



Impact of Corporal Punishment on School Children: A Research Study

May, 2006



Carried out by:
Saath Charitable Trust

Supported by:
Plan International (India) New Delhi



Impact of Corporal Punishment on School Children: A Research Study

Final Report

Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

Chapter One Introduction

Chapter Two Research Tools Used

Chapter Three Desk Review

Chapter Four Research Tools: Coverage and Application

Chapter Five Analytical Findings

Chapter Six Recommendations

Annexes

One Government's views on corporal punishment

Two Case Studies

Three Study Processes

Four Study Tools

Five The Post-Application Distribution of Research Tools

Six The Research Team

Acknowledgements

- As it is with all studies, many persons have indirectly and directly contributed to the present one and the research team gratefully acknowledges their support. Among these, there are two groups of people without whose help the study would not have progressed at all. These were:
 - All the school children, teachers, community members, and the government officials the research team interacted with during the course of the study; and,
 - All the village level volunteers of the respective PUs in the study states who accompanied us to the field as per *our* convenience.
- While it will be difficult to make a list that would name them all, the research team wishes to acknowledge the support and help rendered by the following persons, in particular:
 - At Plan India Country Office, New Delhi - Ms. Randeep Kaur
 - At Plan India South India Office, Hyderabad - Ms. Shruti Joshi
Mr. Rajan Mohanty
 - At the respective PU offices in the study states,
 - PU / Maharajganj - Mr. Bibhas Chatterjee
Mr. Ajay Pathak
 - PU / Muzaffarpur - Mr. M K Upadhyay
Mr. Abhishek Singh
 - PU / Lunkaransar - Mr. Shaliesh Kumar
Mr. Mukhram
 - PU / Vijaywada - Mr. Hari Subramanyam
Mr. D Jedidiah

Executive Summary

Introduction

• The Present Study

- The present study* looks at the incidence and the extent of corporal punishment on school children and the impact it inflicts on them. The study was carried out in four states of India: Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh.
- Spanning over four districts, one each in the aforementioned states, and using participatory research tools and methods, the study covers 41 schools and the corresponding large array of students, teachers, parents, community members, concerned government officials, and others.
- The research team could also convince members of a children's forum in Andhra Pradesh to enact their ideas and views on corporal punishment in the form of a skit. Their performance was video-graphed and is presented here as one of the findings.
- It was indeed a privilege for the research team to have been able to interact with so many children (see below). Everywhere the team went, children just flocked to meet and converse. The team was touched by their warmth and trust. Despite the delicate topic the team carried and despite the probing (that followed) into their personal lives and thoughts, not a child queried or doubted a couple of strangers' capabilities to do justice to such a serious issue.
- The research team interacted with 1591 children across the four survey states, comprising mainly of school going children (both girls and boys) and the members of various children organizations PLAN's partner NGOs have facilitated.

Main Findings

• Corporal Punishment: The Incidence

- Corporal Punishment (CP) is an accepted way of life in schools and at homes. In all the forty-one (41) schools and surrounding communities the team visited, corporal punishment stood out as a common theme. The children also mentioned that the situation was no different at home.
- Almost all teachers and parents, covered under the study, had no hesitation in accepting that they punish children physically. Many argued the children can not be disciplined without punishment.

* The study was sponsored by Plan International' (India), New Delhi. The research team acknowledges the support extended by its partner NGOs during the survey in the respective states.

As one of the parents met in Rajasthan put it,” Children invite punishment by their behavior but whether they should be punished moderately or severely depends on the stamina the children possess.

- The research team saw a stick in the classroom or in the hands of the teachers everywhere it went. In more than twenty (20) schools the team visited, the students actually showed or pointed out the stick with which they are beaten.

- **Corporal Punishment : Types and Forms**

- The most common forms of punishments are hitting with hands & stick, pulling hair and ears, and asking the children to stand – for long periods - in various positions. Threatening to be physically violent is also used as a punishment to create fear among the children.
- The team also intermittently came across more severe forms of corporal punishment afflicted on children; such as: Being kicked severely, making them starve (at home), tying them (with rope) to chairs / poles followed by beatings, assigning physically strenuous work both at home and outside (usually in the fields) etc.
- A child often faces a series of punishment for the same /single “offence”. The team came across a number of cases where the sequence of punishments started with the teacher. The same child is then punished by the head teacher for having “invited” the punishment. Yet another round of punishment – generally, beating – awaits the same child at home if the parents come to know that s/he had been punished in the school.

- **Corporal Punishment: In Schools**

- At schools, the incidence of corporal punishment was found to be quite common and alarmingly frequent. In all the schools the team visited there would be at least five (05) beatings per class per day, not counting other moderate forms of punishment. Inflicting punishment on children is a part of the teachers’ tool kit or a “justified” extension of the teachers’ repertoire!
- Discussions with teachers across all the four (04) states - especially in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Andhra Pradesh – revealed that there were just too many students for them to handle. “Punishments come handy to control this crowd”, said a teacher in Uttar Pradesh pointing out the class he is expected to “teach” every day.
- Almost all teachers point out, particularly in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, at the severe lack of time they have to spend inside (a) classrooms with students, and (b) in schools. They are held accountable to so many non-teaching tasks by the government that they could hardly concentrate on their job.
- The team received a general feeling that while the younger crop of teachers are not very prompt at inflicting punishment, very senior teachers also now repent the fact that they have used the rod

too frequently. It is the middle aged and mid-career teachers who both believe and are engaged in punishing children.

- **Corporal Punishment: At Homes**

- The survey very clearly identified Home as the source of most severe and cruel forms of punishment meted out to children. In comparison, the punishments meted out in schools pale in severity.
- In all the four states the team visited, it came across a large number of vociferous groups of children reporting some of the cruelest forms of punishment they receive at homes. These include: Making children starve; Inflict burns on their hands ; Tying to a chair with rope followed by severe beating; Making children starve; Beating followed by pouring chilly powder down the throat of the child if s/he cries; Tying a thick wooden rod along the child's underarms and the back of the knees and then keep her/him suspended from the ceiling for long hours, and so on.
- At homes, the child is at a severe disadvantage because generally it will be one against many. The team did not come across any case where the child has a respite from either of the parents. Both inflict beatings. In many cases, even the elder siblings will join.
- In schools, teachers are hesitant to punish beyond a limit because of the perceived pressures from the parents and the communities. In extreme cases even the children could retaliate. At home, inside four walls, the parents do not face such pressures. They are the "owners" and "masters" of their wards!
- The research team also found that at home it is NOT just a question of mothers beating daughters and fathers beating sons. Both parents are involved in beating all their wards, irrespective of gender.
- That Mothers beat softly, is also a myth. Children, all across, reported that mothers can also thrash and severely at that. Smaller children who generally hover around their mothers are the worst sufferers.
- Both in Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh, the favorite punishment of mothers were found to be abusing and kicking. A woman member of a parents-teachers' association the team met in Andhra Pradesh confessed in all seriousness that she (and other women she knew) thrash children out of no particular reason.
- A large number of children (above 40 %) report that they consider "WORKING" as yet another form of punishment only. They referred to working as what they are forcefully made to do – against their will - at home and outside.

- **Corporal Punishment: No Gender Discrimination**

- The team did not find any gender discrimination when it comes to punishing children. Some girl-groups (About 15 %) did report they receive lighter punishments at schools but in homes they too are punished as severely as the boys.
- In general, however, boys get punished more frequently. The perception parents particularly hold is, they (i.e. the boys) have far more free time to get into situations that disturb the adults around, and get punished in the bargain. The girls, on the other hand, are always busy in household work and are hardly noticed as “doing nothing” or “playing pranks” or “whiling away time”. At the same time, if girls refuse work at home, the results are severe.

- **Legally Banning Corporal Punishment**

- The Supreme Court In India may have banned corporal punishment for children: only SIX (06) states have undertaken any efforts to follow that order. From these, three (03) states have completely banned corporal punishment [Delhi (2000), Andhra Pradesh (2002), Goa (2003)], while three (03) other states have sought prohibition on corporal punishment: Chandigadh (1990), West Bengal (2000), and Tamilnadu (2003).
- Even though corporal punishment is being recognized as a social malice by all the stakeholders the team met, including children, few agree with the idea of legally banning the same. The exceptions were the children themselves and, in some case the volunteers of the partner NGOs the research team worked with.
- In Rajasthan, the officials whom the team met tried to play down the seriousness of this legislation. According to them, there is no GR issued from the state government / the department of education in this regard; only a directive and a set of guidelines have been issued two years ago. None of the offices the team visited could, however, furnish a copy of the same.
- In Andhra Pradesh, where corporal punishment is legally banned, of the eight (08) education department officials the team had engaged in a group discussion, seven (07) disagreed with the legislation.

- **Children’s Views on Corporal Punishment**

- The children also accept corporal punishment as way of life. They also believe that it is required to some extent and in some form. During the interaction with the team, however, they rated violence (involved in corporal punishment) in a descending order of preference. They have, however, differences of opinion in terms of the severity of punishments.

