant relationship between academic performance and measures of student perception of corporal punishment. However, there are 120 participants (74%) who scored below the proficient level based upon the Case Assessment, which is consistent with findings by Straus and Paschall (2009) and Hickmon (2010) that students who receive corporal punishment have decreased academic performance. A second implication for this study is the need to identify factors other than corporal punishment that influence academic achievement. Once the factors are identified, they can be controlled. This information is important to educators because if corporal punishment can be identified as the cause for decreased student achievement, other methods of discipline will need to be considered that do not cause lower academic performance.

A third implication of the study is the need to have students involved in the decision making process about corporal punishment and broader discipline matters. In this quantitative

study, 90% of the participants had a low perception of corporal punishment, and 61.1% of the participants agreed they would prefer another discipline method to be used instead of corporal punishment. Low perception of corporal punishment means participants chose other discipline methods as more appropriate for misbehaviors. Discussions with students will provide insight into methods they feel are more appropriate for discipline, which may be more effective in deterring future misbehavior.

Based upon the third implication, a fourth implication of the study is the need for school leaders to embrace the idea of shared leadership. All stakeholders need to be involved in the development of discipline practices. Other methods of discipline that have proven to be effective must be researched. Leaders must have an open mind to trying new techniques that could be less harmful to students and effective in decreasing unwanted behaviors.

Recommendations of the Research Study

Research has established a connection between corporal punishment and negative social behaviors (Straus & Kantor, 1994; Straus & Mouradin, 1998) as well as decreased academic performance (Straus & Paschall, 2009; Hickmon, 2010). Data from this quantitative study shows participants do have a low perception of corporal punishment and prefer for other methods of discipline to be used for punishment. The data also shows that 74% of the participants, all whom have experienced corporal punishment, scored below the proficient level on the Case Assessment. Since schools in our nation are charged with the well being of students and producing high levels of student achievement, the following recommendations are made:

- 1) Revisit the corporal punishment policy for the public, rural school district;
- 2) Examine the use of other methods of discipline that have proven to be effective in decreasing student misbehavior; and
- 3) Explore how the usage of corporal punishment affects classroom

management. Proceeding forward with these recommendations provides an opportunity to further investigate the diverse nature of corporal punishment and student discipline as a whole.

The corporal punishment policy for the public, rural school district needs to be revisited. Currently the policy states the use of corporal punishment is to deter repeated misbehavior. Several participants received corporal punishment more than one time. They may have committed different misbehaviors each time or repeated the same offenses numerous times. Within the policy, a set number of times a student can receive corporal punishment for the same offense needs to be established. Educators ought not use it repeatedly for the same student if usage is not deterring misbehavior. Instead of using corporal punishment, educators need to use other methods of discipline such as loss of desired privileges, parent conferences, in school suspension, and afterschool detention.

Administrators, teachers, parents, and students need to explore other discipline methods to determine what alternatives can be used to deter misbehavior. One alternative discipline approach used by schools is Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) (Baker, 2013). PBIS is a discipline philosophy used in schools around the nation to decrease problem behavior and establish positive school cultures over time. Behavioral expectations are taught to students throughout the school year. Also, under this system when students break rules there are clear consequences along with an emphasis on prevention. Following below are three examples of schools that have successfully used the PBIS System.

1. Haut Gap Middle School in South Carolina, which serves a high population of poor students, was at risk for closure in 2008 due to poor academic performance (Baker, 2013). Principal Bob Stevens credits PBIS with turning things around by 2012 with the school receiving top ratings on the state report card.

2. James A. Garfield Senior High School in Los Angeles serves a population in which 90% of students are eligible to receive free and reduced price meals (Omojola, 2013). After adopting PBIS, the school reduced suspensions from 600 to less than 20 and increased its score on the Academic Performance Index.
3. PBIS was instituted at Glenview Elementary School in Nashville, TN and the number of paddlings was reduced by 80% (Curriculum Review's 1995).

Based upon data from this quantitative study, the majority of participants do not prefer for corporal punishment to be used and have a low perception of it. Thus, other methods need to deter misbehavior, particularly those alternative measures that are not linked to decreased academic performance.

