

Corporal Punishment and Alternative Teaching Methods

MV Foundation

February 2011

Written by: Abby Mintz, M.Ed, NCC, MVF Intern and LIFE Fellow

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations..... 3

Introduction..... 4

Context and Relevance..... 4

Government Involvement: Legislation..... 5

NGO Involvement: Grassroots Efforts..... 7

Alternative Teaching Methods..... 8

Recommendations..... 12

Conclusion..... 14

Acknowledgements..... 15

References..... 16

List of Abbreviations

AITFCR: All India Teachers Forum for Child Rights

AP: Andhra Pradesh

CP: Corporal punishment

CRC: Child Rights Cell

MVF: M. Venkatarangaiya Foundation

NGO: Non-governmental organization

SCERT: State Council for Educational Research and Training

SSA: Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan

UN: United Nations

UNCRC: United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child

Introduction

Despite the known detrimental effects of corporal punishment (CP), it pertains to be a widely-practiced teaching method throughout India, including within AP. Legislature recently passed by the Central government of India reiterates CP as an illegal and harmful practice yet its deep-rooted nature as a rote, habitual, and cultural practice poses challenges to its eradication. However, there is a visible presence of teachers in Indian schools who do not practice CP, and it is their alternative teaching methods that are imperative to highlight in order to educate CP-practicing teachers of the possibility and necessity to employ these other developmentally-nurturing methods. This paper will report on the prevalence of CP, discuss government and NGO involvement in addressing the issue, highlight alternative teaching methods, and conclude with recommendations for the government and as well as for NGOs.

Context and Relevance

Corporal punishment (CP) is an issue that has received attention and been extensively researched over the past several decades. As such, there are a number of definitions of CP but for the sake of clarity the all-encompassing definition for this paper will be taken from the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), which defines CP as:

Any punishment in which physical force is used and intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort, however light. Most involves hitting (“smacking,” “slapping,” “spanking”) children, with the hand or with an implement – a whip, stick, belt, shoe, wooden spoon, etc. But it can also involve, for example, kicking, shaking or throwing children, scratching, pinching, biting, pulling hair or boxing ears, forcing children to stay in uncomfortable positions, burning, scalding or forced ingestion (for example, washing children’s mouths out with soap or forcing them to swallow hot spices). In the view of the Committee, corporal punishment is invariably degrading. In addition, there are other non-physical forms of punishment that are also cruel and degrading and thus incompatible with the Convention. These include, for example, punishment with belittles, humiliates, denigrates, scapegoats, threatens, scares or ridicules the child.

In 2007, a comprehensive study on child abuse was conducted by the Ministry of Women and Child Development covering 13 Indian states. The sample size consisted of 12,447 children ages 5-18, 2,324 young adults ages 18-24, and 2,449 individuals identified as stakeholders, which consisted of government workers, community members, and social sector workers. This thorough research yielded results indicating an alarmingly high prevalence of corporal punishment being practiced in schools, homes, institutions, and on the streets. An overwhelming 69% of children 5-18 years-old reported physical abuse, including CP, in at least one environment and 72% of children 5-12 year-old reported the same. The most commonly reported forms of CP were slapping, kicking, beating with a stick, and being pushed or shaken, respectively. For 15% of the reported cases, the individual indicated serious physical injury, swelling, or bleeding (Kacker, Varadan, & Kumar, 2007).

Additionally, research conducted in 2006 in urban schools in Andhra Pradesh indicated 59% of children (ages 5-18) claimed they had been beaten on the hands with a

stick and 71% of students claimed to have witnessed that kind of teaching practice. Even worse, 45% of students said they witnessed CP which caused swelling, 22% saw it cause bleeding, and 13% saw CP which necessitated a later visit to the doctor (Devi Prasad, 2006).

Undoubtedly, this is a significant problem facing children in Indian schools, and, also worth mentioning is the context in which this behavior highlights problems facing teachers. Research conducted by Berkowitz (1993), highlights that adults who were hit as children are more likely to be depressed or violent themselves. This is not alarming given that it is common for today's generation of teachers to have experienced CP when they themselves were students, but it is worth noting the possibility and apparent likelihood that these teachers may also be struggling with depression. As will be discussed later in this document, it is imperative that the well-being of our teachers be addressed.