- Children harbor varied views on corporal punishment. They share them matter-of-factly and with candor that sometimes borders on rare humor. It is to their great credit that despite having no respite in violence meted out to them, by parents and by teachers, they want to just carry on with living.
 - We have divided their views in two categories. The first category comprises of views the children of all the four study-states hold in common. These views are part of a larger belief system and do not vary with geography or culture. The second category comprises of views that are very specific.
- **Children's Views on Corporal Punishment**
 - **Common views across the case study states**
 - Corporal punishment is desirable as it has a huge corrective value
 - Parents and teachers have a right to subject children to corporal punishment otherwise they would go astray
 - The injury (resulting out of a punishment) is not as painful as the act of punishment
 - Corporal punishment is a just reward for bad behavior
 - Legislation banning corporal punishment to children is neither desirable nor acceptable
 - **Specific Views**
 - *"Punishment ought to be made mandatory for children."* (A primary-school boy student, village Bargadai, Maharajgunj district, Uttar Pradesh)
 - *".....sir is a good teacher; so what, if he beats?sir does not beat, but does not teach either."* (A primary school girl student, village Badkidali, Maharajgunj district, Uttar Pradesh)
 - *"I feel depressed when my mother beats me but I continue to do mischief."* (A drop-out boy student from village Parati (East), Muzaffarpur district, Bihar)
 - *"We are beaten mercilessly at the school. As a result, we are no longer able to sit properly."* (A group of boys from upper primary school, village 465 RD, Bikaner district, Rajasthan)
 - *"I have a model of discipline to tackle the students....Between the Baalwadi and the Primary School, there should not be any punishment; little punishment for students between primary and upper primary; moderate punishment for the students belonging to class above upper primary but up to high school; and, corporal punishment – if required – for the students of the high school and above..."* (a girl student from secondary school, village Chandupetla, Nalgonda district, Andhra Pradesh)

Recommendations

- One key realization stemming from the present study refers to the apparent invisibility of corporal punishment at homes and in schools at large. It exists but its existence is denied by all concerned; especially the parents and the teachers. It is not viewed by them as a social malice at all. Like other social malice of similar ilk – gender discrimination, child labor, domestic violence, human exploitation based on social hierarchies etc. - corporal punishment too is all pervasive, highly ingrained, and most resistant to change. Not only such malicious practices are inherited; but they have become so common, so much part of life that they are seldom noticed. If noticed, they are rarely accepted. If accepted, they are almost never acknowledged. The question of viewing it from the prevailing global understanding, i.e., from the viewpoint of human rights perspective / human rights violation does not arise at all.
- It is both tricky and complicated to provide a list of recommendations for overcoming such invisible social malice, the rigor and honesty of a study notwithstanding. It is tricky because, to succeed, it requires an act of honest implementation on part of each and every concerned individual. In the context of the present study, this includes not only the stakeholders the research team interacted with but the rest of the society as well. It is complicated because to implement the same, it will require – again on part of every concerned individual – changing one’s own belief systems and life style. Something that touches the philosophical realm within everyone.
- The research team is thus inclined to believe that the recommendations to overcome the prevalence of corporal punishment will have to be both philosophical and pragmatic in nature. They will have to be philosophical to a level because they will essentially address the issue of understanding one’s own belief systems first; seriously questioning them; and, eventually changing them. At the same time, they will have to be pragmatic enough to be “doable” or “executable” at the ground level as well. In the following paragraphs, these recommendations have been detailed out.
- The study proposes two key recommendations. There are other more practical and doable recommendations and are given at appropriate places in the main text.
 - **Key Recommendation One:** Making each and every adult in the society understand the inevitability of internalizing non-violence as a life skill and then practicing it during all his/her interactions with children and others.
 - **Key Recommendation Two:** Parents and Teachers will have to undergo a process of de-culturization by drastically reducing their respective “ownership” on children that enjoys societal sanction. This ownership exists in almost every interaction that occurs between the adults and the children.

Chapter One
Introduction

1.0 Background

- 1.0.1 Corporal punishment of children is a worldwide phenomenon. Children are physically punished in almost all societies. Two key features define corporal punishment: physical violence against children, and the concept of punishment in response to wrongdoing. Violence is at the extreme end of a range of punishments that are inflicted on children by parents, teachers, peer group members, and justice systems. Many justice systems have removed beatings as a punishment for breaking the law, but beatings are still administered for breaches of rules at school and home. Yet many behavior theorists question the validity of any punishment as a tool for learning, recommending instead systems of reward for positive behavior. When parents and teachers equate “discipline” with “punishment” and couple this with violence, the consequences for children can be catastrophic.
- 1.0.2 Corporal punishment also breaches fundamental rights of children to lead a life of respect, dignity, and physical integrity. The existence of special defenses in state laws, excusing violence by parents, teachers and care-takers, breaches the right to equal protection under the law. Article 19 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child requires States to protect children from “all forms of physical or mental violence” while in the care of parents, teachers, and others
- 1.0.3 Every developed, industrialized country in the world and many developing nations in Asia and Africa have made the violent punishment of school children illegal. In India too corporal punishment of children is “illegal”, but there remains much more to be done.
- 1.0.4 The Supreme Court In India may have banned corporal punishment for children: only SIX (06) states have undertaken any efforts to follow that order. From these, three (03) states have completely banned corporal punishment [Delhi (2000), Andhra Pradesh (2002), Goa (2003)], while three (03) other states have sought prohibition on corporal punishment: Chandigadh (1990), West Bengal (2000), and Tamilnadu (2003).
- 1.0.5 More specifically, according to the Indian law under the Free And Compulsory Education Bill, 2004 and the 86th amendment of the Indian constitution: (1) No child shall be awarded physical punishment in any recognized school. (2) Violation of sub-section (1) by a teacher shall amount to professional misconduct, and shall be liable to be punished in accordance with the disciplinary rules applicable to him / her (3) If a recognized school other than an approved school, fails to take action against a teacher as provided in sub-section (2) above, it shall be liable to forfeit its recognition or State grant or both, in such manner as may be prescribed.

- 1.0.6 Evidence all over the world indicates a strong relationship between high rates of corporal punishment and higher rates of poor academic achievement, dropouts, juvenile delinquents, incarceration and spouse abuse. There appears to be a strong link between corporal punishment during the growing years of a child's life, and his/her easily becoming a perpetrator (of violence) later in life.
- 1.0.7 Despite the evidence, there are educators and legislators who defend student corporal punishment. Students too, conform to school rules outwardly due to fear of corporal punishment- but obedience training isn't education! Children are being exposed from an early age to bullying tactics, and the use and abuse of power. Many of these students will put these lessons into practice at the earliest opportunity. School officials who allow such punishment knowingly put students at risk emotionally and physically and at an unnecessary disadvantage.

Given this background, Plan (International) India approached SAATH to undertake a research study on corporal punishment and its impact on children in schools. Initially, as an external agency, SAATH was mandated to conduct the study in six states in India where Plan has its delineated PU areas. The coverage was later reduced to four states. These were: Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, and Andhra Pradesh. The study itself was titled as: "Corporal punishment: How it impacts the lives of boys and girls in school in four states of the country".

- 1.0.8 In all the four states the research team worked with a NGO partner each. They are also known as Plan's program units (PUs). The NGOs involved in the research study were: Gram Niyojan Kendra (Uttar Pradesh), Adithi (Bihar); Urmul-SETU (Rajasthan), and Arthik Samta Mandal (Andhra Pradesh).

1.1 Study Rationale

- 1.1.1 Death, they say, is a certainty. For children, corporal punishment is no less certain. The United Nations – from where a plethora of conventions on human rights, including the rights for the child, have emerged - recognize about 200 countries/country-states in the world. Of these, only ten (10) countries (Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Israel, Latvia, Norway, Sweden) have outlawed all forms of corporal punishment on children. An innocuous figure of just 5%! Even in these countries, the efficacy of their respective laws banning corporal punishment come into question from time to time.
- 1.1.2 Children of the world, therefore, face a very tall order. For them, escaping punishment is highly improbable. To take it into the stride and carry on with the living is the key, and that is what the children the world over – including those who figure in the present study – are engaged in doing: Grin it, and bear it. It is no solution, however. Such bearings leave behind consequences that are highly damaging to the body and the psyche.

- 1.1.3 Given that Plan is a child-centered organization and that corporal punishment (on children) is a humanitarian issue; a research inquiry into the incidence, extent, and if possible the impact of corporal punishment on school children will contribute to an understanding of not only the culture of corporal punishment in the case study areas but will also shed light on the processes that need to be installed to address the issue effectively in its areas of operation.
- 1.1.4 Moreover, a rigorous research on the subject can provide the seeds of new thought clearly show how Plan can contribute to a discourse within the organization and a wider debate outside, looking at fighting corporal punishment and humiliation in the relationship between children and teachers in education environs; and parents in home environs respectively. The rationale therefore is to facilitate, at all levels, processes that might usher in a culture that is non violent both in schools and homes.

1.2 Study Objectives

- 1.2.1 The study was initiated with the following objectives:
 - 1.2.1.1 **To** study the incidence, the extent, and wherever possible, the impact of corporal punishment on the lives of select school children in the four case study states ;
 - 1.2.1.2 **To** document case studies of children whose lives have been impacted by punishment and who have benefited from models of positive discipline;
 - 1.2.1.3 **To** compile viewpoints of children and other stakeholders on corporal punishment and look at probable solutions that can be initiated by children, and the others; and,
 - 1.2.1.4 **To** arrive at a set of recommendations that addresses the issue of corporal punishment through alternative discipline models.