Having good classroom management is essential for a teacher to be able to teach. Once students receive corporal punishment and reenter classrooms, they could cause disruptions to the instructional flow. Therefore, it is important for educators to ensure students who receive corporal punishment are provided an opportunity to talk through their misbehavior and punishment and calm down before returning to the classroom. This way the students are more likely to be able to get back to their normal routines as soon as possible without causing disturbances due to being angry about the discipline they received.

The usage of corporal punishment as a discipline method for students is an important topic as it affects the students, climate, and culture of a school. Educators have the task of maintaining order in schools to ensure an overall quality educational experience for all students and the families they serve. An orderly and safe environment makes it easier for teachers to deliver quality instruction. In many ways, a comprehensive reexamination of the usage of corporal punishment in schools is necessary to ensure that the type of discipline measure used is not the

cause of unwanted negative social behaviors and decreased academic performance. Thus, as accountability requirements become more rigorous each year across the nation, it is important that schools remain diligent in addressing any barrier affecting to student achievement.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ashton, V. (2001). The relationship between attitudes toward corporal punishment and the perception and reporting of child maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25(3), 389-399. Retrieved from <http://0-www.sciencedirect.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/science/article/pii/S0145213400002581>
- Alexander, K. & Alexander, M. D. (2003). *The law of schools, students, and teachers*. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Co.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barnett, M.A., Quackenbush, S.W., & Sinisi, C.S. (1996). Factors affecting children's, adolescents', and young adults' perceptions of parental discipline. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 157(4), 411-424.
- Basci, Z. & Dilekmen, M. (2009). An analysis on classroom teachers' attitudes towards corporal punishment from the aspects of several variables. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 6(7), 933-938.
- Bennett, J. B. (1984). *Attitudes of elementary school children toward punishment*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University, Colorado.
- Bogacki, D. F., Armstrong, D. J., Weiss, K. J. (2005). Reducing school violence: The corporal punishment scale and its relationship to authoritarianism and pupil-control ideology. *The Journal of Psychiatry & Law*, 33, 367-386. Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c41-6094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=23&hid=127>

- Bower, M. E. & Knutson, J. F. (1996). Attitudes toward physical discipline as a function of disciplinary history and self-labeling as physically abused. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 20(8), 689-699. Retrieved from <http://0-www.sciencedirect.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/science/article/pii/0145213496000579#>
- Bryan, J., Day-Vines, N. L., Griffin, D., and Moore-Thomas, C. (2012). The disproportionality dilemma: Patterns of teacher referrals to school counselors for disruptive behavior. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 90(2), 177-190. Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=30&sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c41-6094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&hid=127>
- Cameron, M. (2006). Managing school discipline and implications for school social workers: A review of the literature. *Children & Schools*, 28(4), 219-227. Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=34&sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c41-6094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&hid=127>
- Catron, T.F. & Masters, J.C. (1993). Mothers' and children's conceptualizations of corporal punishment. *Child Development*, 64, 1815-1828. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.ep9406130036
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Deater-Deckard, K., Dodge, K.A., Bates, J.E., & Pettit, G.S. (1996). Physical discipline among African American and European American mothers: Links to children's externalizing behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 32(6), 1065-1072. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=15&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW hvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=9703070934>

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. Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c416094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=39&hid=127>

Ferrari, A.M. (2002). The impact of culture upon child rearing practices and definitions of maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 793-813. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=21&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZW hvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=7448147>

Firmin, M. W. & Castle, S. L. (2008). Early childhood discipline: a review of the literature. *Journal of Research on Christian Education*, 17, 107-129. doi: 10.1080/10656210801909715

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Akron, OH: Pearson.

- Geldenhuys, J. & Doubell, H. (2011). South African children's voice on school discipline: A case study. *International Journal of Children's Rights*, 19(2), 321-337. doi: 10.1163/157181811X547254
- Gershoff, E.T. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviors and experiences: A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(4), 539-579. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=29&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0ccc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101>
- Gershoff, E. T. (2010). More harm than good: A summary of scientific research on the intended and unintended effects of corporal punishment on children. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 73(2), 31-56. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c416094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=52&hid=127>
- Giles-Sims, J., Straus, M.A., & Sugarman, D.B. (1995). Child, maternal, and family characteristics associated with spanking. *Family Relations*, 44(2), 170-176. Retrieved from <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=7&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711>
- Gwirayl, P. (2011). Functions served by corporal punishment: Adolescent perspectives. *Journal of Psychology*, 21(1), 121-124.
- Heffer, R.W. & Kelley, M.L. (1987). Mothers' acceptance of behavioral interventions for children: The influence of parent race and income. *Behavior Therapy*, 2, 153-163.

