

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A CORPORAL  
PUNISHMENT IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM  
PRESENTED TO PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND  
ADMINISTRATORS OF WEST CENTRAL WISCONSIN

---

A SEMINAR PAPER

Presented to

the Graduate Faculty

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse

---

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Education--Professional Development

---

by

Thomas C. Schmidt

April, 1977

WS  
77  
Schm  
c.2

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN  
La Crosse, Wisconsin  
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

Candidate: Thomas C. Schmidt

We recommend acceptance of this seminar paper in partial fulfillment of this candidate's requirements for the degree Master of Education--Professional Development. The candidate has completed his oral report.

Bob Howland  
Seminar Paper Committee Member

4-26-77  
Date

Steven B. Peemuth  
Seminar Paper Committee Member

4/26/77  
Date

John E. Costek  
Seminar Paper Committee Member

4/26/77  
Date

This seminar paper is approved for the College of Education.

Howard C. Rose  
Dean, College of Education

May 2, 1977  
Date

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF A CORPORAL  
PUNISHMENT IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PROGRAM  
PRESENTED TO PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS AND  
ADMINISTRATORS OF WEST CENTRAL WISCONSIN

Thomas C. Schmidt, ME-PD

University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 1977

Advisors: Bob Gowlland, Ph.D.  
Steven B. Permuth, Ed.D.  
John E. Castek, Ph.D.

The Purpose

The purpose of this study was to test and assess the effectiveness of the corporal punishment in-service presentation delivered by Dr. Steven B. Permuth, by administering, randomly, to those persons attending the presentation, a questionnaire designed to test the level of knowledge and understanding of concepts and guidelines associated with corporal punishment in the public school. The research hypothesis for this study was that the in-service training presentation was effective in producing a significant increase in the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending the presentation. In order to accept this hypothesis, it was necessary to reject the null hypothesis that the in-service presentation in question was not

effective in producing a significant increase in the understanding and knowledge of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those attending the presentation.

### Procedure

The subjects were forty-eight persons attending the corporal punishment in-service training presentation at La Crosse Central High School in La Crosse, Wisconsin on February 11, 1977. Thirty-three of these persons were randomly selected and administered the pretest portion of the experiment before entering the auditorium in which the presentation was to be delivered. Fifteen persons who had not been administered the pretest were randomly selected as they exited the auditorium after the in-service presentation, and were administered the post-test portion of the experiment. The data was analyzed using a t-test to determine if the two groups showed any significant differences in knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines.

### Findings

The raw data revealed an apparent gain in the test scores obtained by the post-test group over those obtained by the pretest group. The t-test showed that the difference between the test scores of the two groups was significant beyond the .01 level. On the basis of these findings, the null hypothesis was rejected, and it was possible to accept

the research hypothesis that the in-service presentation, developed and delivered by Dr. Permuth, was effective in producing a significant increase in the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending. It was determined that this particular in-service presentation could be a useful tool for the promoting of educator's knowledge and understanding of what they may or may not do when confronted by a corporal punishment situation in the public school.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	ix
 Chapter	
I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Background of the Problem . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	3
Significance of the Study . . . . .	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	5
Historical Background of Corporal Punishment in Schools . . . . .	5
Common Law and Corporal Punishment. . . . .	13
Controversy Concerning Corporal Punishment . . . . .	22
Educator's Knowledge and Understanding of Corporal Punishment. . . . .	26
The Effectiveness of In-Service Training Programs . . . . .	29
Summary of Review of Literature . . . . .	37
III. PROCEDURES . . . . .	40
Subjects . . . . .	40
Research Design . . . . .	41
Testing Instrument . . . . .	42
Administration of the Testing Instrument and Testing Procedures . . . . .	43
Reliability of the Testing Instrument . . . . .	44
IV. DATA/ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	46
Statistical Procedure . . . . .	46
Pretest-Post-test Results . . . . .	46

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS . . . .	49
Summary . . . . .	49
Conclusions . . . . .	50
Recommendations . . . . .	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	54
APPENDIXES . . . . .	58
Appendix A: The Testing Instrument . . . .	59
Appendix B: Composite Item Analysis of the Testing Instrument . . . . .	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Personal Data of Respondents . . . . .	41
2. Pretest and Post-test Scores . . . . .	47
3. Values Utilized for the Computation of $t$ . . . . .	47

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation to all the people who have assisted me in the preparation and completion of this seminar study. I want to thank the members of the seminar committee: Dr. Bob Gowlland for his guidance and confidence; Dr. Steven B. Permutth for his suggestion of a topic for study and knowledgeable assistance; and Dr. John E. Castek for his gentle prodding to finish this study in due course and assistance in analyzing data for the study. Special thanks are given to my wife, Janice, who not only has carried out many, and often the most tedious tasks toward the completion of this seminar paper, but has also shown patience and understanding through these many years of schooling.

Thomas C. Schmidt  
May, 1977

## CHAPTER I

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

#### Background of the Problem

Historically, the use of corporal punishment in education has had widespread acceptance (Francis and Hirschberger, 1973). In fact, corporal punishment has been a constant in the history of education. However, its practice has generated considerable activity in American courts which has resulted in nearly every state having had at least one school corporal punishment case on record. Because of this increased court activity, statutes, guidelines, and opinions relating to corporal punishment in the school are changing rapidly. This court controversy over corporal punishment, in light of its historical acceptance, seems to create a contradiction in what teachers may or may not do in terms of corporal punishment. This contradiction and perhaps, confusion, seems to be reflected in state statutes or the lack of the same, evidenced by the fact that four states today have statutes outlawing corporal punishment in the public school, thirteen states specifically allow its practice, and in the remainder of the states, corporal punishment is either permitted as a result of

opinion from the State Department of Education or no official policy exists at the state level whatsoever (Francis and Hirschberger, 1973).

Because of the non-standardization, confusion, and apparent contradictions in state statutes and court decisions, it has been inferred that individual teachers, as well as school administrators, have been confused as to what the guidelines are in regard to corporal punishment in the public schools. With the intent of alleviating the confusion about guidelines associated with corporal punishment and increasing the understanding of them and other recent controversial issues associated with school law, an in-service presentation pertaining to corporal punishment in the public school was developed by Dr. Steven B. Permuth, an instructor of school law in the Secondary Education Department at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. The presentation, by Dr. Permuth, was delivered as part of an in-service day program held at La Crosse Central High School in La Crosse, Wisconsin, on February 11, 1977. The in-service presentation informed those attending of the concepts and guidelines established by the courts which public school teachers and administrators must observe when confronted with a corporal punishment situation in the school. The program also included comments pertaining to what measures might be employed in certain hypothetical cases involving school corporal punishment situations. Further-

more, Dr. Permuth suggested additional safeguards school officials might employ to ensure strict adherence to procedural safeguards for the student.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to test and assess the effectiveness of the corporal punishment in-service presentation delivered by Dr. Permuth by administering, randomly, to those persons attending the presentation, a questionnaire, developed by the researcher, designed to test the level of knowledge and understanding of concepts and guidelines associated with corporal punishment in the public school. The research hypothesis for this study was that the in-service training presentation, developed and delivered by Permuth, was effective in producing a significant increase in the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending the presentation. In order to accept this hypothesis it was necessary to reject the null hypothesis that the in-service presentation in question was not effective in producing a significant increase in the understanding and knowledge of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending.

#### Significance of the Study

In light of the increasing complexity of school law and the expanding procedural safeguards being afforded

students by the courts today, the public school teacher and administrator is being compelled to investigate what both the school official's and student's rights are in terms of corporal punishment. The significance of this study is that if the research hypothesis were accepted, that the corporal punishment in-service training program was accepted as being effective in increasing the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending the presentation, then support or recommendations may be given for the need of establishing subsequent in-service teacher training programs directed at the area of school law and, specifically, the area of corporal punishment in the public schools in order to alleviate the confusion about corporal punishment in the school for all concerned. In its broadest sense, this study benefits those who question the effectiveness of school in-service programs in general; in its narrowest sense, it is of great importance to the individual teacher or school administrator who is confused by court established guidelines today involving corporal punishment and would benefit by an awareness of what type of program may alleviate that confusion.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature was reviewed for the purpose of 1) examining the historical background of corporal punishment in education in an attempt to establish an overview of how corporal punishment in the schools came to be accepted as common law, and how that body of common law has been affected by relatively recent court decisions; 2) investigating the level of educator's knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment in order to determine to what extent confusion may exist on the part of educators, as to what they may or may not do in this area; and 3) determining the effectiveness of school in-service programs in general.

#### Historical Background of Corporal Punishment in Schools

Paul Nash (1963) has defined corporal punishment as "chastisement inflicted on the body in order to cause physical pain or suffering usually with the professed purpose of modifying behavior." (p. 295) In the context of education, this is usually termed as a type of control to insure good discipline in a classroom situation. The question of why corporal punishment in the schools exists at all, however, is best answered by perusing its

historical precedence.