1.3 Study Outcomes

- 1.3.1 The following outcomes were expected from the study:
 - 1.3.1.1 A set of findings on the incidence, the extent, and wherever possible the impact of corporal punishment on children, both at schools and homes;
 - 1.3.1.2 A detailed overview of the insights into adults' role as teachers, parents, government representatives, and social engineers as caregivers (of children) and as perpetrators of corporal punishment;

1.3.1.3 A set of comments based on the perceptions of children and other stakeholders on the existence of corporal punishment in schools and homes; and, their views to tackle the issue; and,

1.3.1.4 A set of future areas of concern.

1.4 The Present Study

1.4.1 Two important points of view merit a mention here.

One: As it turned out, the present study looks more at the incidence and the extent of corporal punishment on school children rather than focusing only on the impact it inflicts on children, as the title of the study would suggest. There were a couple of reasons that forced the research team to shift the focus. Firstly, an impact study demands a longer gestation period in the field than what was available. The team could, in whatever time was at its disposal, barely scratch the surface of the phenomenon that corporal punishment is. Secondly, its impact on the other hand can be gauged only when a set of children and their respective home and school environments are “studied” over a longer period, using mainly psychological methods and tools. The research team did not have a professional psychologist on board who would have designed and executed appropriate tools and tests.

Two: When one follows the conventional paradigm of research methodology, the literature review / the desk review (of the phenomenon under study) precedes the tool design and its application in the field. In the present study, the research team has made an attempt to reverse the sequence. Its justification lies in the fact that it was for the first time ever, an inquiry into the phenomenon (of corporal punishment) was being conducted in the study areas; without any previous reference in terms of knowledge, experience or accounts. The research team therefore could not, and did not, go to the field with a set of hypothesis in mind. The study was conducted with a clean slate, as it were. This particular approach necessitates that in the sequence of presentation, the discussion on the study methods and tools figure prior to the literature review.

1.4.2 The study spans over four districts, one each in the aforementioned states. It uses participatory research tools and methods to covers 41 schools and the corresponding large array of students, teachers, parents, community members, concerned government officials, and others. In the course of the study the team interacted with more than 1500 school children, 215 teachers, and a multitude of other stakeholders.

1.4.3 The research team could also convince members of a children’s forum in Andhra Pradesh to enact their ideas and views on corporal punishment in the form of a skit. Their performance was video-graphed and is included as one of the study’s main findings.

1.4.4 The study has been chaptered into a particular sequence. After the reader is introduced to its shorter version (executive summary), an elaborate introduction follows (Chapter One). Having thus set its background, the study goes on to discuss the tools and methods used (Chapter Two) and the desk review (Chapter Three) in that order (see 1.4.1). The core chapters of the study are the ones on the tool coverage and their application (Chapter Four), and the main findings (Chapter Five) respectively. The study concludes with the help of a set of recommendations (Chapter Five). There are five annexes to the study: case studies of much abused children (Annex One); the views of the government on corporal punishment (Annex Two); the study processes (Annex Three); the study tools (Annex Four); and, the names of the members of the research team (Annex Five).



2.0 Introduction

- 2.0.1 The research tools the team used during the course of the study are described in the sections that follow.
- 2.0.2 Since the tools primarily involved interaction with the stakeholders on issues that were both sensitive and discreet, the research team saw to it that they were applied judiciously and with discretion.
- 2.0.3 The team, therefore, followed a methodology to execute the tools that were designed before the survey. The methodology was:
- Interactive
 - Participatory
 - Recreational (games, physical activities, mind-exercises) , especially with children
 - Rooted in Multi-media. Children were asked to draw, do role plays, use black boards, chart papers, stage a skit etc.
- 2.03 The research team has also drawn extensively on the tool of studying select cases. Attempts were made to document at least 5 case studies of children whose lives have been impacted by corporal punishment and related discrimination. The team also was always on the look out for children who escaped corporal punishment and have benefited from some type of positive disciplining.
- 2.04 The team has taken extra care in designing tools that sought to capture children's views on corporal punishment and their understanding of the same. The idea was to not only take cognizance of what the children feel about corporal punishment but also to seek their views on what can be done to reduce its incidence and extent.
- 2.05 The research team (see Annex Five) comprised of two principal investigators from SAATH who visited all the four states. At the field level, it took on board at least one female investigator so that the ensuing interactions with children, especially girls, will not be biased from the gender perspective. In Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Rajasthan a female social scientist worked with the team. In Andhra Pradesh, because of the language barrier, the team had to take on board a larger team that consisted of two male and two female doctoral-level research students respectively.

2.1 The Tools

2.1.0 The study utilized two basic tools of research; primary and secondary. The former refers to all the interactive tools that were used in the field, while communicating with different stakeholders of the study. The latter, on the other hand, refers to reviewing relevant literature, documents, past studies etc.

2.1.1 The following secondary tools were utilized:

- **Reviewing relevant documents**
 - Published documents of Plan International & SCF;
 - Published documents of the concerned PUs;
 - Published documents of the Government of India;
 - Published documents of the concerned state governments;
 - Relevant Ordinances / Notifications / Rulings of the state governments that have abolished corporal punishment for children; and,
 - Others
- **Reviewing relevant and selected writings in different literature; i.e. English, Hindi, Gujarati etc.**
- **Exploring certain key concepts of societal values**
 - There exist numerous value concepts such as education, schooling, learning, discipline etc. that are not only directly concerned with the concept of corporal punishment but they offer different connotations and meanings for different people. There also seems to exist a generally accepted meaning of these concepts that more often than not is a result of culture and conditioning. The team had listed out, before going to the field, a set of such concepts that it thought would be relevant for the study. These were to be examined both at the primary and secondary level of inquiry (Annex Four).
 - At the secondary level, these key concepts can be examined for their various theoretical constructs in different faculties of knowledge such as sociology, psychology, literature etc.
 - At the primary level, the same concepts are required to be explored, in an interactive mould, with the stakeholders in the field, including children (see later).

2.1.2 The following primary tools were utilized:

- **Exploring certain key societal values with the stakeholder groups**

The research team had designed a schematic framework to involve the stakeholders in discussing certain key societal values that are directly and indirectly related to the subject of the research inquiry. These include: Punishment, Violence, Rights, Home environment, and so on. A comprehensive list of these concepts is given in Annex Four.

- **Interviews**

The Interviews were also designed to be both structured and those involving free wheeling discussion, depending on the situation on hand and the stakeholder group involved. The team had in mind to carry a check list of key questions to be asked. The team expected that with the case study children who would face the task of discussing their private agony in detail, a free wheeling discussion would be more useful than stern-sounding questions. Accordingly, two sets of stakeholder groups were identified for this particular tool:

- Government officials; PU heads and key staff, village head persons
- Case Study Children

- **Focus Group Discussions with selected groups of stakeholders**

While the village level organizations were slated to be involved in the research processes as and when they were found to be available, the research team had planned to involve teachers in both, homogeneous groups and heterogeneous groups: The assumption is that some of the key concepts, especially when related to children, has a significant gender bearing on them in the sense that the views of both the male teachers and their female counterparts are most likely to differ.

- **Role plays and class room observations**

These were expected to be carried out with children only.

2.1.3 A mix of interactive exercises with different stakeholders groups eventually emerged as shown in the following table (Table 2.3.1). This can be termed as the research team's "tool kit".

Table 2.1.3 The Research Tool Kit

Serial Number	Methods	Stakeholders Groups
1.0	Group Exercises	Children
		Children Forums
		PU Staff
2.0	Focused Group Discussions	Teachers: Males
		Teachers: Females
		Teachers: Mixed
		PTAs
		VECs
3.0	Interviews	Government Officials
		Case Study Children
		Must Meet Individuals
		Ex teachers
		Ex Principals
		Ex Govt. Officials

2.2 Details regarding the tools' application

2.2.1 Certain details on the research tools application in the field require a mention here.

2.2.2 Given the nature of inquiry and the time available for the study, the research team decided to give the maximum attention to its interaction with the children. As a stakeholder group they will be accorded the top priority.

2.2.3 The major stake holders groups as the team saw them were:

- Children
- Children's groups/associations/clubs (wherever available)
- Teachers
- Parents
- Concerned community groups such as village education committees, parents-teachers association etc
- Government education machinery at the block & district level
- PU staff

2.2.4 It was thought to be likely that all the key concepts, mentioned in the table above and all the tools discussed above would not be used with all stakeholders groups.

2.2.5 The team also came to an understanding that the research inquiry would essentially focus rural schools, rural children, and rural teachers. Within that universe, the team will have to draw sample from the following categories:

2.2.5.1 Children

- Boys and girls
- Primary and Secondary
- School going and Dropped out
- Control schools and Non-control schools
- Abused (corporal punishment) and those benefited from positive discipline

2.2.5.2 Teachers

- Males and Females

2.2.6 Of the ten schools the team was expected to cover in each state; the mix was expected to be: five each from the control and non control groups.