- Hickmon, M. (2010). *Corporal punishment in schools and its effect on academic success*. Joint HRW/ACLU Statement.
- Hicks-Pass, S. (2009). Corporal punishment in America today: Spare the rod, spoil the child? A systematic review of the literature. *Best Practices in Mental Health*, 5(2), 71-88.
Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff8c416094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=64&hid=127>
- Hinkle, D. E., Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S. G. (2003). *Applied statistics for the behavioral sciences* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Holden, G. W. (2002). Perspectives on the effects of corporal punishment: Comment on Gershoff. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(4), 590-595. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.128.4.590
- Jackson, J.F. (1997). Issues in need of initial visitation: Race and nation specificity in the study of externalizing behavior problems and discipline. *Psychological Inquiry*, 8(3), 204-211. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=6&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101>
- Kennedy, J. H. (1995). Teachers, student teachers, paraprofessionals, and young adults' judgments about the acceptable use of corporal punishment in the rural south. *Education & Treatment of Children*, 18(1), 53-60. Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c41-6094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=72&hid=127&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=9504281807>

- Lansford, J. E., Alampay, L. P., Al-Hassan, S., Bacchini, D., Bombi, A. S., Bornstein, M. H., ...Chang, L. (2010). Corporal punishment of children in nine countries as a function of child gender and parent gender. *International Journal of Pediatrics*, 1-12. doi: 10.1155/2010/672780
- Larzelere, R. E. (2000). Child outcomes of nonabusive and customary physical punishment by parents: an updated review. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 3(4), 199-221.
- Laurence Lwo, L., & Yuan, Y. (2011). Teachers' perceptions and concerns on the banning of corporal punishment and its alternative disciplines. *Education & Urban Society*, 43(2), 137-164. doi: 10.1177/0013124510380232
- Little, S. G. & A. Akin-Little. (2008). Psychology's contributions to classroom management. *Psychology in the Schools*, 45(3), 227-234.
- Maltreatment. (n.d.) Retrieved March 29, 2013, from www.thefreedictionary.com/maltreatment
- Rich, J. M. (1989). The use of corporal punishment. *The Clearing House*, 63, 149-152.
- Robinson, D. H., Funk, D. C., Beth, A., & 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. doi: 10.1007/s10864-005-2706-9

- Rohner, R.P., Bourque, S.L., & Eldori, C.A. (1996). Children's perceptions of corporal punishment, caretaker acceptance, and psychological adjustment in a poor, biracial southern community. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 58, 842-852. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.olemiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=24&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=9701124138>
- Rollins, J. A. (2012). Revisiting the issue of corporal punishment in our nation's schools. *Pediatric Nursing*, 38(5), 248-269. Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.olemiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c41-6094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=86&hid=127>
- Schorr, J. (1959). You be the judge. *Saturday Evening Post*, 232(22), 63.
- Siegal, M. & Cowen, J. (1984). Appraisals of intervention: The mother's versus the culprit's behavior as determinants of children's evaluations of discipline techniques. *Child Development*, 55, 1760-1766. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.ep7304503
- Society for Adolescent Medicine. (2003). *Corporal Punishment in Schools*. New York, NY: Elsevier Inc.
- Sorbring, E., Rodholm-Funnemark, M., & Palmerus, K. (2003). Boys' and girls' perceptions of parental discipline in transgression situations. *Infant and Child Development*, 12, 53-69. doi: 10.1002/icd.265