Historically, corporal punishment has had widespread acceptance. Francis and Hirschberger (1973) maintained that an examination of the literature of Western education since ancient times revealed that corporal punishment always has been entwined with the educational process. Indeed, a clear idea of the universal acceptance of corporal punishment as a necessity of scholastic education has been presented through the words of contemporary writers down through the ages. They described what they had seen or experienced and are of interest if human reaction to the subject is to be understood. Plato, the Greek philosopher born at Athens, B. C. 429, referred to punishing students when he said:

If a child obeys, so much the better!  
If not, one sets him straight, as one sets  
up and guides a sapling, but we must maintain  
him in the way by threats--and blows! (Henri, 1961, p.  
51)

Aristotle, born B. C. 384, Plato's pupil, supported this "principle" of education, and Menander of Athens (B. C. 342-292) maintained that: "A person who has not been beaten has not been trained" (p. 51).

The first evidence of corporal punishment in reference to a school, as distinct from a gymnasium, was in a short work by Herodianus, *The Master* (about B. C. 250). He described how a mother had taken her son to a school-master to be thrashed for various misdemeanors at home

(Henri, 1961).

Later Roman schools, Henri stated, had harsh schedules directed as much to the "building of character" as to any of the usual branches of learning. They kept the students at work from dawn to dusk, and "frequent whippings with a strap, cane, or birch, were considered essential to their training" (1961, p. 52).

Many years later, Plutarch was found to be in strong opposition to the practice of corporal punishment of children when he said:

I believe that children should always be kept to their studies by kindly persuasion and loving admonitions; never by means of blows or mal-treatments (Henri, 1961, p. 52).

According to Henri (1961), other evidences of disapproval, which appeared in what may be termed "ancient times," but which nevertheless established the fact that punishment of children did exist, seem to have disappeared in the medieval period, when teaching again became accompanied by inflexible severity.

With the widespread popularity of whipping as a form of punishment for transgressors, and as a means of preventing others from committing crime in adult life, Scott (1959) argued that it was only to be expected that corporal punishment should rank as an accepted method for the correction of children. Scott maintained that Solomon's dictum: "He that spareth the rod hateth his son, but he that loves him chastises him betimes" (p. 94); and his

admonition:

Withhold not correction from the child; for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell (p. 94).

were acted upon to the letter by parents and schoolmasters all over the world.

Pallas (1973) concurred with the above mentioned evidence of widespread historical acceptance of corporal punishment of children, and noted that both the ancient Hebrews and Egyptians condoned and even promoted corporal punishment; and that this was true even into the Middle Ages. Francis and Hirschberger (1973) stated that the Puritans, in turn, brought this tradition with them to the new world, where it flourished.

The use of corporal punishment in education during the colonial period, Butts and Cremin (1953) suggested, was an outgrowth of the Puritan outlook that permeated much of the religious thinking of Americans for 150 years. They alleged that it stemmed directly from

the religious orthodoxy of Calvinism with its emphasis on God's wrath and power, reverence and fear of God, original sin, obedience to God's commandments, and obedience to the authority of parents and elders (p. 66).

An authoritarian education was believed to be the only way to implement beliefs that the child's nature was inherently evil. Butts and Cremin continued by saying:

Since the child was prone to sin, the best way to keep him under control was to instill in him a fear of the awful and dreadful consequences of sin. Fear, discipline, and obedience were the by-words of this conception of child nature. These formed the staples of educational method throughout the colonial period for those who fully accepted this view of religious orthodoxy (1953, p. 66).

Countless sermons by Puritan ministers reiterated this general theme, and Butts and Cremin (1953) stated that perhaps the most complete statement of this position, especially as it was applied to the family duties of parents to children and the duties of children to their parents, was contained in a tract published in 1699 by Cotton Mather entitled A Family Well-Ordered. In this book, said Butts and Cremin, of most importance and interest to educators were the sections on instruction and authority. Mather's book insisted that "instruction should consist of reading, writing, ciphering, and preparation of an honorable calling, but above all instruction should lead to salvation" (p. 68). In the section on authority, Mather argued that if parents wanted children to fear God, the home must be ruled with absolute authority, children must be kept in subjection, and the parent's word must be law. Mather continued by stating that the

children must be kept in rein and parents must keep vigilant watch over their activities and their friends, rebuking and restraining them when necessary, even to liberal use of the rod but never whipping in anger (pp. 68-69).

Mather thus visualized fear, obedience, discipline, and absolute authority as the essential ingredients of the teaching methods in schools as well as in the home, church, and state.

Despite the prevailing attitudes toward child nature that led to the treatment of the child as a sinful person, there were signs that a change in outlook was in the making in the educational thought of the eighteenth century. Butts and Cremin (1953) argued that though it seemed clear from most descriptions of colonial schools that discipline was harsh and punishment was severe in actual practice, here and there various people began expressing the belief that children should be treated more gently as befitted the characteristics of childhood. More and more persons, they maintained, began to support the idea that children have some rights of their own. Gradually, they said, "it came to be felt that the child should not be expected to live up to the rigorous exactions of an adult standard of religious and moral authority" (p. 71).

Important in the development of a more humane attitude toward children and educational method was the emergence of nonreligious and secular concerns among an increasingly large proportion of the population. This could not be termed an anti-religious movement, argued Butts and Cremins (1953), but rather a growing interest in and respect for activities of a political, economic, and

scientific kind which did not deny the religious motivations but recognized them as one among many motivations that "impelled men to the good and the true and the useful in life" (p. 75).

Initially, the philosophy that corporal punishment \* was a primary teaching technique essential to achieve learning, was challenged successfully during a wave of nineteenth century educational reform. Williams (1937) asserted that this challenge was headed by Horace Mann, an educator and reformer, who believed much of the harshness and severity of schoolroom discipline could safely be abandoned, and that, except in rare instances, corporal punishment could be replaced by another form of control. Similarly, Williams maintained, Mann believed that if a greater degree of sympathy and confidence could be developed between the students and faculty, better behavior would result.

In Mann's time, Downs (1974) noted, there was a sharp difference of opinion about the subject of corporal punishment. Many teachers at that time, as has already been suggested, depended to a much greater degree upon the fear motive than at the present time. However, Downs continued, Mann stated that:

The power of inflicting bodily pain is the lowest form of superiority. It is the instinctive resort of brute animals, which, having no resources in intelligence, appeal to force. It prevails most universally amongst the most savage tribes, whose

superiority of muscular power gives superiority of social rank, and the regal power is conceded to the strongest (1974, p. 101).

Corporal punishment's effect on children was traumatic, Mann believed, because it relied upon the debasing emotion of fear. Mann did not go so far, however, as to maintain that the rod should never be used:

I would by no means be understood to express the opinion that, in the present state of society, punishment, and even corporal punishment can be dispensed with, by all teachers in all schools, and with regard to all scholars. Order is emphatically the first law of the schoolroom (Downs, 1974, p. 101).

Mann added:

This, however, is certain, that when a teacher preserves order and secures progress, the minimum of punishment shows the maximum of qualifications (Downs, 1974, p. 101).

Francis and Hirschberger (1973) concluded that because Horace Mann's consistent attack headed the drive against the use of corporal punishment as an educational method, one of the many innovations which he helped to effect in American schools was a great reduction in the number of school chastisements.

The review of literature revealed that education literature during the first third of the nineteenth century testified to the continuing decline of the use of corporal punishment in the public schools. Francis and Hirschberger (1973) noted this trend, but found evidence of a reverse trend in educational literature commencing from the late 1950's. This evidence, said Francis and Hirschberger,

stemmed either from more candid and accurate reports by contemporary educators than writings of earlier days, or from the fact that the use of physical punishment has indeed, increased within the public schools.

#### Common Law and Corporal Punishment

The practice of corporal punishment, because of its apparent status as a constant in the history of education, has generated considerable activity in American courts, as has already been noted in Chapter I of this study. A review of literature disclosed that nearly every state in the nation has had at least one school punishment case on record. Through the years, these cases relevant to education, have added greatly to the common law of the United States.

Francis and Hirschberger (1973) defined common law as "the body of legal principles which derive authority from the customs of the people or from the judgements of the court" (p. 592). In the absence of statutory provision, they maintained, American jurists referred to this body of legal principles from previously tried cases as a guide in their deliberations. A look, therefore, at the common law applicable to corporal punishment was revealing in terms of the historical background of corporal punishment.