Chapter Three
Desk Review

3.0 Introduction

- 3.0.1 The present chapter is a narrative note, prepared out of the desk review the team carried out before and after the field surveys.
- 3.0.2 Corporal punishment as an area of interest (for study) may not be as ancient as the phenomenon itself, it has drawn considerable attention world wide nevertheless. Academicians, policy makers, governments, international development organizations have given it more than a cursory look in recent decades.
- 3.0.3 Corporal punishment as a subject itself, commands a vast body of literature. An exhaustive desk review would have been out of the purview of a study of present nature any way. At the same time, from its short exposure to the literature, the team has been able to identify and understand several areas of global interest on corporal punishment. These are presented in the following paragraphs.
- 3.0.4 A list of documents referred by the team during the desk review is given at the end of the chapter.

3.1 Corporal Punishment: Areas of global interest

- 3.1.1 As mentioned above, for the global community there are several areas of interest – and of concern as well – when it comes to discussing corporal punishment. The team had been able to categorise these into the following. A brief discussion on each is presented subsequently.
- Three key concepts
 - Prevalence and extent
 - In defence of corporal punishment
 - Relevant laws and legalities
 - Children’s views on corporal punishment
 - Human rights perspectives on corporal punishment
 - Towards abolishing corporal punishment
 - A caution against “successful” models
 - Positive approaches to disciplining

3.1.2 Corporal punishment: Three key concepts

- 3.1.2.1 Every social phenomenon is embedded in a set of social values. Punishment / corporal punishment is no exception to this. There are many concepts and values that offer explanation towards knowing and understanding corporal punishment as a social phenomenon, there are three key concepts that underline it all. These are: Punishment, Discipline, and Positive Disciplining.
- 3.1.2.2 Punishment is defined as an "undesirable event that follows an instance of unacceptable behavior and is intended to decrease the frequency of that behavior." (Paul J. Champagne and R. Bruce McAfee: 1989)
- 3.1.2.3 Corporal or physical punishment is any punishment in which physical force is intended to cause some degree of pain or discomfort: hitting children with a hand, or with a cane, strap or other object, kicking, shaking or throwing children, scratching, pinching, biting or pulling their hair, forcing them to stay in uncomfortable positions, locking or tying them up, burning, scalding or forced ingestion – for example washing mouths out with soap. There are other harmful and humiliating forms of punishment of children which do not involve the direct use of physical force.
- 3.1.2.4 Interestingly, it is the industrial / corporal sector for who the term discipline seems more important and relevant, concerned as they are, with managing and controlling the employer-employee relationship. Although the term "discipline" is so commonly used and stands universally accepted as "a method to control unaccepted behaviour/s", the first specific definition of the term is credited to authors Paul J. Champagne and R. Bruce McAfee. In their book, *Motivating Strategies for Performance and Productivity* (1989), they caution against treating discipline synonymously with punishment as discipline can be contrasted to punishment in a number of ways.
- 3.1.2.5 Accordingly, the term "Discipline" has three distinct meanings: (a) "punishment for a violation of a work rule or direct order" (b) "training that molds and strengthens the employee's behavior", and (c) "control gained by enforced obedience". From these three definitions, one can see that discipline not only has a corrective component but also an educational one.
- 3.1.2.6 Viewed and compared with the relationship/s children normally share with their adult counterparts in their home and school environments respectively, it seems that (a) and (c) are the more accepted meanings of discipline vis-à-vis children. Applying the meaning (c) to the same, one is not viewing discipline and punishment synonymously, because "discipline is not what you do to the child, but what you do with and for the child". This particular understanding strikes a very positive note that underlines the concept of positive disciplining.

- 3.1.2.7 Children need to understand that they have choices or options that are alternatives to misbehavior. Positive Discipline espouses the use of a "wheel of choice" where several alternatives are posted on a circle. Students are encouraged to look at the wheel of choice for options that may be chosen.
- 3.1.2.8 Positive disciplining has its roots in the applied control theory (of behavior). It has originated from the work of William Glasser (1984) that assumes all behavior to be purposeful and is carried out in ways to meet our basic psychological needs for survival, love, power, fun and freedom. The study looks more closely at positive disciplining in section 3.1.9 of the present chapter.

3.1.3 Corporal punishment: Prevalence and extent

- 3.1.3.1 Children are physically punished in almost all societies. Two key features define corporal punishment: physical violence against children, and the concept of punishment in response to "wrongdoing".
- 3.1.3.2 No survey will reveal the full extent of corporal punishment: parents and teachers are likely to under-report, and very young children (who suffer corporal punishment the most) can not be interviewed.
- 3.1.3.3 In most countries worldwide, many children – even babies – continue to be subjected to corporal punishment in their homes, with significant numbers suffering death or serious injury.
- 3.1.3.4 In many countries, teachers are still authorised to beat school pupils with canes or straps; corporal punishment is also used in residential institutions and in children's workplaces. Children and young people can still be sentenced by courts to whipping or flogging and corporal punishment is used within penal institutions.
- 3.1.3.5 There is absolutely no dearth of example, as the following ones show, the world around proving that not only corporal punishment is highly prevalent but its extent could be wide and damaging could go

Brazil: Successive surveys have found very high levels of corporal punishment, both with the hand and with slippers, belts, canes and other implements, leading to the conclusion that "Hitting mania is one of the national institutions of Brazilian culture" (*Hitting Mania: domestic corporal punishment of children and adolescents in Brazil, 2001*).

Bangladesh: Severe punishment at home and at school as well as in the workplace is a part of daily life for children here Pain is often inflicted on children by parents, guardians and teachers to secure

better academic performance and to enforce obedience. This practice is augmented by the traditional view in Bangladesh society that parents, guardians, teachers and elders 'can do no wrong' (*Better Days, Better Lives: Towards a strategy for implementing the CRC in Bangladesh, Kamal Siddiqui, 2001*).

- South Africa:** Until 1993, up to 30,000 young offenders were whipped each year. But in 1995 the new Constitutional Court declared whipping unconstitutional, and since then corporal punishment has been prohibited throughout the penal, school and child care systems; enforcement is not yet effective but the law is now clear.
- Kuwait:** a 1996 survey of parents' attitudes found 54 per cent agreeing, or strongly agreeing, with severe beating in cases of gross misbehaviour. 9 per cent of parents agreed with burning as a form of punishment.
- Pakistan:** a study covering parents and teachers at 600 primary schools in the North West Frontier province in 1998 found over 70 reports of serious injury arising from corporal punishment; the most common forms of punishment were beating with sticks, pulling ears, slapping faces and forcing children to stay in humiliating positions.
- Romania:** A 1992 survey found 84 per cent of parents regarded spanking as a "normal" method of childrearing. 96 per cent did not consider it humiliating.
- UK:** Government-commissioned research in the 1990s found that three quarters of a large sample of mothers admitted to smacking their baby before the age of one. In families with children aged one, four, seven and eleven where both parents were interviewed, over a third of all the children were hit weekly or more often by either or both parents, and a fifth of these children had been hit with an implement.
- Europe:** A UNICEF opinion survey of children and young people across 35 countries in Europe and Central Asia in 2001, including 15,200 interviews representative of the 93 million 9 to 17 year olds in the countries surveyed, found six out of ten children reporting violent or aggressive behavior within their families.

3.1.4 Commonly raised arguments upholding corporal punishment

- 3.1.4.1 There are active national and international campaigns to end corporal punishment of children in many states in all continents now. The issue arouses strong feelings, and campaigners often meet strong resistance.
- 3.1.4.2 There are certain “defenses” that are commonly raised by parents, teachers, and other adults whenever corporal punishment is challenged.
- 3.1.4.3 The Global Initiative, a global movement launched in 2001 under the context of United Nations Convention on Child Rights, has brought out a revealing publication in 2002 that discusses some of these commonly raised arguments upholding corporal punishment. The discussion (reproduced below) clearly shows the odds against which those, not in favor of corporal punishment will have to work. It may be noted that all quotations given below are from the above mentioned publication of 2002 and in the original document the quotations remain uncredited.

- **“Corporal punishment is a necessary part of upbringing and education. Children learn from a smacking or beating to respect their parents and teachers, to distinguish right from wrong, to obey rules and work hard. Without corporal punishment children will be spoilt and undisciplined.”**

Children need discipline, and particularly need to learn self-discipline. But corporal punishment is a very ineffective form of discipline. Research has consistently shown that it rarely motivates children to act differently, because it does not bring an understanding of what they ought to be doing nor does it offer any kind of reward for being good. The fact that parents, teachers and others often have to repeat corporal punishment for the same misbehaviour by the same child testifies to its ineffectiveness.

Smacking, spanking and beating are a poor substitute for positive forms of discipline which, far from spoiling children, ensure that they learn to think about others and about the consequences of their actions. In the countries where corporal punishment has been eliminated through Mobilising action to end all corporal punishment of children is not just about promoting one way of child-rearing over another: it is about seeking to apply fundamental human rights to all adult/child relationships.

- **“Many parents in our country are bringing up their children in desperate conditions, and teachers and other staff are under stress from overcrowding and lack of resources. Forbidding corporal punishment would add to that stress and should await improvement of these conditions.”**

This argument is a tacit admission of an obvious truth: corporal punishment is often an outlet for pent-up feelings of adults rather than an attempt to educate children. In many homes and institutions adults urgently need more resources and support, but however real adults' problems may be, venting them on children cannot be justifiable. Why should children wait for this basic protection? Nobody argues that we should wait for full employment and an improvement in men's living conditions before we challenge domestic violence against women. In any case, hitting children is an ineffective stressreliever. Adults who hit out in temper often feel guilty; those who hit as a conscious strategy find they have upset or angry and resentful children to cope with. Life in homes and institutions where corporal punishment has been abandoned for more positive discipline is much less stressful for all.