- Stern, B.L. & Peterson, L. (1999). Linking wrongdoing and consequence: A developmental analysis of children's punishment orientation. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, **160**(2), 205-224. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=4&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=1887337>
- Straus, M. A. & Kantor, G. K. (1994). Corporal punishment of adolescents by parents: A risk factor in the epidemiology of depression, suicide, alcohol abuse, child abuse, and wife beating. *Adolescence*. *29*(115), 543-563. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=51&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=9411072706>
- Straus, M. A. & Mouradin, V. E. (1998). Impulsive corporal punishment by mothers and antisocial behavior and impulsiveness of children. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*. *16*(3), 353-374. Retrieved from <http://0-web.a.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?vid=53&sid=40495cae-e742-4a5a-ba0c-cc406711d7fb%40sessionmgr4002&hid=4101&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=11818705>
- Straus, M. A. & Paschall, M. J. (2009). Corporal punishment by mothers and development of children's cognitive ability: A longitudinal study of two nationally representative age cohorts. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*. *18*(5), 459-483. DOI: 10.1080/10926770903035168.
- Sue, D. W. et al. (2007). Racial microaggressions in everyday life: Implications for clinical use. *American Psychology*, *62*, 271-286.

Victorian Era. (n.d.) Retrieved March 29, 2013, from

www.victoriaspast.com/FrontPorch/victorianera.htm

Vittrup, B. & Holden, G. W. (2010). Children's assessments of corporal punishment and other disciplinary practices: The role of age, race, socioeconomic status, and exposure to spanking. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 31*, 211-220. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2009.11.003

Vockell, E. L. (1991). Corporal punishment: The pros and cons. *Clearing House, 64*(4), 278-283.

Retrieved from <http://0-web.ebscohost.com.umiss.lib.olemiss.edu/ehost/detail?sid=3da666a0-0eeb-41ff-8c41-6094efbb0591%40sessionmgr112&vid=94&hid=127&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=aph&AN=9706300021>

Whaley, A.L. (2000). Sociocultural differences in the developmental consequences of the use of physical discipline during childhood for African Americans. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 6*(1), 5-12.

Wasserman, L. M. (2011). *Touro Law Review, 26*(4), 1029-1101.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: STUDENT SURVEY OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Student Survey of Corporal Punishment

Section 1

Directions: The directions will be read to each group of participants before the administration of the survey. The researcher will read every question from the survey to the participants regardless of grade level.

This is not a test.

These questions were created to assist me in learning how students in elementary and middle school grades feel about certain types of punishment.

As you know, sometimes a problem may happen when you are going to or from school, in the classroom, or on the playground. Sometimes the teacher or principal must become involved to assist with solving the problem.

Listen carefully to some short stories, which describe a number of problems that may have occurred within your class or in your grade. Do not be concerned with whether the person could be a boy or a girl.

Please be certain to answer each question. Choose only one answer for each question. Do not write your name on the answer sheet.

Imagine you are the teacher or principal who must punish a student who has done something wrong. Draw a circle around the picture, which best describes the punishment you would choose for each situation.

1. Circle the empty box, with the word “nothing” underneath, if you would ignore or do nothing about the problem.
2. If you would remove the student from the situation, circle the picture, which shows a child sitting on a chair, separated from the rest of the class in “time out”.
3. If you would choose, as punishment, to not allow a student to watch a special movie, which will be shown to the rest of the class, circle the picture, which illustrates that punishment.
4. A suspension from school requires parents to keep their child at home for a certain number of days. If you would suspend the student from school, as punishment, circle the picture, which shows the principal pointing away from the school.
5. If as the teacher or principal you would paddle the student for the misbehavior, circle the picture, which illustrates that punishment.

6. If none of the pictures describes what you would choose as punishment, write a description of the punishment you would select on the line below the pictures. Do not write on this line if you choose one of the punishments that have been shown in the pictures.

1. The teacher discovered that a student was cheating by copying answers from another person's paper during a test. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

2. The teacher discovered that a student had stolen another child's lunch money, which totaled \$5.00. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

3. Two students were half an hour late in coming to school because they had stopped at the store to buy candy. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

4. A group of three students were playing ball at recess. One child became angry with the others because that child was losing. A fight was started by the loser. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

5. The teacher was showing a science project to the class. The teacher reminded one of the children to stop whispering during the lesson. The student became angry and began to “mouth off” to the teacher. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

6. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for a student who was using bad language or swearing at the teacher?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

7. A student has not completed a homework assignment for the day. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

8. A student has not completed any homework assignments for many days. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

9. A student is constantly “butting” in line. The teacher has told the child repeatedly to be respectful of the other children. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

10. The teacher has often reminded a student not to bother or talk to the children who are seated near-by in the classroom. If you were the teacher or principal, which of the following would you choose as punishment for the student?