The common law of the United States recognizes that teachers, administrators, and even boards of education stand

in loco parentis to their students. Francis and Hirschberger (1973) maintained that this concept, by which an educator stands in the place of a parent for the purpose of a child's education, "stretches back in time through two millennia" (p. 592). The first discoverable legal writer, they noted, to apply the in loco parentis concept directly to the teacher-pupil relationship was the eighteenth century English jurist, Sir William Blackstone. In defining the teacher-pupil relationship as similar to the parent-child relationship, Blackstone followed the basic common law principle of attaching considerable value to the customs and practices of society in ruling on cases. Blackstone, in his commentaries (1765), maintained that English laws gave such power to a parent as to sufficiently "keep the child in order and obedience. He may lawfully correct his child, being under age, in a reasonable manner; for this is for the benefit of his education" (p. 440). Furthermore, Blackstone stated that the parent:

May also delegate part of his parental authority, during his life, to the tutor or schoolmaster of his child; who is then in loco parentis, and has such a portion of the power of the parent committed to his charge, viz. that of restraint and correction, as may be necessary to answer the purposes for which he is employed (p. 441).

The opinion of Blackstone in regard to the concept of in loco parentis gave the schoolmaster at that time a great deal of latitude in dealing with children. Blackstone's mention of "restraint" and "correction" undoubtedly also

implied the use of corporal punishment when deemed appropriate by the schoolmaster.

Francis and Hirschberger (1973) asserted that the nineteenth century courts, relying heavily on the legal teaching of Lord Blackstone and the ordinary school customs of the private school of the period, applied the *in loco parentis* concept to the new system of public education. They maintained that two early common law principles which come from legal construction of the rights and duties arising from the relationship were the teacher's duty to maintain discipline in the classroom and the teacher's right to use corporal punishment if necessary to preserve that discipline. Accordingly, the legal use of corporal punishment was a court given right. The courts granted this privilege to the American teacher over his students to enable the teacher to perform the duties necessary to achieve the educational goals of the state.

Bolmeier (1976) asserted that with the development of the public school system, and especially, with the statutory provisions for compulsory school attendance, the application of *in loco parentis* as a right for a teacher to impose physical force upon a student as a means of preserving discipline came into question. He insisted that some parents and school personnel favored the use of corporal punishment; whereas others opposed it. In the United States there is presently no general law specifically

concerning corporal punishment though, and, as inferred in Chapter I, each individual state has the power to make such laws. Consequently, many of the states enacted legislation defining authorization or prohibition of corporal punishment as a disciplinary practice in public schools" (Bolmeier, 1976, p. 59). Currently, statutory references to corporal punishment as found in state laws show that four states (New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Maine) statutorily prohibit corporal punishment in schools. Pallas (1973) maintained that while these states outlaw corporal punishment, thirteen states specifically permit corporal punishment, and in the remainder of the states, corporal punishment is permitted as a result of opinion from the State Department of Education or no official policy exists at the state level whatsoever. In lieu of the absence of state statutes governing corporal punishment in the schools, Pallas said that each school district in a state can write its own laws.

Regardless of the controversy involving the concept of *in loco parentis* and corporal punishment in the schools, Ashwill (1975) noted that

Whether or not "*in loco parentis*" authority will continue in modern times to be used as a legal basis for use of force in punishing children is not known in view of the lack of recent cases on this subject. Since the case *In re Gault* (1967), 387 U. S. 1, gave to youngsters in juvenile proceedings the same due process rights afforded adults, there has been a great increase in

constitutional rights considered available to students. We can only guess that the use of force in disciplining students will tend to become less justified and more restricted in light of the increased freedoms and rights of youngsters (p. 4).

Pallas (1973) explained that the law does not permit the abuse of a child by anyone, be he/she parent or educator. While American courts have recognized the privilege of both the parent and educator, as a person in loco parentis, to inflict reasonable corporal punishment, the courts have recognized the necessity to safeguard children from excessive physical punishment given by an adult. In no state is undue physical punishment permitted, and "in many cases this punishment and the conditions under which it is to be performed have been explicit" (p. 313).

Although there have been relatively few court cases during the past decade involving the legality of inflicting corporal punishment on students as a disciplinary practice, Bolmeier (1976) maintained that those which have been reported by the courts of record since 1970 showed that in order for corporal punishment to be legal, it must be "reasonable in the eyes of the judiciary" (p. 63). Bolmeier stated that ever since the beginning of litigation on the issue, the courts have generally held that if corporal punishment were inflicted upon students it should:

- 1) be in conformance with statutory enactment;
- 2) be for the purpose of correction without malice;
- 3) not be cruel or excessive as to leave permanent marks or injuries; and

4) be suited to the age and sex of the pupil (pp. 63-64).

Indeed, the fourteen relatively recent court cases involving the question of corporal punishment in schools, which Bolmeier reviewed, reflected these four points. In his review of these court cases, those which held that the corporal punishment inflicted on the student was impermissible, were generally cases in which the court found the punishments to be cruel and excessive and unreasonable. In cases holding that the punishment was impermissible, such as *Johnson vs. Horace Mann Mutual Insurance Co.* (1970) and *People vs. Ball* (1974), multiple bruises and emotional harm respectively were found to constitute excessiveness and unreasonableness. In the cases finding that the corporal punishment inflicted was permissible, the courts considered factors such as the nature of the punishment, the nature of the student's misconduct, the age and physical condition of the student, the nature of the object used to administer the punishment, and the teacher's motive. Generally, after considering such factors, the courts decided on the reasonableness of the punishment while considering the possibility of any malicious intent on the part of the teacher. In general, the recent court cases holding corporal punishment permissible, which Bolmeier reviewed, found that corporal punishment itself was not necessarily cruel and unusual punishment as determined by the Eighth

Amendment. The courts held that teachers were responsible for maintaining discipline in the schools and "in the absence of statutory prohibition, corporal punishment may be inflicted upon unruly students if reasonably applied" (p. 86). In addition, Bolmeier (1976) noted a 1972 NEA Task Force Report which suggested that corporal punishment may be applied when reasonable and necessary under the qualifying circumstances:

- 1) to protect himself, the pupil or others from physical injury;
- 2) to obtain possession of a weapon or other dangerous object upon the person or within control of the pupil;
- 3) to protect property from serious harm, and such physical restraint shall not be construed to constitute corporal punishment or bodily pain within the meaning and intentment of this section (p. 63).

Francis and Hirschberger (1973) maintained that the immoderate use of physical punishment was an illegal act which could constitute an assault and battery at law. An assault and battery, they stated, was classified as an intentional tort; that is an action implying intent to injure another. As such it was a criminal action. Both the parent and educator may be found criminally guilty if they exceeded their corporal privilege. The convicted educator also would be potentially liable in money damages if a civil suit was brought by a student.

The "key" court case, and most definitive to date, which established additional safeguards for the student in

relation to corporal punishment administered by school officials, is the United States Supreme Court decision, *Baker vs. Owen* (1975). In this decision, the Supreme Court affirmed a North Carolina federal court decision without comment. The decision ruled that certain procedural guidelines must be observed before corporal punishment can be administered. The Court concluded that Baker had an "interest protected by the concept of liberty in the Fourteenth Amendment, in avoiding corporal punishment" (p. 301). It followed, as a constitutional principle, Flygare (1976) asserted, that some procedure was due. The scope of that procedure, however, must be determined, the Court said, by balancing the rights of the student with the need to maintain order in the schools. In this case of *Baker vs. Owen*, four principles governing the use of corporal punishment in school were used to balance the countervailing interests. The four principles mandated by the Court were:

- 1) Corporal punishment should not be used unless the student was forewarned that specific misbehavior would cause its use.
- 2) Corporal punishment "should never be employed as a first line of punishment for misbehavior" (Here the Court suggested detention and extra work as punishments to be administered before corporal punishment).
  - a. these first two elements were subject to an exception: They did not apply if the student's behavior was "so antisocial or disruptive in nature as to shock the conscience. . . ."

- 3) Corporal punishment can only be administered in the company of a second staff member who has been informed beforehand and in the student's presence of the reason for the punishment.
- 4) If the parents so request, the official who administered the punishment must furnish a written statement of the reasons for using this form of punishment. The statement must include the name of the second staff member who was present.

The Court seemed to make it clear, Permuth (1976) maintained, that if these procedural safeguards listed above were not afforded to the students, then there would exist a violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Permuth argued that although the Court had not declared "the utilization of corporal punishment, per se, to be unconstitutional, it has looked at a variety of circumstances that make its utilization one of severe question" (p. 12).

In the most recent corporal punishment court case to date, the case of *Ingraham vs. Wright*, the United States Supreme Court ruled, in a five to four vote, that the corporal punishment of school children by teachers does not violate the Constitution's ban against cruel and unusual punishment, even if the punishment is "excessive" and medically harmful. In its decision, the Court relied heavily on the current principle derived from common law that teachers may impose reasonable but not excessive force to discipline students. The Court maintained that the current law provided enough civil and criminal sanctions to deal

with cases of abuse by school officials of their disciplinary power. A majority of the Court contended that the Eighth Amendment was designed to protect persons convicted of crimes, and that the prisoner and schoolchild stood in wholly different circumstances. The Supreme Court also ruled that a student has no constitutional right to have even an informal hearing before the corporal punishment is justified. In so ruling, the Court inferred that the basic directions offered by the Baker case in terms of due process of law in corporal punishment cases, were likely valid.