- **“I was hit as a child and it didn't do me any harm. On the contrary I wouldn't be where I am today if it were not for my parents and teachers physically punishing me.”**

People usually hit children because they themselves were hit as children: children learn from and identify with their parents and teachers. It is pointless to blame the previous generation for hitting children because they were acting in accordance with the general culture of the time; nor should bonds of love and gratitude which children have towards their elders be denied. However, times change and social attitudes change with them. There are plenty of examples of individuals who were not hit as children becoming great successes, and even more examples of individuals who were hit failing to fulfil their potential in later life. legal reform and appropriate public education there is no evidence to show that disruption of schools or homes by unruly children has increased: the sky does not fall if children cannot be hit. Corporal punishment may lead children to fear rather than respect their parents or teachers. Do we really want children to learn to “respect” people who use violence to sort out problems or conflicts?

- **“Corporal punishment may be wrong, but it is a trivial issue compared with the extreme breaches of their rights which children suffer in many countries. Why should ending it be a priority?”**

Where millions of children suffer for lack of adequate food, shelter, medical care and education, even those most concerned with children's rights may argue that corporal punishment is a relatively minor problem that should await better times. But human rights issues do not lend themselves to a sequential approach, as the Convention on the Rights of the Child recognises. Pressure to end corporal punishment should be an integral part of advocacy for all children's rights. Refraining from hurting and humiliating children does not consume, or distort the deployment of, resources. When children are asked, they identify ending corporal punishment as an issue of high importance to them. Just as challenging routine violence to women has been

a central part of their struggle for equality, so it is with children. Challenging corporal punishment is fundamental to improving their status as people and asserting their rights to participation as well as protection. While any level of violence to children in their homes and institutions remains legal and socially approved, progress to protect children from extreme violations and to reduce and prevent all forms of violence is hampered.

The few countries that have outlawed all corporal punishment of children have done so first in institutions and only then within the family. But now that corporal punishment is visible and recognised as a breach of children's fundamental rights, pressure on parents to stop hitting their children should not await prohibition in school and care systems. Corporal punishment of children should be challenged wherever it occurs and whoever administers it. Given traditional attitudes to children, many parents feel threatened by any attempt to change the status quo. This is why any change in the law needs to be accompanied by public and parent education to promote positive, non-violent forms of discipline.

“There is a big difference between a vicious beating and corporal punishment administered in a controlled way by a parent or a teacher. This is not dangerous, causes little pain and cannot be called abuse. Why should it be outlawed?” Everyone, including children, has a right to respect for their human dignity and physical integrity. People would no longer get away with condemning “violence” against women, but continuing to defend “little slaps”. In any case, “minor” corporal punishment can cause unexpected injury. Hitting children is dangerous because children are small and fragile (much corporal punishment in the home is targeted at babies and very young children). Ruptured eardrums, brain damage, and injuries or death from falls are the recorded consequences of “harmless smacks”. There is a large body of international research suggesting negative outcome from corporal punishment. These are some of the conclusions:

- **“Schools need corporal punishment as a last resort – a deterrent to discourage bad behavior and encourage good work.”**

If corporal punishment is available as a sanction, you can be sure it will be used. And because it is not effective, it will tend to be used repeatedly on a minority of students. If it is regarded as a “last resort”, it may well lead students to regard other, more positive forms of discipline as unimportant and so render them ineffective. Corporal punishment teaches children nothing positive, nothing about the way we as adults want them to behave. On the contrary, it is a potent lesson in bad behavior. Children do not learn well when they are distracted by fear, and corporal punishment has been shown to increase school drop-out rates significantly. “Parents’ right to bring up children as they see fit should only be challenged in extreme cases.”

The Convention on the Rights of the Child replaces the concept of parents' rights with "parental responsibilities" (which of course carry with them certain rights), including the responsibility to protect the rights of children themselves. The assertion of children's rights seems an unwarranted intrusion to people accustomed to thinking of children as parents' possessions, but children are now recognised as individuals who are entitled to the protection of human rights standards along with everyone else. Human rights do not stop short at the door of the family home. Other forms of inter-personal violence within families – including wife-beating – are already subject to social control and are unlawful in almost every society. It is quite wrong that children, the smallest and most vulnerable of people, should have had to wait until last for protection. As adults, we have a clear responsibility as far as possible to remove objects of danger to children in their homes and schools.

- **“This is a white, Euro-centric issue. Corporal punishment is a part of my culture and child-rearing tradition. Attempts to outlaw it are discriminatory.”**

No culture can be said to “own” corporal punishment. All societies have a responsibility to disown it, as they have disowned other breaches of human rights which formed a part of their traditions. The Convention on the Rights of the Child upholds ALL children's right to protection from all forms of physical or mental violence without discrimination on grounds of race, culture, tradition or religion. Corporal punishment of children is being challenged now in many parts of the world. School and judicial beatings have been outlawed in some states in all continents.

- **“My religion requires the corporal punishment of children.”**

People are entitled to freedom of religion only insofar as the practice of their religion does not break the law or infringe human rights. But in fact in none of the world's great religions does the word of God require children to be beaten. Phrases such as “spare the rod and spoil the child” do occur in some holy books, but not as a doctrinal text. Sayings which endorse peaceful solutions and kindly forms of child-rearing can be found in equal measure to punitive sayings in all religious scriptures, and in every faith there will be prominent leaders who denounce all violence to children. Attempts by schools run by particular religious groups to make a special case for retaining corporal punishment have been thrown out by courts, including South Africa's Constitutional Court and the European Court of Human Rights. that the ill-treatment of their child began as “ordinary” corporal punishment.

- **“I only smack my children for safety – for their own sake they must learn about danger.”**

If a child is crawling towards a hot oven, or running into a dangerous road, of course you must use physical means to protect them – grab them, pick them up, show them and tell them about the danger. But if you raise your hand to hit them, you are wasting crucial seconds and – more important – by hurting the child yourself you are confusing the message the child gets about the danger, and distracting their attention from the lesson you want them

- **“Banning corporal punishment will just lead to children being treated in more horrible ways – emotional abuse, or humiliation or locking them up.”**

Children must be protected from all forms of humiliating and inhuman punishment, not only corporal punishment, and parents, other carers and teachers often need guidance on alternatives to such punishments. The starting point is not to replace one form of punishment with another, but to see discipline as a positive not punitive process, part of the communicative relationship between adult and child. “Good” discipline – which must ultimately be self discipline – depends on adults modeling and explaining positive behaviour; having high expectations of children’s willingness – and realistic expectations of their developmental ability – to achieve it, and rewarding their efforts with praise, companionship and respect. Schools must develop their behaviour codes and disciplinary systems in co-operation with students. The imposition of arbitrary, adult-designed rules and automatic sanctions will not encourage self-discipline.

- **“This country is a democracy but there is no democratic support for ending corporal punishment. If there was a poll on the issue a huge majority would support retaining corporal punishment.”**

Representative democracies are not run by popular referenda. When elected politicians are drawing up new laws or a new constitution, they may need to make a number of unpopular decisions, based on human rights principles and informed arguments. Like the abolition of capital punishment, proposals to end the corporal punishment of children never enjoy popular support before they are implemented. But if the reforms are accompanied by appropriate public education, attitudes and practice rapidly change.

- **“In my country, adults as well as children are subject to corporal punishment.”**

In places where law makes corporal punishment commonplace for adults too, it may be considered that there is no discrimination involved in subjecting

children to it. This is a misapprehension. Corporal punishment contravenes the rights of all human beings, including children, but even where it is accepted throughout a culture, it discriminates against children because of their greater physical vulnerability and the imperatives of their growth and development.

- **“If corporal punishment of children is outlawed or criminalized this will result in outrageous judicial or disciplinary intervention. Children will be encouraged to act like police and spies in the home.”**

In countries where corporal punishment is outlawed there have been some disciplinary actions against teachers and childcare workers who persist in hitting children. In relation to the family home, these laws are about setting standards and changing attitudes, not prosecuting parents or dividing families. Child protection becomes more straightforward once confusing legal concepts of “reasonable chastisement” or “lawful correction” are abandoned. Research shows that parents seek help earlier when they recognise that hurting their children is socially and legally unacceptable. Welfare services recognise that children’s needs are as a rule best met within their families, so provide parents with help and support rather than punitive interventions.

- **“Changing the law to ban corporal punishment will make little difference in states where the law is not widely respected or enforced.”**

Ending corporal punishment is fundamentally an educational process. Law reform should be seen as an essential part of that process. But changing the law will only be effective if the change is widely disseminated to children and adults and backed up by promotion of positive, nonviolent methods of discipline to parents, other carers and teachers. On the other hand, attempts to change attitudes and promote positive discipline will be ineffective while the law provides a defense to parents or teachers who hit children, or while politicians or other influential leaders persist in condoning the practice. In schools and other institutions, there will need to be effective enforcement of the law, including through regular independent inspections and the availability of independent advice, advocacy and complaints procedures for children, parents and others.