Spanking
(5)



Suspension
(4)



No Movie
(3)



Timeout
(2)

Nothing
(1)

APPENDIX B: PERMISSION TO USE STUDENT SURVEY OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Dear Ms. Smith:

Attached is my written authorization for you to use the student survey from my doctoral dissertation.

Best wishes.

Vic Riley

APPENDIX C: STUDENT SURVEY OF SOCIAL BEHAVIORS

Student Survey of Social Behaviors

Directions: Listen to each question as it is read. Put an X in front of the response that is appropriate.

General Background Information

1. Do you live with both of your parents? _____ Yes _____ No
2. Is corporal punishment used in your home? _____ Yes _____ No
3. Do you have any siblings? _____ Yes _____ No
4. Do your siblings live at home? _____ Yes _____ No
5. Have you seen a sibling receive corporal punishment? _____ Yes _____ No

Social Behavior Information

Directions: Respond to the each statement by marking an X under the response that most closely matches your feelings about each statement.

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. I argue a lot. | strongly
disagree
(1) | disagree

(2) | neither agree
nor disagree
(3) | agree

(4) | strongly
agree
(5) |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. I destroy my own things. | strongly
disagree
(1) | disagree

(2) | neither agree
nor disagree
(3) | agree

(4) | strongly
agree
(5) |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. I am mean to others. | strongly
disagree
(1) | disagree

(2) | neither agree
nor disagree
(3) | agree

(4) | strongly
agree
(5) |
| | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

4. I do not get along with other kids.
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| strongly disagree
(1) | disagree
(2) | neither agree nor disagree
(3) | agree
(4) | strongly agree
(5) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
5. I get in many fights.
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| strongly disagree
(1) | disagree
(2) | neither agree nor disagree
(3) | agree
(4) | strongly agree
(5) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
6. I physically attack people.
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| strongly disagree
(1) | disagree
(2) | neither agree nor disagree
(3) | agree
(4) | strongly agree
(5) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
7. I scream a lot.
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| strongly disagree
(1) | disagree
(2) | neither agree nor disagree
(3) | agree
(4) | strongly agree
(5) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
8. I destroy things belonging to others.
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| strongly disagree
(1) | disagree
(2) | neither agree nor disagree
(3) | agree
(4) | strongly agree
(5) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
9. I threaten to hurt people.
- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| strongly disagree
(1) | disagree
(2) | neither agree nor disagree
(3) | agree
(4) | strongly agree
(5) |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

10. I have a hot temper.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neither agree nor disagree (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

11. After I received corporal punishment, my perception of it as a form of discipline changed.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neither agree nor disagree (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

12. After I received corporal punishment, my behavior changed completely and now I no longer do that inappropriate act again.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neither agree nor disagree (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

13. Although I received corporal punishment as a discipline measure, I would prefer some other approach to be used.

strongly disagree (1)	disagree (2)	neither agree nor disagree (3)	agree (4)	strongly agree (5)
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------

APPENDIX D: CONSENT LETTERS

Consent to Participate in a Survey Research Design Study

Title: The Diverse Impact of Corporal Punishment: An Investigation of Students' Perceptions of the Discipline Method, Academic Performance, and Social Behaviors

Investigator

Demeka Smith. (Student)
Leadership and Counselor Education
School of Education
133 Guyton Hall
The University of Mississippi
(662) 915-7636

Advisor

RoSusan D. Bartee, Ph.D. (Faculty)
Professor and Program Coordinator
Leadership and Counselor Education
School of Education
133 Guyton Hall
The University of Mississippi
(662) 915-7636

Description

I want to examine the relationship between perceptions of corporal punishment, academic performance, and social behaviors of elementary and middle school students in a public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi. The study particularly considers the implications associated with perception, race, gender, SES, grade level, and previous exposure to corporal punishment at school for students in a public, rural school district. In order to answer my question, I am asking you to take two short surveys. One is the Student Survey of Corporal Punishment. I will read ten scenarios for which you will choose an appropriate punishment. Then, you will provide demographic information about yourself. The second survey is the Student Survey of Social Behaviors. I will ask you to tell me general background information about yourself. Then, you will answer ten questions about your emotional state and social behaviors at home and school. It will take you about 30 minutes to finish both surveys. I will explain the surveys to you and you can ask any questions you have about the surveys.