#### Controversy Concerning Corporal Punishment

The controversy about corporal punishment in the schools has been a long and involved one, as has already been demonstrated. The Educational Digest (1973) noted that the concept of corporal punishment still enjoys widespread use. Figures from Dallas, Texas schools, the Digest reported, showed a monthly average of more than two thousand reported incidents of physical punishment in 1971-72. Furthermore, Patterson (1974) reported an investigation carried out by the Norfolk, Virginia school district which showed that of the fifty cities responding, eighty per cent of the school districts, permitted the use of corporal punishment. However, Patterson argued that the controversy surrounding corporal punishment has not been whether it exists in the schools, but whether corporal

punishment is a viable means for modifying disruptive behavior.

Arguments in support of corporal punishment have varied. Pallas (1973) argued that it could be used as a punishment for incorrect answers, as in historical times. Pallas noted, however, that, in general, this reason was no longer given as a reason for administering corporal punishment. Pallas said that a second argument for using corporal punishment is that it could be used as a disciplinary measure to punish the wrongdoer for disruptive or antisocial behavior. Used for this reason, Pallas reasoned, corporal punishment would be utilized to maintain an atmosphere conducive to learning, usually by discouraging an offender from further disruptive behavior. A third argument favoring corporal punishment, Pallas maintained, was that it could be used to defend endangered persons or property.

Arguments opposing corporal punishment in the schools were also varied. One argument, proposed by Schumacher (1974), was one of historical law which contended that by the middle of the nineteenth century children were already the last persons left who could legally be beaten. In 1853, noted Schumacher, Judge Stuart stated that

The husband can no longer modestly chastise his wife; nor the master his servant or apprentice. Even the degrading cruelties of the naval service have been arrested. Why the person of the schoolboy should be less sacred in the eyes of the law than that of the apprentice or the sailor, is not easily explained (p. 689).

The Educational Digest (1973) included an argument opposing corporal punishment in the schools made by a 1972 NEA task force. The argument asserted that physical punishment was an ineffective method to maintain order and usually had to be repeated over and over again. Hawkins (1976) carried the argument even further, and said that corporal punishment actually increased disruptive behavior, hindered learning, and taught that might was right.

Marion Langer (1973), in her opposition to corporal punishment in the schools, noted that it did not strengthen self-discipline. She maintained that a young person's development of self-discipline had long been accepted as a developmental and internalized process. Langer concluded that corporal punishment did not contribute to this constructive process, and that the control in a corporal punishment situation rested with the adult (principal or teacher). She argued that with the use of corporal punishment, the student's body became the object for control and the discipline used was outside the student and imposed on him.

A final argument opposing corporal punishment was expounded by Paul Nash (1963). Nash argued that corporal punishment was simply not for the good of the student. He wrote,

He (the teacher) cannot fight the battle for the student. No one can do that but the student himself. Corporal punishment reduces the chances of genuine change taking place by replacing the conflict within the student by a teacher versus student conflict, a clash of wills or bodies. (p. 304).

The Educational Digest (1973) noted that the 1972 NEA task force, which recommended that corporal punishment be phased out by the beginning of the 1973-74 school year, also maintained that if it were true that corporal punishment was good for a student, then teachers would not hit the same students again and again.

Corporal punishment has existed, and still exists in the schools. The arguments for and against it have not yet proven beyond a doubt whether corporal punishment is necessary or not. The United States Supreme Court, in its decision on the Baker case (1975), stated:

opposition to corporal punishment, on the other hand, enjoys no such universal approbation in our society even today, and certainly not historically. Quite the contrary, it bucks a settled tradition of countenancing such punishment when reasonable. . . . And though we accept Mrs. Baker's assertion that corporal punishment of children is today discouraged by the weight of professional opinion, we are also cognizant that the issue is unsettled and probably incapable of categorical resolution (p. 300).

The current court controversies surrounding corporal punishment with the additional arguments relating to the question of whether corporal punishment is a viable means for modifying disruptive behavior, in light of its historical acceptance, may very well have confused teachers

and administrators alike as to what they may or may not do in terms of corporally punishing students. However, Steven Permuth (1976), in a concluding remark, warned that, "For those who believe that use of corporal punishment should be at the discretion and designs of the individual administrator, they are living in a time which may have been in our society, but which, certainly, is not going to return" (p. 12).

#### Educator's Knowledge and Understanding of Corporal Punishment

Because of the relatively recent court decisions dealing with corporal punishment and the specific procedural safeguards established by the court as a result of these decisions, a review of literature was undertaken with the purpose of determining the level of educator's knowledge and understanding of school corporal punishment concepts and guidelines established in recent years.

The review was unable to reveal any specific studies designed to determine educator's understanding of school corporal punishment concepts and guidelines. In fact, the literature in general revealed little to assist in this determination. There have been a small number of books written to inform teachers, administrators, and school board members of the rights, responsibilities, and risks involved in corporal punishment situations which, in turn, have inferred that educators have encountered some confusion

in this area.

One such book, written by Ladd and Walden (1975), attempted to clarify what an educator should keep in mind and described what courses of action were open when he/she confronted a particular corporal punishment situation. Ladd and Walden maintained that teachers and principals encountered discipline problems not because they were deficient in skill or virtue, but because they had inherited misleading definitions of their respective roles. The authors noted that what the schools must do, may do, and may not do about disciplining was what the individual chapters, in their book, dealt with.

Another book, written by Catherine and Leon Rovetta (1968), also presented authoritative material in the area of corporal punishment in the schools. They maintained that the book was written "to remove teacher confusion, and, hence, to lessen many classroom problems and tensions" (Preface). They stated, in the Preface to the book, that ignorance of the law was no excuse and that

teachers without knowledge of the rules and regulations in reference to corporal punishment may wrongfully punish a pupil and find themselves involved in a lawsuit because of acts performed with the best intentions.

The Rovettas noted that the right to administer lawful corporal punishment depended on many material factors. Teachers not aware of these material factors, they warned

may harm a child as well as incur severe penalties-- personal and professional--such as a criminal lawsuit or a civil lawsuit. To know the guiding factors involved in the punishment of pupils should aid teachers in undertaking their disciplinary tasks with a lesser degree of mental anxiety and with more professional understanding (Preface).

The Rovettas asserted that the handbook they had written attempted to present to school personnel a simple clarification of the fundamental laws on corporal punishment. It was hoped, they continued, that all of the teachers who read the handbook would "resolve any problem or confusion which they may have regarding corporal punishment for that particular state in which they may be teaching" (Preface).

These books were written with the intent of assisting educators in eliminating any confusion they might have in terms of what they may or may not do in corporal punishment situations. Although they do not provide information as to the level of educator's knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines, they have inferred that educators have possibly been confused by the recent court controversy relating to corporal punishment in the schools. It must also be noted that these books were written prior to the time that the courts established many additional guidelines for schools and school officials to follow in corporal punishment situations (as evidenced in Baker vs. Owen, 1975). These additional court mandates may, subsequently, have added to the confusion of school officials. In commenting on how Wisconsin law was not

clear on the subject, one school official said: "I think the state board leaves many school board members out on a limb, because the statutes are not really clear on corporal punishment" (La Crosse Tribune, April 23, 1976). If other educators have felt as did this school official in Wisconsin, whose responsibility it was of overseeing enforcement of a student conduct code, plus enforcement of a no corporal punishment policy, then, indeed, confusion about corporal punishment in the schools has clearly existed to some extent.

#### The Effectiveness of In-Service Training Programs

A review of the literature was also made to determine if, and to what extent various in-service training programs were effective in fulfilling the goals and achieving the purposes for which they were developed. In their study of variables that determine the effectiveness of teacher in-service workshops, Peters and Schnare (1976) argued that the purpose of any in-service workshop program was threefold and functioned for: the educational enrichment of teachers, supervisors, curriculum specialists, and administrators; recertification credit; and direct teacher involvement in the decision-making process of the school system. Peters' and Schnare's study included the development of an in-service program for teachers providing direct teacher involvement in program development. A teacher/staff and administrator/supervisor questionnaire

for obtaining evaluative feedback regarding the character and value of in-service training workshops was subsequently devised for the study. Data analysis obtained from the evaluation of the in-service training workshops revealed that in-service training was, indeed, perceived by classroom teachers as an effective vehicle of educational enrichment, with the most crucial characteristic being the organization of subject matter and content.