- **“I’d bet that if you asked children how they’d like to be punished they would choose corporal punishment.”**

Perhaps you could say that was a good reason not to use it! One reason some children may say they like to be physically punished is because it is “quick”. In one sense this is true, in that a blow or a beating may quickly be shrugged off, or can even bring esteem from peers. This underlines how very

ineffective it is as a method of discipline. In another sense physical punishment is not “quick” because its hidden effects – humiliation, loss of self-esteem, encouragement of aggression and bullying – can be long lasting. If the influential adults in a child’s home and school life use corporal punishment, it is not surprising that some children may at first defend its use. Children have a natural tendency to defend their childhood. You don’t want to think badly of your parents. The child learns that he or she deserves a beating and that it is a necessary part of growing up. But attitudes will change if children are enabled to reflect on how they felt when punished and are introduced to positive approaches to discipline built on respect, rewards and companionship. Young people need to be involved in real debates, be properly informed about human rights and understand that corporal punishment is part of a child-rearing culture that can be changed.

3.1.5 Relevant laws and legalities

- 3.1.5.1 In the ambit of Law, the phenomenon of corporal punishment raises a number of basic questions. Who can punish whom? What is the crime for which punishment can be inflicted? Whether parents, teachers or other adults have any adjudicatory authority to decide circumstances under which a punishment can be inflicted? What should be the type, the quantum, the method and the timing of punishment?
- 3.1.5.2 Law basically does not agree with any excessive punishment to human beings, which would be definitely a violation of personal right. According to law, the adjudicatory authorities alone have authority to hear complaints, try the contentions and draw the conclusions as liability and penalty. The corporal punishment, especially envisages a legal process and appropriate authority to fix the guilt according to established and enforceable law. Not otherwise. It is both a crime and a civil wrong for holding some one guilty and inflicting penalty, without legal authority.
- 3.1.5.3 In India, the education system itself promotes corporal punishment. Teacher is assumed a respectful and thus powerful position. This power includes power to inflict corporal punishment as well.
- 3.1.5.4 Parents and Teachers usually impose some sort of corporal punishment over the children under their control. How far that is justifiable? From legal perspective, the basis of justification depends on the purpose, circumstance and reasonability of the force applied. Punishments for offences or misbehaviour of the child is one class while punishments for not following dress code or carrying number of note books or not doing the assigned homework etc, is different one. Whether law favours imposing the corporal punishment at all? If favours, does it confine to control the offensive behaviour or misbehavior? Or extend to all sorts of simple, technical or some other activity, which cannot be categorized as evil?

- 3.1.5.5 A teacher has a quasi-parental authority to discipline the child and for that purpose use the force also. However, the use must be in all cases, reasonable one. Parents and other persons in similar positions are necessarily immune against liability for many acts like assault and battery. They have control, usually but not necessarily, of a disciplinary character, over those committed to charge.
- 3.1.5.6 Law and legal systems are expected to protect the children from abuse of authorities either at home or at schools or at systems of administration of justice duly considering their childhood, innocence and incapacity to understand. Children below seven years are exempted from criminal liability. Their act is not treated as an offence at all. Similar exemption is extended to children of above seven years and under twelve of immature understanding under Section 83 of IPC. In essence, a child cannot be subjected to ordinary methods of physical punishments including imprisonment for the offences owing to their age and incapacity of formulating a malicious intention. Thus for being a student and having committed a wrong of not doing home work or violating a dress code, should not invite any corporal punishment.
- 3.1.5.7 Researchers, especially lawyers have brought out certain limitations of the Indian Penal Code (IPC) in terms of the way it views corporal punishment. At best, it is a mixed bag; at worst it could be quite a protector of those who have in their power to inflict corporal punishment on children.
- 3.1.5.8 For example, the IPC recognizes that:
- Imposing harm or corporal punishment on children in schools could be against the general principles of civil liability, which may result in payment of damages in an action for tort, i.e., civil wrong;
 - It can attract penal measures under the general principles of criminal liability for assaulting, causing injury or harm resulting in prosecution under Sections 89, 319, 320, 349, 350, 351 of Indian Penal Code;
 - Corporal punishment violates Juvenile Justice Act, and principles laid down by the Convention of Child Rights;
 - It follows the norms and procedure prescribed by the Government through GO Rules or Act, or judicial directions laid down by Supreme Court or High Court.
- 3.1.5.9 At the same time, there are enough provisions in the code that may justify legal reforms.

- Indian Penal Code Section 88 protects an act which is not intended to cause death, done by consent in good faith for person's benefit. Master chastising pupil fall under this clause. A head teacher who administers in good faith a moderate and reasonable corporal punishment to a pupil to enforce discipline in school is protected by this section and such an act is not crime under Section 323.
- Section 89 of Indian Penal Code protects an act by guardian or by consent of guardian done in good faith for benefit of child under 12 years. However the same section says that this exception will not extend to cause death, or attempting to cause death, causing grievous hurt. These provisions extend to teachers having quasi-parental authority i.e., consent or delegation of authority from parents also, of course, with exceptions. Using excessive force, causing serious injury, purpose being very unreasonable can turn the act of the guardian or teacher with the consent of guardian, an offence, because such incidents are outside the scope of "good faith".
- Child battering is one of the serious forms of domestic violence, over which the controls are not specified, in penal systems till Juvenile Justice Legislation came in 1986. The principles of criminal liability are not totally absent as they could be inferred from different ambiguous provisions prior to these Acts also. This provision should be used to control the child battery at homes and schools.

3.1.5.10 Some argue that the process of legal reforms so far as child abuse is concerned is very slow. There are, however, examples of change in the way the law itself looks at the situation.

- Section 23 of new Juvenile Justice Act, 2000 provides punishment for cruelty to juvenile or child. Whoever, having the actual charge of or control over, a juvenile or the child, assaults, abandons, exposes or willfully neglects the juvenile or causes or procures him to be assaulted, abandoned, exposed or neglected in a manner likely to cause such juvenile or the child unnecessarily mental or physical suffering shall be punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to six months, or fine, or with both.
- This section has no exceptions to exempt parents or teachers. Though it is intended to punish cruelty by those in authority, it equally applies to parents and teachers also. The whole purpose of the Juvenile Justice Act 2000 is to translate the objectives and rights enshrined in Convention on Child Rights which include separation of juveniles in conflict with law from ordinary judicial proceedings to avoid corporal punishment.

- 3.1.5.11 Though a very small number, a number of states in India have taken initiatives in dealing with corporal punishment for children. Three (03) states have completely banned corporal punishment [Delhi (2000), Andhra Pradesh (2002), Goa (2003)], while three (03) other states have sought prohibition on corporal punishment: Chandigadh (1990), West Bengal (2000), and Tamilnadu (2003).
- 3.1.5.12 The state of Andhra Pradesh was the first state to take any cognizance of corporal punishment as a social vice. It began to deal with it way back in 1966.
- Rule 39 of A. P. Integrated Educational Rules, 1966 lays down that corporal punishment shall not be inflicted in elementary schools.
 - Rule 122 of the Andhra Pradesh Integrated Educational Rules 1966, deal with imposing various kinds of fines, corporal punishments, suspension, expulsion and rustication etc. There is a restriction on imposing a corporal punishment in Rule 122 (2), which says that corporal punishment shall not be inflicted in schools except in a case of moral delinquency such as a deliberate lying, obscenity of word or act or flagrant insubordination and then it shall be limited to six cuts on the hands and be administered only by or under the supervision of the Headmaster.
 - Corporal punishment should never be inflicted in any recognised school on boys of classes XI and XII. The headmaster shall record in a register every case in which corporal punishment has been inflicted specifying the name, class and age of the pupil, the date the nature of the offence and amount of punishment.
- 3.1.5.13 The state of Goa is the latest addition to the above set of states who have either banned or prohibited corporal punishment. The state assembly passed The Goa Children's Act in April 2003. The act is a well researched and very specific legal document.

3.1.6 Children's views on corporal punishment

- 3.1.6.1 Children's experiences and views are beginning to be heard on corporal punishment – an issue which plainly affects them most of all. Children speak not only about the pain, but about the humiliation of corporal punishment, how it hurts them “inside”. Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child requires States to respect children's right to express their views on all matters that affect them – and to give their views “due weight”.
- 3.1.6.2 The Global Initiative has also compiled results of numerous surveys done in this regard. Accordingly,

- In the **UK**, five to seven year old children were consulted about smacking. They defined smacking as hitting; most of them described a smack as a hard or very hard hit. Smacking hurts. They said children responded negatively to being smacked, and that smacking was “wrong”. “[I]t feels like [they] shouldn’t have done that, it hurts. It feels embarrassed, it feels like you are really sorry and it hurts” (7 year old girl). “It hurts people and it doesn’t feel nice and people don’t like it when they are smacked’ (5 year old). “[It makes you] grumpy and sad and also really upset inside. And really hurt.” (5 year-old girl)
- In **Ethiopia**, researchers from Swedish Save the Children asked 13 and 14 year-old girls about the effects of corporal punishment. They listed: disturbed personality, physical injury, death, running away onto the streets, suicide due to fear of punishment.
- Children in Bangladesh, asked about perceptions of their working lives, frequently complained of beatings in their workplaces as well as at home and in school: “I get punished by my employer but I don’t tell my father. My father will get even angrier than my boss if he knows that I play. Physical punishment is everywhere. If we don’t do our lessons teachers beat us. They beat us with a cane or a bamboo stick on our palms or back... At times they also push our heads under a table and hit us on our buttocks. We are also made to stand on a stool holding our ears...