Risks and Benefits

You may feel uncomfortable when completing the surveys because you want to choose the best responses. However, the surveys are not tests and will not count against you in any way. I do not think that there are any other risks. I will talk with you about the study and surveys before you complete them to ensure you understand what you are expected to do.

Cost and Payments

The surveys will take about 30 minutes to finish. There are no other costs for helping me with this study. Students who participate in this study will receive two out of uniform days. Also, snacks will be provided at the administration of the surveys

Confidentiality

I will not put your name on any of your surveys. The only information that will be on your materials will be your grade level, your age, gender (whether you are male or female), whether or not you have received corporal punishment at school and home, and your lunch status (free, reduced, full pay). Therefore, I do not believe that you can be identified from any of your surveys.

Right to Withdraw

You do not have to take part in this study. If you start the study and decide that you do not want to finish, all you have to do is to tell Demeka Smith, Student or Dr. RoSusan Bartee, Faculty in person, by letter, or by telephone at the Department of Leadership and Counselor Education, 133 Guyton Hall, The University of Mississippi, University MS 38677, or 915-7636. Whether or not you choose to participate or to withdraw will not affect your standing with the public, rural school district in Northwest Mississippi, the Department of Leadership or Counselor Education, or with the University, and it will not cause you to lose any benefits to which you are entitled. Inducements, if any, will be prorated based on [the amount of time you spent in the study.]

The researchers may terminate your participation in the study without regard to your consent and for any reason, such as protecting your safety and protecting the integrity of the research data. If the researcher terminates your participation, any inducements to participate will be prorated based on the amount of time you spent in the study.

IRB Approval

This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study fulfills the human research subject protections obligations required by state and federal law and University policies. If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have been given a copy of this form. I have had an opportunity to ask questions, and I have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

		_____ Signature of Participant		_____ Date	
_____ Signature of Parent/Guardian		_____ Date		_____ Signature of Investigator	
_____ Date		_____ Date			

[Remove if no minors are involved.]

**NOTE TO PARTICIPANTS: DO NOT SIGN THIS FORM
IF THE IRB APPROVAL STAMP ON THE FIRST PAGE HAS EXPIRED**

Dear Superintendent Jerry Moore:

As we have previously discussed, I am currently writing my dissertation which is titled “THE DIVERSE NATURE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THE DISCIPLINE METHOD, AND STUDENTS’ ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS.” My intent is to investigate third through eighth grade students’ perceptions of corporal punishment and then explore possible relationships between their perceptions and other variables. I am asking for your permission to contact building principals who have third through eighth grade students as well as their parents for permission to participation in my study.

Only students who have received corporal punishment at least once will be targeted. I will need a list of these students and the number of times they have received corporal punishment from each principal during the 2013-2014 school year. Also, each student’s race, socioeconomic status (lunch paying status), grade level, gender, and academic performance level from Case 21 will need to be included on the list. Each participating student will complete The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment and The Student Survey of Social Behaviors at their respective school sites on days designated by their building principals.

I will administer the surveys. I will provide snacks after surveys are completed and will ask each building principal to allow participating students to have two out of uniform days during the last week of school as an incentive to participate in the study. Data from the surveys and all other student information will be used in my dissertation. However, neither the school district, individual schools, nor any student will be named in the study. Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Demeka Smith

Dear Building Principals:

I am currently writing my dissertation which is titled “THE DIVERSE NATURE OF CORPORAL PUNISHMENT: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF THE DISCIPLINE METHOD, AND STUDENTS’ ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, AND SOCIAL BEHAVIORS”. My intent is to investigate third through eighth grade students’ perceptions of corporal punishment and then explore possible relationships between their perceptions and other variables. I have obtained permission from Mr. Moore to contact each of you and parents of your third through eighth grade students for participation in my study.