Richard L. Sagness, et. al. (1976) completed a study which evaluated a comprehensive in-service program for science teacher education at the University of South Dakota. Participating in the study were in-service secondary science teachers enrolled in the program. These participants were pretested and post-tested in: science subject matter competency; understanding of science; and attitudes toward mathematics, science, science teaching, and laboratory work. The resulting data were reported and analyzed. The primary aim of the in-service program was to develop subject matter and mathematics competencies required to teach modern science courses. Sagness, et. al. reported that results of the analysis of the data collected showed that the primary objective had, indeed, been met. As a result of this study, Sagness concluded, the program focus at the University of South Dakota was changed to a much more direct collaborative effort with school districts within its region. This effort, he continued, involved

creating awareness of newer curricular materials, helping districts with adoption decisions, and then assisting with implementation.

In 1972, the District of Columbia Public Schools conducted an evaluative study of the Croft In-Service Reading Program for the purpose of determining the effectiveness of the program. The Croft Program proposed to help teachers at every grade level to acquire the skill and knowledge necessary to be successful in teaching word attack skills.

Data was collected from 148 elementary teachers and 55 junior high school teachers. Analysis of the data led to the conclusion by the District of Columbia Public Schools that the Croft In-Service Reading Program enabled the teacher to acquire the skills necessary to be successful in teaching word attack skills. Over eighty-five per cent of the elementary and junior high school teachers recommended that the Croft training be offered to teachers indicating a need for additional training in word attack skills and that they would like to have additional in-service training in the teaching of specific reading skills. Since the overall purpose of in-service training was the improvement of the professional competence and functioning of the teachers, the District of Columbia Public Schools concluded that the Croft In-Service Program had met the requirements of a successful in-service training program for teachers

who needed to acquire, or improve their skills in teaching word attack skills.

The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (1971) also conducted an independent evaluative study of an in-service Institute Program. The in-service program of the Institute was designed to provide training in the regional geography of the American Southwest for trainers of teachers, administrators, and secondary teachers of Indians and Mexican-Americans. Twenty-five participants were in attendance at the Institute, which was an eight-week in-service program.

Several evaluation instruments were developed for the pre-institute and post-institute administration; these included: the EPDA Geography Questionnaire, the Geography Content Test; and a History of Geography Test. The Southwestern Educational Laboratory maintained that the major strength of the program was perhaps twofold: first the introduction of the participants to the field of geography and, secondly, the sum indication of its effectiveness in providing an understanding of economic, cultural, physical, and special factors of the Southwest. Variations in pretest and post-test evaluations indicated that there was considerable change in attitudes, knowledge and methods on the part of the participants. The Southwestern Education Laboratory attested to the effectiveness of the in-service Institute by saying that:

It is generally believed that the Institute Program was worthwhile and did make a contribution to the potential performance of the participants in their classrooms. Geography as a discipline which has something to offer in the realm of social studies education in its applicability to teaching of the socio-economically deprived groups was acknowledged to be valid (1971).

Further evidence of the effectiveness of in-service programs was shown in a study by Wilson (1972) which evaluated the effectiveness of an in-service training program for day care center teacher aides. This in-service program had been designed to help meet the increased need for training day care center teacher aides in caring for children from six months to three years of age. The program, which consisted of ten sessions, presented an overview to raise the teacher aide's level of knowledge in five major areas pertinent to child care. Each session highlighted aspects of the development of the child and their relevance to the teacher's aides interaction with the child.

It was hypothesized, by Wilson, that there would be no significant difference in child development knowledge as shown in post-test results between the teacher aides in the experimental group who participated in this specially developed in-service training program, and the teacher aides in the control group who received no training. This hypothesis, however, was rejected by Wilson. An analysis of covariance showed that the experimental group did gain significantly in child development knowledge over the control

group between the pretest and the post-test. A significant difference was also found between the post-test performance of the two groups. In fact, both differences were significant beyond the .001 level.

A similar conclusion was made by Breit (1969) in his study examining the relative effectiveness of a teacher education program given at the pre-service level and at the in-service level in the development of certain teacher competencies. The specific teacher competencies studied were knowledge of science content, positive perception of goals and methods of a curriculum innovation, and facility in coping with a learning environment which emphasizes the child's responsibility for his own learning.

Four groups of individuals were included in Breit's study. The pre-service version of the program under study was given to fifty-eight students enrolled in an undergraduate methods course. Fifteen students enrolled in an undergraduate social studies methods course served as a control group for the group above. The in-service version of the program under study was given to twenty-eight teachers enrolled in an elementary school science workshop. Eleven elementary school teachers enrolled in the summer school served as a control group for the group above.

The results of Breit's study indicated that the program was successful in developing knowledge of the processes of science with both pre-service participants and

in-service participants. However, Breit found a greater increase for the in-service participants. Breit concluded that the high correlation between pretest scores and change scores on the Science Process Measure for Teachers indicated that the greater change in knowledge in the in-service participants was related to their lower initial level of knowledge. This may have indicated, he maintained, that the instruction given was more beneficial for those with a lower level of knowledge.

In the review of literature, in-service programs not only demonstrated their effectiveness in increasing the level of knowledge of those participating in the in-service programs, but also showed evidence of changing participants attitudes as well. In Breit's (1969) study, mentioned above, in-service participants showed a change in attitude towards the program itself along with methods of instruction utilized in the program. On the other hand, pre-service participants did not show much change in attitude toward the program itself but did show a change in attitude toward the philosophy of the new curriculum under study in the program. Breit noted that the changes in attitude seemed to indicate that the program itself had a bigger impact on the in-service participants.

Another study, with the purpose of examining the effectiveness of an in-service program in changing teacher attitudes, was made by Romaine Ringis (1972). This

in-service program was designed to provide participants with the ability to produce and use instructional materials which would facilitate individualized instruction.

Attitudes were expected by Ringis to change toward those in support of individualized instructional practices.

A Post-test Only research design was used in Ringis' study to determine change in attitudes among three groups of twenty-six subjects as measured by the Minnesota Teachers Attitude Inventory. As a result of significant data obtained from this measurement, a major conclusion of the study was that in-service programs for cognitive change can effect an attitudinal change as well. A recommendation made by Ringis as a result of the study was to conduct other studies to determine the relationship between differing cognitive content of in-service programs and the resultant attitude changes.

A study by Lee (1967) furnished further credibility to the evidence already indicated that in-service training programs affect the attitudes of participants. Lee's study of the effectiveness of sensitivity training in an in-service teacher-training program compared two basic methods of human relations training with each other and with a control group. Sensitivity training constituted one method of human relations training; the other utilized the conventional classroom instruction techniques of lectures, demonstrations, and discussion.

The subjects in Lee's study were fifty-one public school teachers. Twenty teachers received ten classes in the principles of human relations, twenty-one served as the control group taking all measurements and receiving no human relations training, and ten participated in a sensitivity in-service training program.

Comparing the effectiveness of sensitivity training with the control group, Lee found that teachers in sensitivity training improved their scores on the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) significantly more than did those in the control group. Lee concluded that the teachers in the sensitivity in-service training program increased in self-esteem, or self-value, significantly more than did those in the control group. Comparing the effectiveness of the sensitivity in-service training program with the conventional class he found the sensitivity training superior in reducing student absenteeism with near significant trends favoring sensitivity training in improving MTAI scores and teacher's self-esteem measures.

#### Summary of Review of Literature

Literature was reviewed for the purpose of examining: the historical background of corporal punishment in education, past studies investigating the level of educator's knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment, and past studies determining the effectiveness of school in-service programs.

The historical acceptance of corporal punishment has been well documented by this review. There exists a definite and lengthy history of corporal punishment in connection with education. This history embraces the customs of the people and from the judgements of the court as well. Indeed, the courts have been shown to be of considerable consequence in the historical perspective of school corporal punishment cases. Although the historical acceptance of corporal punishment in education has been noted however, the review indicated that there exists today an ongoing discussion as to the effectiveness of corporal punishment as a means of discipline. This question, and the increased court activity in the area of corporal punishment, may very well have created confusion for school officials in terms of what they may or may not do to corporally punish a student.

The review of literature has been unable to reveal any studies which may have investigated the educator's level of understanding and knowledge of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines. Therefore, the extent to which educators may be confused as to what they may or may not do in terms of corporally punishing a child has not been determined. However, inferences to the effect that educators are confused in this area, to some extent, have been made.

The review of literature disclosed that, in general, in-service training programs have been effective not only in increasing knowledge levels but also in affecting teacher attitudes. No evaluative studies on the effectiveness of corporal punishment in-service presentations, per se, were revealed in the review. All of the studies of the effectiveness of in-service programs which were reviewed in this chapter, unlike the corporal punishment in-service program evaluated in this particular study, covered a time span of more than one day, and in most instances covered a period of several weeks. In fact, the review was unable to reveal any single-presentation in-service training program which had undergone an evaluative study for its effectiveness.