3.1.7 Human rights perspectives and corporal punishment

- 3.1.7.1 Changing attitudes to corporal punishment, and hence to children, will discourage other harmful forms of punishment. The imperative for removing adults’ assumed rights to hit and humiliate children is that of fundamental human rights. Research into the harmful physical and psychological effects of corporal punishment and into links with the development of other forms of violence, in childhood and later life, add further compelling arguments for condemning and ending the practice. They suggest that it is an essential strategy for reducing all forms of violence in societies.
- 3.1.7.2 Corporal punishment of children breaches children’s fundamental human rights. It has been found to be a threat to the healthy development and welfare of children and their societies, and an ineffective form of discipline or control. Constructive, non-violent, child discipline is needed. It should be formulated and applied in a manner that respects the human dignity and rights of the child and understanding of child development. Positive, non-violent ways of discipline and child rearing are being promoted and applied in all regions and cultures.
- 3.1.7.3 The existence of special defenses in state laws, excusing violence by parents, teachers and carers, breaches the right to equal protection under the law. Article

19 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child requires States to protect children from “all forms of physical or mental violence” while in the care of parents and others.

- 3.1.7.4 During the first decade of the Convention, its Treaty Body, the Committee on the Rights of the Child, has stated consistently that corporal punishment is incompatible with the Convention. The Committee has recommended to States in all continents that they should abolish all corporal punishment, including in the home, and develop public education campaigns to promote positive, non-violent discipline in the family, schools and other institutions.
- 3.1.7.5 Other human rights Treaty Bodies have also condemned corporal punishment of children in various contexts. For example, in 1999 the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights adopted a General Comment on “The Right to Education”. It states: In the Committee’s view, corporal punishment is inconsistent with the fundamental guiding principle of international human rights law enshrined in the Preambles to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and both Covenants: the dignity of the individual.
- 3.1.7.6 Article 28(2) Convention on Rights of Child 1989 indicates that the school discipline should be administered in a manner consistent with the child’s human dignity and the Convention. Article 28 says the education is a right and Article 29 says that the purpose of school education should be to assist the child in developing his or her personality talents, mental and physical abilities to their fullest potential. Article 3, 18, and 36 of the Convention, deal with parental and adult responsibility in the private sphere and the right to protection from exploitation. Article 19 provides for measures to protect children against all forms of physical abuse and imposes an obligation on member states to protect children from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury or abuse.
- 3.1.8 Towards abolishing corporal punishment**
- 3.1.8.1 Abolishing corporal punishment means removing any existing legal defenses that excuse violence by parents, teachers and others to give children equal protection under laws on assault.
- 3.1.8.2 By 2001, 10 states had prohibited all corporal punishment of children: **Austria (1989); Croatia (1999); Cyprus (1994); Denmark (1997); Finland (1983); Germany (2000); Israel (2000); Latvia (1998); Norway (1987); Sweden (1979)**. More have reforms under discussion and are close to a total ban.
- 3.1.8.3 Corporal punishment in schools and penal systems is prohibited in more than half of the world’s countries. These states, for example, have recently banned school corporal punishment: **Ethiopia, Kenya, Korea, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago and Zimbabwe**.

- 3.1.8.4 The issue is now on the political agenda in many other countries. There have been landmark human rights judgments condemning corporal punishment of children, from constitutional and supreme courts at national level – for example in **Israel, Italy, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe** – and from the **European Court of Human Rights**.
- 3.1.8.5 There are certain human rights standards that require prohibition of all corporal punishment. Hitting people violates their fundamental rights to respect for their physical integrity and human dignity, as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Children are people too and equal holders of human rights.
- 3.1.8.6 This is confirmed in the United Nations Convention on the Right of the Child, which is also the first international instrument to require protection of children from “all forms of physical or mental violence” (article 19). The Committee on the Rights of the Child, Treaty Body for the Convention, has consistently interpreted it as requiring prohibition of all corporal punishment, including in the family.
- 3.1.8.7 Abolition of corporal punishment in schools and other institutions and in penal systems for young offenders is accelerating in all continents and is complete in Europe (although enforcement may not be consistent). The banning of corporal punishment by parents and all caregivers, begun in Sweden 50 years ago, has spread to at least 12 countries.
- 3.1.8.8 Established human rights standards require abolition of all corporal punishment, and the evolving understanding of child development and social environments add strong arguments against corporal punishment and other destructive punitive practices, including psychological maltreatment. The Convention on the Rights of the Child provides a vision and accompanying set of standards for the goals of child behavior and development that have achieved international and cross-cultural acceptance and commitment.

3.1.9 **A caution against successful models**

- 3.1.9.1 Of the documents the team has referred to for the desk review, none proved to be more interesting and relevant than the one depicting the famous “smacking” ban of Sweden. It is a very good illustration of a policy, however well intentioned, having not only gone astray but turning controversial as well.
- 3.1.9.2 The above mentioned controversy refers to two sets of research findings. One claims the “smacking” ban of the Swedish government to have been a total success while the other offers conclusions that attempt to prove completely the opposite.

- 3.1.9.3 These documents are: Save the Children's a report – *A Generation Without Smacking* (by Joan Durrant; 2002) and its critique – through a booklet - by Prof. Robert E Larzelere of the University of Nebraska Medical Center (2004).
- 3.1.9.4 Sweden is often considered as a role model in dealing with corporal punishment and child abuse. Sweden banned smacking in 1979. A primary aim of the ban was to decrease rates of child abuse and to promote supportive approaches for parents rather than coercive state intervention.
- 3.1.9.5 Durrant's (2002) major conclusions are: (a) A whole generation of children has gone without being smacked (b) Attitudes and practices (towards treating a child) have changed a lot since the ban (c) Child abuse fatalities have been very low, almost infrequent, in Sweden since the ban.
- 3.1.9.6 Prof. Lazelere (2004), on the other hand, not only questions the authenticity (data wise) of the above findings but also suggest that (a) Far from any decrease in violence in Sweden there has been a sharp increase in child abuse and child-on-child violence (b) The support extended by the state to the parents has, in reality, meant the removal of children from the home in 46% of new cases receiving "support and care measures", and (c) The best indicators of physical child abuse showed a 489% increase in physical child abuse cases classified as criminal assaults in Sweden from 1981-1994.
- 3.1.9.7 Prof. Lazelere (2004) also feels that that the influence of parents has been inadvertently compromised by the entire set of overly intrusive Swedish policies. Because parents have been disempowered, the police must intervene in many more incidents than was previously the case.
- 3.1.9.8 Even if one wants to discount to an extent the severity of claims and counter claims of the two authors, perhaps there is a lesson in it for all. Any policy evaluation exercise must give convincing explanation of the situation on the ground that is based on objective, unbiased evidence before the policy / the country of its origin is looked upon as an example to emulate.

3.1.10 Positive approach to disciplining

- 3.1.10.1 Considerable literature is available on alternatives to corporal punishment or degenerative disciplining. Some have argued against it because in the process the fact that corporal punishment is a fundamental breach of human rights is often overlooked. The study team also considered this idea at length before involving the children covered in the study in discussing (see the following chapter) "having choices in the type of punishment we receive" and, since corporal punishment is inevitable in the environs they live in, "the types of punishment we can put up with and those we can not."

- 3.1.10.2 Once again, organizational behaviour theories offer thoughts on methods to disciplining. Two discipline models - progressive discipline and positive discipline - are followed by most large industrial or business organizations.
- 3.1.10.3 Progressive discipline follows a four-step progression: an oral warning, a written warning, suspension, and dismissal. The second model - positive discipline - is a participatory approach that can be used to encourage the employee to recognize his or her deficiencies and recommit to the goals and mission of the organization. Positive discipline places the responsibility of change upon the employee, thus serving as an employee incentive to improve job performance.
- 3.1.10.4 The two most commonly used disciplinary models, progressive discipline and positive discipline, share three common elements. They include:(1) coaching; (2) communicating; and (3) decision- making processes.
- 3.1.10.5 Progressive Disciplining boasts of three characteristics:
- The organization is obliged to address every performance flaw and assign an appropriate punishment to meet the offense;
 - The organization may focus solely on the problem employees at the expense of the good performers in the group; and,
 - Progressive discipline focuses on employees' past mistakes. No emphasis is placed on helping the employee to recommit to proper performance.
- 3.1.10.6 On the other hand, positive disciplining implies,
- Participation in that "each employee has the right to correct problems that arise in the workplace and be allowed the time required to return to fully acceptable performance." Each step in the system recognizes this employee right;
 - Implementing positive disciplining requires that the supervisor and employee work together to correct the problem behavior;
 - Entailing communication at a horizontal level. "Positive discipline treats employees as adults or peers in a "participative, problem-solving, rather than punitive manner.
- 3.1.10.7 Bringing the above methods to the level in order to use them in dealing and managing the adults-children relationship is a challenge. Every relationship and the environment in which operates is unique and different from the other. However, positive disciplining (of children) will mean:
- A positive approach to discipline helps adults and children work together rather than against each other.