Consequences of CP

The purpose of this document is not to highlight the practice of corporal punishment and its impacts because there is already a substantial amount of literature available regarding that. However, to present all angles of the issue it is necessary to understand that there is a substantial amount of research concluding that corporal punishment has negative impacts on cognitive, physical, social, and psychological development. Furthermore, it is a common misconception amongst CP-practicing teachers that by punishing misbehavior they are teaching the child to fear misbehavior and thus act accordingly. On the contrary, research shows that the practice of CP actually does not produce long-lasting effects on behavior change. Additionally, the practice of CP models and promotes violent behavior and contributes to the cycle of child abuse (NASP, 2006).

Government Involvement: Legislation

The most appropriate and productive way for the government to get involved has naturally been through the creation of legislature to protect child rights. As such, the Constitution of India, national legislature, and the UNCRC provide laws, to which the government of India subscribes, prohibiting the practice of corporal punishment. A review of that legislature is documented below:

The Constitution of India

- Article 21 declares the 'right to life' of Indian persons, which is interpreted to include: A life of dignity; a life free from arbitrary and despotic control, torture, and terror; and protection from cruelty, physical or mental violence, injury or abuse, and exploitation.
- Likewise, Article 39, Section (e) protects the child by stating "that the health and strength of workers, men and women, and the tender age of children are not abused." The following section, Section (f), further states that "children are given the opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner and in conditions of freedom and dignity."

National Legislature

- The Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009) is the most recently passed legislature protecting children from CP practices in educational institutions. It states that “no child shall be subjected to physical punishment or mental harassment.” Additionally, the government holds accountable the educators who fail to ensure the protection of these child rights by indicating that a person who commits CP will be “liable to disciplinary action under the service rules applicable to such person.”
- The Juvenile Justice Rules (2007) communicates ‘fundamental principles’ for caring for and protecting children and Chapter 2 section (a) specifically states children are entitled to respect of dignity which “includes not being humiliated, personal identity, boundaries and space being respected, not being labeled and stigmatized, being offered information and choices and not being blamed for their acts.” Furthermore, Chapter 4 addresses the Principle of Safety which speaks to a child’s right to be free from harm, abuse, neglect, exploitation, and maltreatment.
- The Juvenile Justice Act (2006) addresses children who are in juvenile homes or are otherwise somehow in conflict with the law. Section 23 holds authorities responsible for juvenile delinquents to protect the child from harm and identifies that failure to do so is punishable with imprisonment.
- The National Plan of Action for Children (2005) aims “to protect all children against neglect, maltreatment, injury, trafficking, sexual and physical abuse of all kinds, pornography, corporal punishment, torture, exploitation, violence, and degrading treatment.”
- The National Charter for Children (2003) is based on the guiding framework of the Constitution and 1974 National Policy, and includes ‘neglect’ and ‘degrading treatment’ in its list of conditions from which children are to be protected.
- The National Policy on Education (1986) addresses a ‘Child-Centered Approach’ to learning and explicitly states that CP should be excluded from the educational systems.

United Nations Convention on Rights of the Child (1989)

India signed on to commit to the UNCRC in 1992 and thus has since been responsible for upholding the child rights as outlined below:

- Article 2 addresses the need for making the child’s best interest a primary consideration in any public or private institution with which children are being dealt.
- Article 19 addresses the responsibility of all States parties to take appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect child rights, which include freedom from all forms of physical or mental abuse.
- Article 28 protects the child’s human dignity within administration of school discipline.
- Article 37 states “No child shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Neither capital punishment nor life imprisonment without possibility of release shall be imposed for offences committed by persons below eighteen years of age.”

- Article 40 protects children accused of violating penal law from CP or any form of treatment that hinders their development or defies their dignity and worth.
- Article 42 holds State parties responsible for spreading awareness of issues pertaining to the protection of child rights through all appropriate means to adults and children alike.

Current Program

As of November 14, 2010, the Child Rights Cell (CRC) of Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) has been operating a toll-free hotline where anyone located in Andhra Pradesh can call and report witnessed cases of CP or other violations of child rights. The objectives of the program are three-fold: First, to facilitate adequate response to all children whose rights have been violated, secondly, to improve the child rights and protection systems, and third to increase the recognition of children's voices.