Generally, the literature and studies reviewed would seem to indicate that there is a definite need for further research in the area of determining 1) educator's understanding and knowledge of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines today; and 2) the effectiveness of a corporal punishment in-service training presentation.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURES

#### Subjects

The subjects of this study were forty-eight persons attending the corporal punishment in-service training presentation at La Crosse Central High School in La Crosse, Wisconsin on February 11, 1977. Thirty-three of these persons were randomly selected for the pretest portion of the experiment as each was about to enter the auditorium in which the presentation was to be given. Fifteen persons who had not been administered the pretest were randomly selected as they exited from the auditorium after the in-service presentation, and were administered the post-test portion of the experiment.

Personal data items pertaining to those completing the questionnaire were included on the testing instrument.

That data is summarized in the table below:

Table 1  
Personal Data of Respondents

Age:	Under 25 10	25-30 8	31-40 7	41-50 10	Over 50 13
Years Experience in Education:	0-5 13	6-10 10	11-20 9	Over 20 16	
Educational Grade Level Most Closely Associated With	K-6 20	7-9 7	10-12 17	Post- Secondary 4	
Vocation:	Teacher 41	School Administrator 5		Other 2	

Additional Data:

The number of persons having ever had any formal coursework, in-service training, or direct personal experience in school law was 16; of those 16 people, 10 had prior coursework in college, and 6 had prior experience through in-service training (13 of the 16 persons who had prior experience in school law were administered the pre-test portion of the experiment).

Research Design

The research design applied in this study was the Separate--Sample Pretest--Posttest Design (design number 12) as explained and outlined by Campbell and Stanley (1963, p. 53). This design can be represented graphically in the following manner:

R O (X)

R X O

In this diagram, the letter R denotes the random selection of the two sub-groups, the letter O represents the times of observation, and the letter X represents the experimental

treatment administered to each subgroup with the parenthetic X indicating its irrelevance to the argument (p. 53).

The external sources of invalidity were controlled by this design. However, as Campbell and Stanley point out, there are some uncontrolled internal sources of invalidity such as history, maturation, and mortality (p. 40). It must be noted in this particular study, however, that the effect of these sources of invalidity were severely reduced to the point at which they had virtually no effect whatsoever due to the limited time span (less than two hours) between administrations of the Pre-test and Post-test.

#### Testing Instrument

The testing instrument (questionnaire) was designed to determine the effect of the treatment on the subject's knowledge and understanding of concepts and court established guidelines relating to corporal punishment in the public school. The testing instrument contained 25 questions (15 multiple choice questions and 10 true-false questions) which were developed by this researcher and subsequently reviewed by Dr. Steven Permuth prior to the in-service presentation (see Appendix A for a copy of the complete test instrument). The assumption was established, following the development and review of the instrument, that the testing instrument did, indeed, fulfill the function for which it was designed. It should be noted, at this point, that the testing instrument was developed by this researcher

without prior knowledge of the specific content Dr. Permuth was to present in his program on corporal punishment. In addition, it must be noted that the testing instrument was not received by Dr. Permuth for review purposes until he had developed and completed work on his presentation. This sequence was carried out to prevent the possibility of developing an instrument which would test only the specific content of the presentation as well as to insure that the presentation was not developed to correspond specifically to the content material of the testing instrument. By developing the instrument independent of the presentation on corporal punishment, the ability to validly generalize the effectiveness of the in-service program was enhanced. Both the pretest and post-test portions of the testing instrument were identical except for the color of the paper on which the tests were printed (pretest: white; post-test: green).

#### Administration of the Testing Instrument and Testing Procedures

The corporal punishment in-service program assessment instrument was administered to forty-eight persons attending the in-service presentation at La Crosse Central High School. Administrators of the testing instrument consisted of two teaching interns at Central High School and one student from the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse.

The first step in the experiment was to administer the pretest portion of the instrument. The pretest group was randomly selected by the administrators of the instrument by approaching persons indiscriminately as they were about to enter the auditorium to attend the presentation. These persons were asked to voluntarily complete the questionnaire at tables in the hallway before entering the auditorium. Those persons asked to complete the questionnaire were requested not to discuss the items on the questionnaire with others and were informed that the questionnaire was part of a study to assess the effectiveness of the ensuing in-service presentation.

The administration of the post-test portion of the experiment was the second procedural step. At the conclusion of the presentation those persons in attendance were requested to complete a questionnaire as they exited from the auditorium, if they had not already done so. The same administrators distributed the post-test questionnaire requesting again that the test items not be discussed with others. The collection of the post-test questionnaires was carried out in the same manner as the pretest collection.

Reliability of the Testing Instrument

A computer performed item analysis of the questionnaire was carried out to test for the reliability of the testing instrument (see Appendix B for complete composite

analysis of the testing instrument). The item analysis on the questionnaire provided both a distractor analysis and a discrimination analysis of each test item. The discrimination analysis provided the following information on a composite analysis of the pretest and post-test: there was an average item difficulty of .521, an average item discrimination of .446, and a Kuder--Richardson reliability measure of .7924 by the method using proportions of correct answers. This reliability coefficient indicated that the testing instrument had a high degree of reliability. Even when compared to typically high reliability coefficients of standardized tests such as the Otis Quick--Scoring Intelligence Test (Green, 1970, p. 76), the questionnaire developed for this study was shown to be of comparable reliability.

## CHAPTER IV

### DATA/ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Statistical Procedure

The statistical procedure utilized to provide an analysis of the data collected during this study was a t-test on the test scores from both the pretest and post-test. This procedure was used to determine if the difference in scores was significant between the pretest and post-test groups' knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines.

#### Pretest--Post-test Results

The test scores for the testing instrument were based on a fifteen multiple choice and ten true-false item questionnaire. The possible scores ranged from 0 to 25. The following table lists the frequency of scores of both the pretest and post-test within the specified range of test scores:

Table 2  
 Pretest and Post-Test Scores  
 (Number Correct)

	Pretest	Post-Test
<u>Range of Scores</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Frequency</u>
22-24	0	5
19-21	0	5
16-18	3	5
13-15	3	2
10-12	14	1
7-9	10	0
4-6	3	0

The raw data from Table 2 revealed an apparent gain in the test scores attained by the post-test group over those attained by the pretest group. To test whether or not this difference in scores was significant, a t-test was performed. The following table contains the data used in the test for significance:

Table 3  
 Values Utilized for the Computation of t

	Sample Sizes	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Pretest Group	33	10.2424	2.95836
Post-Test Group	15	17.8667	3.35659

The t value computed was 7.93639 with 46 degrees of freedom. The probability of  $t = 7.93639$  with 46 degrees of freedom was .0. The difference between the test scores of the two groups was significant beyond the .01 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ), that the in-service presentation on corporal punishment was not effective in producing a significant increase in the understanding and knowledge of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those attending, was rejected as untenable. With the  $H_0$  rejected, it was possible to accept the research hypothesis that the in-service presentation, developed and delivered by Dr. Permuth, was effective in producing a significant increase in the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary of the Study

This study was undertaken to assess the effectiveness of a corporal punishment in-service presentation delivered by Dr. Steven Permuth at La Crosse Central High School. The research hypothesis for this study was that the in-service presentation, developed and delivered by Dr. Permuth, was effective in producing a significant increase in the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending the presentation. A questionnaire was developed by the researcher which was designed to test the level of knowledge and understanding of concepts and guidelines associated with corporal punishment in the public school.

The questionnaire was administered to forty-eight educators attending the corporal punishment in-service training presentation. Thirty-three of these educators were randomly selected for the pretest portion of the experiment as each was about to enter the auditorium in which the presentation was to be given. Fifteen educators who had not been administered the pretest were randomly

selected as they exited from the auditorium at the conclusion of the in-service presentation, and were administered the post-test portion of the experiment.

The test scores of both groups were then compared to discern whether or not there was a significant difference between the scores attained by those educators completing the pretest and those educators completing the post-test. An analysis of the statistical data provided by the testing instrument showed a significant difference between the two groups' scores. A t-test on the scores of both groups indicated that the difference between the scores of the pretest and post-test groups was significant beyond the .01 level. The scores revealed that the post-test group (those who had attended the in-service presentation) had an increased level of understanding and knowledge of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines.

#### Conclusions of the Study

The conclusion arrived at through this study was that the null hypotheses should be rejected and that the research hypotheses should be accepted that the in-service training presentation, developed and delivered by Dr. Permuth, was effective in producing a significant increase in the level of knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment concepts and guidelines of those persons attending the

presentation. It is important to note, however, that this experiment dealt with a particular corporal punishment in-service presentation which was delivered by one particular person with a certain level of expertise in the area of school law and corporal punishment. While this study has accepted the hypothesis that this particular presentation was effective in increasing educator's knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment in the schools, it should not be interpreted to mean that subsequent corporal punishment in-service presentations, developed and delivered by others, will bring about similar results.