Only students who have received corporal punishment at least once will be targeted. I will need a list of these students and the number of times they have received corporal punishment. Also, I am requesting for each student’s race, socioeconomic status (lunch status), grade level, gender, and academic performance level from Case 21 to be included on the list. Each participating student will complete The Student Survey of Corporal Punishment and The Student Survey of Social Behaviors at their respective school sites on days designated by you, the building principals. I will administer the surveys. I will provide snacks to the students at the completion of the surveys and am asking you to allow them to dress out of uniform two days during the last week of school as an incentive to participate in the study. Data from the surveys and all other student information will be used in my dissertation. However, neither the school district, individual schools, nor any student will be named in the study. Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

Demeka Smith

APPENDIX E: IRB LETTER OF APPROVAL

Ms. Smith:

This is to inform you that your application to conduct research with human participants, "The Diverse Nature of Corporal Punishment: An Investigation of the Relationship Between Students' Perceptions of The Discipline Method, and Students' Academic Performance, and Social Behaviors" (Protocol #14x-241), has been approved as Exempt under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(#1).

Please remember that all of The University of Mississippi's human participant research activities, regardless of whether the research is subject to federal regulations, must be guided by the ethical principles in The Belmont Report: Ethical Principles and Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects of Research.

It is especially important for you to keep these points in mind:

- You must protect the rights and welfare of human research participants.
- Any changes to your approved protocol must be reviewed and approved before initiating those changes.
- You must report promptly to the IRB any injuries or other unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact the IRB at irb@olemiss.edu.

Jennifer Caldwell, PhD

Senior Research Compliance Specialist, Research Integrity and Compliance

The University of Mississippi

212 Barr

University, MS 38677-1848

U.S.A.

+1-662-915-5006

irb@olemiss.edu | www.olemiss.edu

This message is the property of The University of Mississippi and is intended only for the use of Addressee(s) and may contain information that is PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL and/or EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE under University policy or applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution, or use of the information contained herein is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you receive this communication in error, please destroy all copies of the message, whether in electronic or hardcopy format, as well as attachments and immediately contact the sender by replying to this e-mail.

VITA

PROFESSIONAL OBJECTIVE: To obtain a position that will fully utilize all educational knowledge and experiences leading to a successful career in education.

Education: University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi
Bachelor of Science: Biology
May 2002 Graduate

University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi
Bachelor of Arts: Elementary Education
May 2005 Graduate

University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi
Master of Arts: Curriculum and Instruction
Emphasis in Math & Science
August 2006 Graduate

University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi
Educational Specialist: K-12 Leadership
December 2008 Graduate

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

Byhalia Elementary School, 172 Hwy 309 N Byhalia, MS 38611

August 2010 - Present

Principal

The responsibilities of this position include but are not limited to student discipline, teacher observation and evaluation, professional development for staff, curriculum coordination, facilities management, budgeting, data collection and analysis, student achievement, parent communication and involvement, response to intervention coordinator, community engagement, fundraising, etc.

Byhalia Elementary School, 172 Hwy 309 N Byhalia, MS 38611

August 2009 - July 2010

Assistant Principal

The responsibilities of this position included but were not limited to student discipline, teacher observation and evaluation, parent involvement coordinator, yearbook coordinator, transportation management, etc.

Byhalia Middle School, 172 Hwy 309 N Byhalia, MS 38611

August 2008 – July 2009

Instructional Facilitator

The responsibilities of this position included but were not limited to budgeting, teacher observation and evaluation, coordinator of tutoring, testing coordinator, parent involvement coordinator, yearbook coordinator, dance squad sponsor, etc.

Byhalia Elementary School, 172 Hwy 309 N Byhalia, MS 38611

August 2007 – July 2008

Fourth Grade Teacher

Responsibilities of this position included but were not limited to preparation of lessons and delivery of instruction for all subjects, data collection and analysis, differentiated instruction, student discipline, parent communication, etc.

Byhalia Elementary School, 172 Hwy 309 N Byhalia, MS 38611

August 2005 – July 2007

Kindergarten Teacher

Responsibilities of this position included but were not limited to preparation of lessons and delivery of instruction for all subjects, data collection and analysis, differentiated instruction, student discipline, parent communication, etc.

HONORS AND AWARDS

*Byhalia Elementary School Teacher of the Year 07-08

*Kindergarten Grade Chairperson August 2006-May 2007

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS AND ORGANIZATIONS

*Golden Key International Honor Society

*National Education Association