From each phone call that comes through an incidence report is written up that includes information about the caller as well as the incidence that's being reported. In December 2010, which was the first full month of operation of the program, ¼ of all complaint calls that came through were reports specifically identifying cases of corporal punishment in schools.

Since the program began in mid-November there have been increasing numbers of calls each month indicating increased public awareness of the program and thus reported cases of violations of child rights. The individuals responsible for operating the phone line stated that they believe the program has been receiving positive feedback from the community as evidenced by not only the increased amount of calls but also by the visible media publicity. They also reported that local education departments have been taking rapid action to spread awareness of the program and to respond quickly to complaint calls that come through. They identified that they also believe the program has been slow to develop but are not concerned because the nature of the program simply requires more time to spread.

NGO Involvement: Grassroots Efforts

MVF/AITFCR Partnership

While government involvement addresses CP from a top-down approach with its efforts on legislature, MVF in conjunction with All India Teachers Forum for Child Rights (AITFCR), which is a registered partner group of MVF and an association of government teachers working for the protection of child rights, work together to address CP and spread awareness of the issue.

Together, these organizations have combined resources to disseminate information and raise awareness on the issue of CP. They have done so via seminars at mandal, district, state, and national levels, creation and dissemination of informational pamphlets, meetings with school administrators from government and private schools, and by making themselves available to the community. At an interventional level, both AITFCR and MVF advocate for children within their schools and communities when incidents of CP have occurred, and, in cases where incidents persist despite their initial involvement, they advocate for the children on legal levels with the government.

MVF Teaching Model

The MVF teaching model has proven to be tremendously successful and is necessary to examine at a more in-depth level in order to analyze the components that facilitate such success. In particular, the MVF teaching model emphasizes relationships and focuses on fostering a sense of community amongst and between students and teacher alike. For example, when a child first enters an MVF bridge camp, he or she transitions into the camp through a semi-formal adjustment phase. During this time, which varies in length depending upon the child's individual needs, the sole goal is to build rapport and nurturing relationships with the child. Teachers also intentionally work to not only facilitate those relationships between themselves and the children but also between the children themselves. Once, and only once, those relationships have been established do they start to introduce formal education to the child. Ultimately, they are creating an environment where the child had organically come to value education, health, and general respect for self and others.

Additionally, it was observed and noted in interviews with MVF teachers and volunteers that these teachers experience a high degree of job satisfaction. This is imperative to note because low job satisfaction can only help to promote the practice of CP; thus, if we can identify ways to better support our teachers we are more likely to reduce the prevalence of CP. MVF teachers also demonstrated tremendous patience, dedication to their work, and belief in children's potential and efficacy.

Alternative Teaching Methods

There is substantial evidence to support the abolishment of the practice of CP, and, further, there is evidence to support other teaching methods as being more effective for achieving the teacher's desired goal. Over the course of 3 months, approximately 50 teachers from 10 government schools in Hyderabad and surrounding districts were interviewed on their teaching methods and observed on their teaching styles in order to amplify alternative and developmentally-appropriate teaching methods being practiced. If the goal is to eliminate the practice of CP, then it is necessary to equip teachers who currently practice it with alternative teaching methods that are practical and feasible to adopt in order to achieve their same teaching goals.

Through conducting interviews with these teachers, 4 key differences regarding teaching styles and methods became apparent between teachers who do not practice CP and those who do. First, those who do not practice CP had pronounced empathic and compassionate understandings of their students' home environments. Secondly, those who do not practice CP also had clearer working knowledge of effective tactics for reinforcing good behaviors and punishing bad behaviors. Third, teachers who do not practice CP had closer interpersonal relationships with their students. Lastly, teachers who did not practice CP demonstrated a clearer understanding of child development and learning styles.

Empathy and Compassion

It was discovered that non-CP-practicing teachers had a high degree and empathy and understanding of their students' behaviors as evidenced by their responses to questions about specific incidents that may theoretically take place in the classroom. For

example, teachers were asked how they would handle a situation if a child showed up to school without having completed his or her homework. A common response from CP-practicing teachers was that they would discipline the child by having him stand for extensive periods of time or through public humiliation. However, teachers who do not practice CP frequently responded by first explaining the difficult home environment many of these students come from and thus their understanding as to why the child was unprepared. They explained that oftentimes children come from home environments that are abusive, drug or alcohol infested, and with parents who are unsupportive of their education. In these cases the teacher would, without question, provide the student with class time and materials necessary to complete the homework assignment.