The corporal punishment in-service training presentation can be a useful tool for the promoting of educator's knowledge and understanding of what they may or may not do when confronted by a corporal punishment situation in the school. More importantly perhaps, the presentation could provide guidelines for teachers and administrators to allow them to better develop preventive measures and additional safeguards to ensure strict adherence to procedural due process for the student. Public school officials have a responsibility not only to protect themselves from liability, but also to protect the student's rights. The in-service training program evaluated in this study is one method by which this responsibility may be fulfilled and confusion about corporal punishment in the schools eliminated.

### Recommendations

Evidence from this study suggests that the level of educators' knowledge and understanding of corporal punishment in the schools may be low. However, there have been no studies to determine how much confusion or misunderstanding exists on the part of educators in the area of corporal punishment. One recommendation, therefore, would be to conduct studies to determine the level of knowledge and understanding educators possess in the area of corporal punishment in the schools at the present time. Because of the conclusions arrived at in this study, an additional recommendation would be to establish and extend subsequent in-service teacher training programs directed at the area of school law and, specifically, the area of corporal punishment in the public schools. With the continuing controversy about corporal punishment, both among educators and in the courts, and with the expanding procedural safeguards being afforded students by the courts today, the public school teacher and administrator must have access to information as to what their rights as school officials are and what their student's rights are in terms of corporal punishment. Cooperation between the college or university and the public secondary and elementary schools is also recommended in order to establish an effective corporal punishment in-service teacher training

presentation for the particular public schools becoming involved in such a program.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ashwill, Max C. "New Corporal Punishment Guidelines Established," DPI Newsletter. December, 1975, pp. 3-4.
- Blackstone, Sir William. Commentaries of the Laws of England. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1765, pp. 440-442.
- Bolmeier, E. C. Legality of Student Disciplinary Practices. Charlottesville: The Mitchie Company, 1976, pp. 1-93.
- Breit, Frank D. A Comparison of the Effectiveness of an In-Service Program and a Pre-Service Program in Developing Certain Teacher Competencies. Unpublished manuscript, 1969.
- Butts, Freeman R. and Cremin, Lawrence A. A History of Education in American Culture. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1953, pp. 65-75.
- Campbell, Donald T. and Stanley, Julian C. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1963.
- District of Columbia Public Schools. An Evaluation of the Croft In-Service Reading Program. Unpublished manuscript, 1972.
- Downs, Robert B. Horace Mann: Champion of Public Schools. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1974, pp. 92-106.
- Educational Digest, "It's Time to Hang Up the Hickory Stick." January, 1973, pp. 34-35.
- Federal Reporter, Vol. 498, Ingraham vs. Wright. 2d 248 (1974/525 F. 2d 909 (1976)).
- Federal Supplement, Vol. 395, Baker vs. Owen. 294 (1975).
- Flygare, Thomas J. "Procedural Due Process Now Applies to Corporal Punishment," Phi Delta Kappan. January, 1976, pp. 345-346.
- Francis, Samuel N. and Hirschberger, Emma Jane. "Corporal Punishment in School: 1973," Educational Leadership. April, 1973, pp. 591-595.

- Green, John A. Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1970, pp. 71-80.
- Hawkins, Vincent J. "The Negativism of Corporal Punishment," The Clearing House. January, 1976, pp. 223-226.
- Henri, Edwin J. Kiss of the Whip. London: Walton Press, 1961, pp. 51-90.
- La Crosse Tribune, "School Discipline Answer Unclear." April 23, 1976.
- Ladd, Edward T. and Walden, John C. Student's Rights and Discipline. Arlington, Virginia, 1976.
- Langer, Marion F. "New Year's Resolution: No More Corporal Punishment," Teacher. January, 1973, pp. 12+.
- Lee, Walter S. A Study of the Effectiveness of Sensitivity Training in an In-Service Teacher Training Program in Human Relations. Unpublished manuscript, 1967.
- Nash, Paul. "Corporal Punishment in an Age of Violence," Educational Theory, XIII. October, 1963, pp. 295-304.
- Pallas, Abraham. "Corporal Punishment: Ancient Practice in Modern Times," The Clearing House. January, 1973, pp. 312-315.
- Patterson, Jerry L. "How Popular Is the Paddle?," Phi Delta Kappan. June, 1974, p. 707.
- Permut, Steven B. "Corporal Punishment: Guidelines for School Principles," Wisconsin Association of Secondary School Administrators Bulletin. Winter, 1976, pp. 11-12.
- Peters, Richard and Schnare, Gordon. Variables that Determine the Effectiveness of Teacher In-Service Workshops. Unpublished manuscript. 1969.
- Ringis, Romaine H. Effectiveness of an In-Service Program in Changing Teacher Attitudes. Unpublished manuscript, 1972.
- Rovetta, Catherine and Leon. Teacher Spanks Johnny. Stockton: The Willow House Publishers, 1968.
- Sagness, Richard L., et al. Comprehensive Program for Science Teachers Education Evaluation Report Number One. Unpublished manuscript, 1976.

- Schumacher, Carolyn T. "Exit Corporal Punishment,"  
Educational Leadership. May, 1974, pp. 688-690.
- Scott, George R. The History of Corporal Punishment.  
London: Luxor Press, 1959, pp. 94-107.
- Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory. Regional  
Geography of the American Southwest for Teachers and  
Trainers of Teachers of Indians and Mexican-Americans:  
Director's Report. Unpublished manuscript, 1971.
- Spinning, James M. "Corporal Punishment? Considerably Less  
Than Seldom," The Teacher and School Discipline.  
Metuchen, New Jersey: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1970.
- Williams, E. I. F. Horace Mann. New York: The MacMillan  
Company, 1937, pp. 245-264.
- Wilson, LaVisa K. A Study of the Effectiveness of a Self-  
Instructional Multi-Media In-Service Training Program  
for Day Care Center Teacher Aides. Unpublished  
manuscript, 1972.
- Zanella, Richard E. "Can Principals Still Discipline?,"  
NASSP Bulletin. February, 1976, pp. 67-70.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

THE TESTING INSTRUMENT

IN-SERVICE PRE AND POST PROGRAM  
ASSESSMENT: CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Feb. 11, 1977

Dear Educator: This is a brief, confidential questionnaire developed for a study by UW-La Crosse, designed to assess the effectiveness of in-service programs in the public schools. We ask you to please read the directions and complete the questionnaire immediately. When finished completing the questionnaire, please return it immediately to the person who distributed it to you. Thank you for your cooperation!

Directions: For each numbered selection, circle the appropriate letter provided on the left hand side of the sheet which best answers the question or selection. Please do not discuss this form or answers with any others at today's conference.

- a b c d e 1. Age: (a) under 25 (b) 25-30  
(c) 31-40 (d) 41-50 (e) over 50
- a b c d e 2. Number of years in education: (a) 0-5  
(b) 6-10 (c) 11-20 (d) over 20
- a b c d e 3. Educational grade level most closely  
associated with: (a) K-6 (b) 7-9  
(c) 10-12 (d) post-secondary
- a b c d e 4. Vocation: (a) teacher (b) school  
administrator (c) other (please  
specify \_\_\_\_\_)
- a b c d e 5. Have you ever had any formal coursework,  
in-service training, or direct personal  
experience in school law? (a) Yes  
(b) No
- a b c d e 6. If yes, where? (a) a high school  
course (b) a college course (c) in-  
service training (d) direct personal  
experience (e) other
- a b c d e 7. The concept of corporal punishment has  
been derived from (a) constitutional  
law (b) statutory law (c) tort law  
(d) common law

- a b c d e 8. The number of states today outlawing corporal punishment is about (a) 5 (b) 10 (c) 15 (d) 25
- a b c d e 9. The currently definitive corporal punishment case in respect to procedural safeguards for students is (a) Nelson v. Heyne (b) Goss v. Lopez (c) Tinker v. Des Moines (d) Baker v. Owen (e) Birch v. Johnson
- a b c d e 10. Procedural safeguards, established by the Court, protecting students from corporal punishment (a) are to be instituted in all cases involving corporal punishment (b) can be neglected if misconduct by the student is so "disruptive that it shocks the conscience" (c) can be neglected when protecting another student (d) none of the above
- a b c d e 11. The Supreme Court has affirmed a lower court decision which provides procedural safeguards for a student from corporal punishment by setting a maximum limit of swats administered to a student to (a) 2 (b) 4 (c) 6 (d) none of the above
- a b c d e 12. In corporal punishment cases, the Court maintains that (a) student's rights do not necessarily supercede those of the school (b) student's rights should supercede those of the school (c) the school's rights to maintain discipline must supercede the student's rights (d) the student's rights only supercede the school's rights in cases of school violation of procedural due process guidelines.
- a b c d e 13. The present case in front of the U. S. Supreme Court in the area of corporal punishment is (a) Ingraham v. Wright (b) Hegrich v. Hohn (c) Robinson v. California (d) Epperson v. Lopez (e) Baker v. Owen