Another question asked of the teachers interviewed was what they would do in cases where a child showed up to school without appropriate physical presentation (i.e. uncombed or oiled hair, ripped shirt, unclipped nails). CP-practicing teachers were more likely to punish the child in the classroom by humiliating them whereas non-CP practicing teachers were more likely to provide the child with the necessary tools to groom him or herself properly for school. In several cases these teachers explained that they understood many of the students' parents left for work in the early hours of the morning and were unable to assist their children in preparing for school by dressing them, making them breakfast, or preparing them in any other capacity.

A third question asked of the teachers with a theoretical situation was what they would do in cases where the child is absent from school for extended periods of time. Responses from CP-practicing teachers varied and were inconsistent although they frequently included punishing the child, ignoring the absences, and maintaining the same academic expectations of the child to his peers. On the other hand, non-CP-practicing teachers often responded indicating their understanding of students' home environments and the lack of familial facilitation of school attendance. These teachers explained turbulent home environments, the impact of migrant work on children, and described the school setting as an asylum for children.

In addition to possessing compassion and empathy toward their students, these teachers model it in the classroom. Teachers were asked how they would address students who misbehave in the classroom by engaging in behaviors that disrupt the learning of other students. A method mentioned by several non-CP practicing teachers was to have the students engage in activities that required perspective-taking and facilitate the development of empathy. Misbehaving students were asked to either respond to a series of questions in the classroom related to how they might feel if someone treated them the way they were treating others. Another method was to have students write a report on their behavior and perceived impact of it on others. In some cases the students were required to share the report with their classmates, which the teachers believed raised their understanding of the consequences of their behavior and personal sense of responsibility to their teacher and classmates.

Effective Tactics for Rewarding and Punishing Behaviors

Non-CP-practicing teachers demonstrated working knowledge of the most basic principle of behavioral psychology, which is the imperative nature of employing rewards to shape behavior in addition to punishments. Literature on CP often addresses the issue of the widely held belief that discipline is synonymous with punishment. However, they

are two separate concepts entirely where discipline deals with the learning and practice of appropriate behaviors while punishment deals specifically with responding to stimuli in order to decrease occurrence of undesired behaviors. Most CP-practicing teachers tend to get the two concepts confused, and place unequal and greater emphasis on punishments over rewards.

Non-CP-practicing teachers demonstrated clear understanding of the difference between the two as evidenced by particular teaching styles that were observed and methods that were revealed during their interviews. During classroom observations, it was noted that non-CP-practicing teachers frequently responded to students' correct answers by saying "good," smiling, and instructing the student's classmates to applaud one another for correct responses. In many cases the same was done not only for correct answers but also for thoughtful efforts, which one teacher explicitly stated was an intentional teaching method employed in order to encourage making mistakes. Similarly, these teachers also punished undesirable behaviors by paying no attention to them, for example, not calling on children or making eye contact with them when they spoke out of turn or over another child. Rather they rewarded those who acted in a more desirable manner by raising their hand or speaking in turn.

Additionally, non-CP-practicing teachers' responses to their students were immediate, consistent, and provided specific feedback. For example, the teacher would say "good, xyz was the correct answer," or "I like how you raised your hand and waited to be called on before speaking." In opposite cases where a child misbehaved the teacher still responded consistently and immediately with specific feedback regarding the misbehavior, and provided the child with a replacement behavior as well. For example, instead of just saying "stop" or "don't do that" the teacher would say, "please speak only when you're called upon," "please sit down until I give you permission to stand," and "please keep your hands on your lap instead of pushing your friend."

Another imperative concept of behavioral psychology over which non-CP practicing teachers demonstrated proficiency was response to children's behaviors at intermittent intervals. This is a necessary technique in the process of shaping behavior when working on generalizing and maintaining behaviors. A specific example is when non-CP-practicing teachers would randomly select children to answer questions. This method encouraged students to possess a greater sense of responsibility over their own learning because they were motivated by the consequences of being called upon. Either they would answer correctly and be rewarded by the teacher or they would be incorrect and then possibly feel a sense of embarrassment for lacking the right answer.

Overall, non-CP-practicing teachers understand the most effective ways of shaping behavior involve rewards as well as punishments, that desirable behavior is best reinforced through consistent, immediate, and specific feedback. Finally, these teachers understand that in order to teach maintenance of behaviors and generalize them other contexts a schedule of intermittent responses is necessary.

Interpersonal Relationships with Students

The relationship between teachers and students is the most critical determinant for success in the classroom (Noam & Fiore, 2004). In cases where positive teacher-student relationships are fostered not only are students' sense of self and psychological well-being likely to be raised but teachers are also more productive because students respond

best to teachers who make them feel “cared about” (Pianta, 1999). Furthermore, research shows that when positive teacher-student relationships are lacking there is greater likely for student dissatisfaction with schools and teachers as well as higher rates of teacher burnout (Poster & Neugebauer, 1999). Findings from this study demonstrate that through modeling desired behavior, intentional non-verbal communication, and by sharing personal stories and information, non-CP-practicing teachers facilitate nurturing and growth-fostering relationships with their students.

It was observed in the classrooms of non-CP-practicing teachers that they exhibited respectful characteristics in their interactions with students and other personnel in the school. For example, these teachers used the terms “please” and “thank you” and spoke in gentle and soft tones, which could communicate warmth, care, and respect for the individual with whom she is speaking. These teachers were also found in clothing appropriate for the environment, they were well-kempt, made eye contact with people when they spoke to them, they would smile and laugh, and they would stand with their hands at their sides or behind their back.

In cases where students were called to the front of the classroom to rehearse or respond to part of the lesson, non-CP-practicing teachers were more likely to stand next to the child which is demonstrative of a partnership and non-threatening relationship with the child.

During the teacher interviews it was also revealed that these teachers occasionally use their personal stories and experiences as a tool for building rapport and positive relationships with their students and role modeling desirable behavior. Teachers often had difficulties reflecting on particular tactics employed in order to foster these relationships, which has implications for how teacher training programs might help future teachers develop the competencies necessary to facilitate these nurturing bonds. These will be discussed further in the recommendations section.

Child Development and Learning Styles

Non-CP-practicing teachers demonstrated the strongest working knowledge of various learning styles and child development on all bases: mental, social, emotional, and physical. These teachers were most likely to manage and organize their classrooms in such ways that they could meet the individual needs of each child in the classroom. This is likely one of the greatest challenges facing CP-practicing teachers since many of them in government schools struggle with disproportionate teacher: pupil ratios.

Non-CP-practicing teachers employed teaching methods that cater to visual, auditory, and kinesthetic learners, while teachers who practice CP were observed to demonstrate more rote and homogenous teaching methods that catered primarily to auditory learners. In cases where a child was disruptive in the classroom, non-CP-practicing teachers were observed to distract the child by providing him with a creative project such as coloring or drawing diagrams relevant to the lesson being taught. In other circumstances the child was called to the blackboard to complete the assignment there. In cases where enough students were being disruptive the teacher would send the children outdoors to play games and release energy. In each of these circumstances the teacher employed teaching methods that involved tactile activity, which is good for kinesthetic learners, as well as visual and auditory instruction through creative means. Additionally,

the method of taking a break to allow children time for play and games outside meets developmentally appropriate goals for social interaction and physical health.

One particular teaching method that appeared to yield highly productive responses was by placing a disruptive child in a leadership role to decrease disruptive behavior. For example, a child who was talking too much would become responsible for maintaining silence in class. In any way that a teacher was able to delegate her responsibilities to the students she would do so with disruptive students. This helped tend to their developmental needs on an emotional level because this kind of activity fostered perspective-taking, awareness of consequences to one's own behavior, and it could teach empathy as well. Socially, this activity can also potentially foster a cohesive classroom experience and the opportunity for the student to take greater responsibility over his own learning.