- a b c d e 14. In a relatively recent and significant Supreme Court decision delineating procedural safeguards for students in corporal punishment situations, the Court also ruled that (a) in loco parentis is a moot legal concept today (b) a school official should not be permitted to corporally punish a student whose parent has specifically requested previously that it not be done to his/her child (c) the boundaries of the in loco parentis guidelines had been exceeded (d) in certain situations a school official could be permitted to corporally punish a student whose parent had specifically requested previously that it not be done to his/her child.
- a b c d e 15. A general tendency of court cases in which corporal punishment is an issue is that (a) the higher the case goes in the courts, the more likely the student will win (b) the higher the case goes in the courts, the more likely the student will lose (c) we have no way of assessing the likelihood of winning or losing no matter how high the case goes (d) the higher the case goes in the courts, the more immediate a decision is reached on the case.
- a b c d e 16. In terms of corporal punishment, the NEA's policy is (a) generally for corporal punishment (b) generally against corporal punishment (c) have not publically supported nor rejected corporal punishment as a satisfactory means of discipline (d) to give the controversy more study before taking a stand.
- a b c d e 17. As a result of the "key" case in corporal punishment to date, corporal punishment of students by school officials may never, except in very unusual circumstances, be employed (a) in front of other faculty members (b) when a parent has requested the school not to corporally punish his/her child (c) as a first line of punishment for misbehavior (d) when the student is under the age of 10.

- a b c d e 18. The landmark Supreme Court case establishing due process safeguards for students in corporal punishment situations (a) will have no effect on state statutes already prohibiting corporal punishment (b) will alter all state statutes involving corporal punishment (c) will only affect those states which had no corporal punishment law at the time of the decision (d) none of the above.
- a b c d e 19. The state of Wisconsin has (a) a statutory statement mandating corporal punishment in schools (b) a statutory statement preventing corporal punishment in schools (c) a statutory statement which specifically designates the individual school boards of the state to set up guidelines for corporal punishment in the individual school districts (d) none of the above
- a b c d e 20. In the "key" case in corporal punishment to date, in which a sixth grade student, receiving two swats with a wooden drawer divided by his teacher for throwing kickballs around, the Court found (a) the punishment to be "unreasonable" (b) the student has rights distinct from those of his/her parents (c) a parent's rights supercede the responsibilities of a school (d) the teacher was negligent
- a b c d e 21. A factor taken into consideration by the courts when determining "reasonable punishment" in a corporal punishment case is (a) the age of the student (b) the sex of the student (c) the attitude of the teacher as he/she administered the punishment (d) all of the above (e) none of the above
- a b c d e 22. Courts have never declared the utilization of corporal punishment, per se, to be unconstitutional. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 23. A good definition of the concept of "privilege" is immunity. (a) True (b) False

- a b c d e 24. Court established procedural safeguards for students in corporal punishment situations require that the student have a right to counsel. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 25. Physical contact between a school official and a student is not allowed under most state statutes. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 26. Corporal punishment must be administered in the presence of a second school official. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 27. Unreasonable corporal punishment cannot legally constitute a charge of battery. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 28. Adhering to court established due process guidelines in corporal punishment situations, a student must be told the reasons for the punishment. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 29. The "key" case in corporal punishment to date, alters the well-established principle that the use of excessive force against students constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 30. Court established procedural safeguards for students in corporal punishment situations require that the student be forewarned that certain misbehavior could result in spanking. (a) True (b) False
- a b c d e 31. The possibility that psychological harm to a student in a corporal punishment case could be a factor in determining "reasonableness" of the punishment, has been completely dismissed by the courts. (a) True (b) False

APPENDIX B

COMPOSITE ITEM ANALYSIS OF  
THE TESTING INSTRUMENT

## UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-LA CROSSE

Distractor Analysis  
(Asterisk Indicates Right Answer)

Item Number		Responses					
		None	A	B	C	D	E
1	Total	2	7	15	3	21*	0
	Upper	0	1	1	0	11	0
	Lower	1	1	4	1	6	0
2	Total	1	18*	6	4	19	0
	Upper	0	12	0	0	1	0
	Lower	1	1	1	3	7	0
3	Total	8	2	3	5	27*	3
	Upper	0	1	0	0	12	0
	Lower	5	0	1	1	4	2
4	Total	0	19	6	14*	9	0
	Upper	0	6	3	4	0	0
	Lower	0	4	1	3	5	0
5	Total	1	3	0	2	41*	1
	Upper	0	0	0	0	13	0
	Lower	1	2	0	1	9	0
6	Total	1	11*	4	6	24	2
	Upper	0	5	1	1	6	0
	Lower	1	2	1	2	7	0
7	Total	8	11*	1	10	1	17
	Upper	0	6	0	0	1	6
	Lower	5	0	1	4	0	3
8	Total	7	7	6	8	19*	1
	Upper	0	1	1	0	11	0
	Lower	6	0	2	4	1	0
9	Total	1	10	16*	21	0	0
	Upper	0	0	10	3	0	0
	Lower	1	4	1	7	0	0
10	Total	1	3	16	21*	6	1
	Upper	0	0	6	6	1	0
	Lower	1	1	4	5	2	0

Item Number		Responses					
		None	A	B	C	D	E
11	Total	2	7	14	20*	5	0
	Upper	0	3	1	9	0	0
	Lower	2	3	4	3	1	0
12	Total	3	7	15	13*	9	1
	Upper	0	3	1	7	2	0
	Lower	2	1	4	1	4	1
13	Total	2	2	9	26	9*	0
	Upper	0	0	0	6	7	0
	Lower	2	1	3	7	0	0
14	Total	3	10	17*	5	13	0
	Upper	1	3	8	0	1	0
	Lower	2	3	0	3	5	0
15	Total	2	1	2	13	27*	3
	Upper	0	0	0	1	12	0
	Lower	2	0	0	5	4	2
16	Total	3	34*	9	1	0	1
	Upper	0	12	1	0	0	0
	Lower	3	4	5	0	0	1
17	Total	1	16*	31	0	0	0
	Upper	0	8	5	0	0	0
	Lower	1	4	8	0	0	0
18	Total	1	20	18*	0	0	0
	Upper	0	3	10	0	0	0
	Lower	0	12	1	0	0	0
19	Total	0	9	30*	0	0	0
	Upper	0	0	13	0	0	0
	Lower	0	11	2	0	0	0
20	Total	0	40*	9	0	0	0
	Upper	0	13	0	0	0	0
	Lower	0	9	4	0	0	0
21	Total	1	9	38*	0	0	0
	Upper	0	2	11	0	0	0
	Lower	1	3	9	0	0	0

Item Number		Responses					E
		None	A	B	C	D	
22	Total	1	44*	3	0	0	0
	Upper	0	11	2	0	0	0
	Lower	1	11	1	0	0	0
23	Total	2	27	19*	0	0	0
	Upper	0	5	8	0	0	0
	Lower	2	9	2	0	0	0
24	Total	0	38*	9	0	1	0
	Upper	0	12	1	0	0	0
	Lower	0	8	4	0	1	0
25	Total	0	17	31*	0	0	0
	Upper	0	2	11	0	0	0
	Lower	0	6	7	0	0	0

## DISCRIMINATION ANALYSIS

Item Number	Difficulty Index	Right Upper	Right Lower	Difference Up - Low	Discrimination Analysis
1	.65	11	6	5	.38
2	.50	12	1	11	.85
3	.62	12	4	8	.62
4	.27	4	3	1	.08
5	.85	13	9	4	.31
6	.27	5	2	3	.23
7	.23	6	0	6	.46
8	.46	11	1	10	.77
9	.42	10	1	9	.69
10	.42	6	5	1	.08
11	.46	9	3	6	.46
12	.31	7	1	6	.46
13	.27	7	0	7	.54
14	.31	8	0	8	.62
15	.62	12	4	8	.62
16	.62	12	4	8	.62
17	.46	8	4	4	.31
18	.42	10	1	9	.69
19	.58	13	2	11	.85
20	.85	13	9	4	.31
21	.77	11	9	2	.15
22	.85	11	11	0	.00
23	.38	8	2	6	.46
24	.77	12	8	4	.31
25	.69	11	7	4	.31
Average Item Difficulty	.521		Average Item Discrimination		.446

## TEST STATISTICAL DATA

	Total Group	Upper Group	Lower Group
Number of Students	48	13	13
Mean Score	12.3542	18.6154	7.4615
Standard Deviation	4.6149	2.2560	1.3914

Note: Test Scores may not have normal distribution.

Mean plus 1.5 S.D. equals 19.2766

Mean plus .5 S.D. equals 14.6617

Mean minus .5 S.D. equals 10.0467

Mean minus 1.5 S. D. equals 5.4318

Kuder-Richardson measure of reliability equals .7360 by the method using the mean.

Kuder-Richardson measure of reliability equals .7924 by the method using proportions of correct answers.