At one school, non-CP-practicing teachers engaged the students in an activity using media and current events as a window for opening up discussion about ethics. They would look at news clippings, stories—fiction and non-fiction alike, as well as other forms of pop culture to open facilitate discussion and critical thinking about appropriate behavior, compassion, empathy, and relationships. The dialogue would also intentionally include a reflective element where students were asked to examine their own behaviors and responsibilities in response to the current event or media clipping being discussed. This activity is a formal way of addressing their social and emotional developmental tasks by fostering opportunity to take different perspective and develop greater capacities for empathy and compassion. It also meets their developmental needs mentally by fostering critical thinking and increasing awareness of current events.

These teachers who demonstrate working knowledge of their students various learning styles developmental needs also effectively employed peer pressure to help them achieve their teaching goals. In fact, social learning theory posits that behavior can be learned by observing others' behaviors and the consequences that they yield. CP-practicing teachers acknowledge that when they intentionally punish a child with the hopes that those who witness the punishment will learn to fear acting in certain ways, as well. In contrast, teachers who do not practice CP focus on rewarding good behavior with the hopes that other students will witness the rewards and be encouraged to behave well, too.

Another tactic teachers use to understand how to apply peer pressure in the classroom is by assigning group work in the classroom and intentionally placing high-achieving and well-behaved students with those peers who are struggling. Group work can help teachers manage the class, particularly in rooms where the teacher-pupil ratio is disproportionate, and by providing students with specific tasks and responsibilities it raises their levels of self-efficacy and fosters social development by creating teams that encourage fulfilling personal responsibilities.

Recommendations

Government Recommendations

In order to meet the goals of decreasing the prevalence rates of CP and raising awareness of its impact, it is recommended that the government take the following action:

conduct in-service trainings, avail relevant statistics to the general public, reward excellent teachers and schools, and revise teacher training curriculum.

In-service trainings are currently offered to teachers once every couple months at schools throughout AP. Teachers at schools in rural and urban areas both report attending these trainings and claim to learn from them and value the education they provide. However, currently the government does not have any in-service trainings regarding the impact of CP and how teachers can address it in their classrooms and schools. SCERT, the governmental body responsible for state-wide curriculum development, claims to be working on this kind of training and plans to start implementing it in March of 2010. It may be worthwhile for an NGO to follow-up after that time and oversee its content and proper implementation.

The SSA CRC hotline program has been collecting data on a daily basis and each month since the program began it has been expanding the amount and content of data being collected. While protecting the confidentiality of the callers and child victims, it is recommended that the SSA release statistics from their hotline program in order to a) spread awareness of the program and hopefully increase the number of cases being reported, and b) educate the general public on the seriousness and prevalence of the issue.

Thirdly, similar to the way non-CP practicing teachers reward their students to increase desirable behavior, it is recommended that the government create ways to reward schools and teachers who demonstrate excellence. A successful example of this is the way the Japanese government rewards schools with gender equality by providing them with a flag to hang in front of their schools. It is considered a high honor to receive the flag and it reinforces that school and other neighboring schools to work towards gender equality as well. Likewise, schools that have a decreasing number of CP incidence reports, schools participating in advocacy against CP, and teachers attending workshops on CP are several examples of how the government might start to reward teachers and schools.

Finally, it is recommended that the government address issues considered causes and effects of CP in their teacher training program. At the present time, all government teachers in AP undergo the same training with a unified curriculum. Missing from that curriculum are modules on educational psychology, child psychology, and classroom management. Resultantly, teachers are not being educated on proper and effective methods for teaching desirable behaviors or understanding the purposes of misbehaviors. Additionally, these teacher training programs could benefit from developing the teacher competencies to include components reflecting self-care and self-awareness. This will assist teachers from reaching burnout points, to better manage their stress, and to be intentional about their teaching methods.

NGO Recommendations

It is recommended that NGOs working to spread awareness and decrease the incidence of CP take the following action: utilize the MVF teaching model, develop and implement teacher training models, and finally that they consider most effective communication methods for each of the modes they use to communicate with the public.

First, the MVF teaching model has had such high rates of success and it seems as though it would be worthwhile for MVF, or perhaps for another governmental or non-governmental body, to study their model and consider ways to replicate it. Perhaps this

can be an assignment for future interns to analyze the teaching model and develop a training from it that can be utilized for external communities.

Secondly, similar to the governmental recommendation, it is suggested that MVF create and implement teacher trainings not only on the consequences of CP but also on alternative teaching methods. Many teachers who practice CP are conscious of their choice to practice it and if educated, provided an opportunity to change, and thus empowered, perhaps would be more willing to adopt alternative teaching methods. The goal needs to be to provide them other ways to meet their teaching goals rather than just strip them of the only tool they have to reach them.

Finally, it is necessary for NGOs to consider and be intentional about their communication methods when advocating against corporal punishment. If trainings are developed, seminars are conducted, pamphlets are created and handed out, yet the language used causes CP-practicing teachers to become defensive then the implementation is not effective. Specifically, it is important to understand the mindset of CP-practicing teachers so as to communicate to them the possibility of reaching their teaching goals via alternative teaching methods.

Conclusion

While the practice of CP pertains to negatively impact the lives of many students in Indian and specifically in AP schools, there are also a prominent degree of teachers employing alternative teaching methods that merit spotlight. It is necessary to emphasize the profiles of these teachers and their teaching practices so that CP-practicing teachers can be educated on alternative modes of instruction that will meet their teaching goals and are thus feasible for adaptation.

The government has already played an active role in addressing the issue of CP by creating legislation and the SSA CRC hotline program. However, to have an even greater impact, it is recommended that the government create and implement in-service trainings for teachers on CP and alternative teaching methods, that they make statistics from the hotline program available to the general public, and that they enhance the curriculum for teacher training programs to include courses relevant to causes and effects of CP and student misbehavior in the classroom.

Likewise, MVF and AITFCR have already created a partnership and together taken action to spread awareness of CP and work towards the decrease of its practice. MVF teachers also operate under a highly effective model, which is recommended to be replicated in other educational institutions. Additionally, recommendations were made for NGOs to develop teacher training programs and then be intentional about their implementation so as to ensure the messages in the trainings are being communicated most effectively.

While CP remains to be a prevalent issue, and one that is culturally engrained, throughout Indian society, there is a strong and visible movement away from its practice and toward developmentally-appropriate teaching methods. Hopefully, these recommendations will be taken into consideration and implemented so as to further the process.

Acknowledgments

The research for this project was made possible by the staff of MVF who helped to coordinate and supervise each site visit. Specifically Arvind Kumar, Venkat Reddy, Dhananjay, Swamy, Prakash, and Nareen who served as advisors and mentors. MVF volunteers also dedicated their time to facilitate visits and particularly Pavan Kumar who helped with English translations. The site visits for this research were conducted at the following villages and schools: Cheelapur Primary School, Dhurnal Primary School, AITFCR, GGPS Camp No. 1 Amberpet, Kurnool MVF School, Lingampally, Ramanaguda, Dharur, Rangareddy, Aloor, Ongole, Markapuram. Additionally, Madhusudan Vedula spent significant time sharing his knowledge as well as his co-workers at SSA and SCERT.

References

- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its causes, consequences, and control*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Commissioner for Human Rights. (2008). *Children and corporal punishment: The right not to be hit, also a child's right*. Last retrieved 10 January, 2011 online at https://wcd.coe.int/wcd/ViewDoc.jsp?id=1237635&Site=CM%23P94_4010
- Devi Prasad, B. (2006). *Spare the rod and save the child: A Study of the corporal punishment in urban schools of Andhra Pradesh*. Child Rights Advocacy Foundation-Vijayawada.
- Kacker, L., Varadan, S. & Kumar, P. (2007). *Study on child abuse: India 2007*. New Delhi: Ministry of Women and Child Development.
- National Association of School Psychologists. [NASP, (2006)]. NASP position statement – corporal punishment. Last retrieved on 3 February, 2011 online at http://www.nasponline.org/about_nasp/pospaper_corppunish.aspx
- Noam, G. & Fiore, N. (2004). *Relationships across multiple settings: An overview*. New Directions for Youth Development, 2004. p. 9-16. doi: 10.1002/yd.87
- Pianta, R. (1999). *Enhancing relationships between children and teachers*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Poster, M. & Neugebauer, R. (1999). Innovative ideas from the field. In M. L. Culkin (Ed.), *Managing quality in young children's programs: The leader's role*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.