- The purpose of positive discipline is to teach in such a way that children can develop their inner guidance system and the ability to think, judge, and make decisions on their own.
- In its original form, *discipline* meant teaching or learning -- not "to punish." The root word of discipline is disciple, a person who leads others in the way they should go. To discipline is to lead or guide behavior.
- The short term goal of discipline is to guide behavior on a daily basis and to protect children from hurting themselves and others. The long term goal is to help children become self-disciplined and responsible for their own behavior. They need to be able to rely on themselves.

3.1.10.8 The Positive Disciplining identifies four (04) solutions that begin with the letter R: Related, Respectful, R reasonable, and Revealed in order to be effective. Their respective meanings are given below:

- **Related** means that it is directly linked to the misbehavior in some way;
- **Respectful** means that teachers retain a respectful posture when dealing with a student;
- **Reasonable** means that the consequence or solution doesn't contain any additional punishment; and,
- **Revealed** means that the student knows in advance what the consequences will be.

3.2 Conclusions

3.2.1 Subsequently to the desk review, one can draw the following conclusions:

- 3.2.1.1 Initiating efforts to abolish or eradicate corporal punishment, one has to work against wide public support; almost working against the societal norms, irrespective of the society one lives in or the environment one works in. The task gets harder when one considers the fact that many children themselves do not regard beating as an abusive or violent behavior.
- 3.2.1.2 Since punishment of any kind always implies imposition of power, more often physical power, children eventually come down rejecting it. There are almost as many research findings of children justifying punishment as there are of their rejecting it.
- 3.2.1.3 Those who want to get involved will have to understand that corporal punishment or any abusive behavior is directly related to power, and the positional advantage it gives to who yield this power (over children). In other words, one's understanding of the power equations in the society /environment in question has to be thorough before any action can be initiated.

3.2.1.4 Two aspects of the causes of corporal punishment – cultural conditioning and the wider educational picture – are important in understanding why corporal punishment continues to carry such wide public support. All human beings, more so the adults, carry a hidden wish to wield power and have the opportunity to do so. Everyday, they face situations where they are de-powered by others – wives by husbands, teachers by their supervisors, grown up people by their parents, employees by their employers....the list is endless....The only “feel-good” factor they can experience is to assert back and who better than children to practice it?

3.3 Referred Documents

- Glenn, H. S. and J. Nelsen. *Raising Self-Reliant Children In a Self-Indulgent World* Prima Publishing & Communications, 1989.
- Nelsen, J. *Positive Discipline* New York: Ballentine Books, 1987.
- Wyckoff, J. and B. C. Unell. *Discipline Without Shouting or Spanking* New York: Simon & Schuster, 1984.
- Ending Corporal Punishment of Children, Making it Happen: A briefing analysis Save the Children, London, 2001
- Against Corporal Punishment –Moving Toward Constructive Child Discipline A UNESCO PUBLICATION
- Sweden’s smacking ban: more harm than good Robert E Larzelere Associate Professor of Psychology University of Nebraska Medical Center, 2004
- Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan: a program for universal elementary education in India Ministry of human resource development, Department of elementary education & literacy, Government of India
- Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan, *An Environmental Assessment* by Technical Support Group, Educational Consultants India Ltd, New Delhi.
- Hitting people is wrong, A handbook by The Global Initiative, 2003



Research Tools: Coverage and Application

4.0 Introduction

4.0.1 In the second chapter of the study, a detailed account of the types of research tools to be used during the field work in the four case study states was given. The present chapter looks at the three different ways in which these research tools were used in the field. These were (a) the tools' coverage: geographical areas, the stakeholder groups, and the children (b) their contents, and (c) their "on the field" application. \

4.1 Research tools: The coverage

4.1.1 Geographical coverage

4.1.1.1 States, districts, and blocks

- The survey covered 4 states, 6 districts, and 16 taluka /blocks. In terms of the number of districts covered, Bihar offered the most; 3. The others offered one each. Rajasthan was the only state where the survey was confined to one district and one taluka. In others the geographical spread was wider. In Andhra Pradesh the study covered 3 taluka; in Uttar Pradesh 4; and, in Bihar 8. The study's basic coverage is given in the following tables (Table 4.1.1.1 & 4.1.1.2)

Table 4.1.1.1 The Study Coverage

State	District	Blocks / Taluka
Uttar Pradesh	Maharajgunj	Sonauli
		Laksmipur
		Badkidali
		Trilokpur
Bihar	Muzaffarpur	Bochahan
		Kaanti
		Mushhari
		Parati East
		Gaighat
	Vaishali	Ganipur
		Patepur
Chhapra	Sarmasapur	
Rajasthan	Bikaner	Lunkaransar

Andhra Pradesh	Nalgonda	Suryapet
		Chivemla
		Mothey

4.1.1.2 Villages and Schools

Table 4.1.1.2 Villages and Schools Covered

State	Villages	Schools
Uttar Pradesh	08	08
Bihar	13	11
Rajasthan	11	11
Andhra Pradesh	11	11
Total	43	41

4.1.1.3 School Types

- The survey covered three types of schools. These were: (a) Those supported by Plan and those who are not; (b) Whether they were primary, upper primary, and secondary; and (c) whether they were owned by the government or private group.

Table 4.1.1. The Study Coverage: School Types

State	With Plan		Levels			Ownership	
	Yes	No	Primary	Upper Primary	Secondary	Govt.	Private
Uttar Pradesh	04	04	04	02	02	04	04
Bihar	06	05	05	04	02	08	03
Rajasthan	04	07	03	06	02	07	04
Andhra Pradesh	05	06	05	03	03	10	01
Total	19	22	17	15	09	29	12

- As shown in the above table, the survey treated both the Plan supported schools and those which weren't, equally. Of the total schools covered, the former's and the latter's shares were 46.3 % and 53.7 % respectively. Of the different levels of schools covered under the survey, primary and upper primary schools (Classes 1 to 7 / 8) comprised 78 % of the total. In terms of the ownership of the schools surveyed, government schools (70.7 %) outweighed those run by private trusts / groups (29.2 %).

4.1.2 Coverage of the stakeholders group

- The study covered **1984** individuals belonging to different stakeholders groups as shown in the table below. Children constituted the largest group (82.6%). There were three types of children groups that the research team interacted with. These were school children (65.3%); children who were members of different forums (14.8 %); and, children who were covered as the case study group (2.41 %).
- From the non-children groups, teachers formed the largest group (10.8 %), followed by the staff members of Plan's partner NGOs (2.92 %), members of the different community groups concerned with education at the village level (2.57 %); and, the officials belonging to the state governments' education department at the district and block levels (1.05 %).

Table 4.1.2 The Study Coverage: Stakeholders Types

Stakeholders Groups	Uttar Pradesh	Bihar	Rajasthan	Andhra Pradesh	Total
School Children	232	312	370	383	1297
Children's Forum Members	075	073	---	146	0294
Case Study Children	005	005	005	033	0048
Teachers	034	053	047	081	0215
Communities' Forum Members	005	024	010	012	0051
Government Officials	008	002	003	008	0021
Members of Plan's partner NGOs	008	025	015	010	0058
Total	367	494	450	673	1984

- If looked at in terms of distribution across the four survey states, it was Andhra Pradesh where the research team interacted with the largest number of stakeholders (33.8 %), followed by Bihar (24.9 %), Rajasthan (22.6 %), and Uttar Pradesh (18.5 %). In terms of the total number of children the team interacted with during the course of the survey, Andhra Pradesh is well ahead (34.2 %) of others.
- It may be mentioned here that Rajasthan loses out on the fact that the villages the team visited did not have any children's forum in place. On the other hand, it could meet as many as 146 children belonging to different children's forums in Andhra Pradesh; 49.6 % of the total children met under this category.
- Same is the case when it comes to covering the case study children. Of the total number of children covered using this particular research tool, Andhra Pradesh provided 68.7 % of them. The others' contribution was 10.4 % each.

4.1.3 Coverage of children

- It was indeed a privilege for the research team to have been able to interact with so many children (see below). Everywhere the team went, children just flocked to meet and converse. The team was touched by their warmth and trust. Despite the delicate topic the team carried and despite the probing (that followed) into their personal lives and thoughts, not a child queried or doubted a couple of strangers' capabilities to do justice to such a serious issue.
- As the following two tables (Tables 4.1.3.1 & 4.1.3.2) show, The research team interacted with 1591 children across the four survey states, comprising mainly of school going children (both girls and boys) and the members of various children organizations PLAN's partner NGOs have facilitated. Of these, the team could not account for the gender distribution of 100 children in Andhra Pradesh.

Table 4.1.3.1 The Study Coverage: Children

Survey States	Children Interacted with				
	Girls	Boys	Sub Total	Children Forums Members	Total
Uttar Pradesh	108	124	232	075	307
Bihar	186	126	312	073	385
Rajasthan	178	192	370	--	370
Andhra Pradesh	138	145	283	146	429
	Additional Children		100	--	100
Total	610	587	1297	294	1591

- In terms of percentages, the distribution is as follows. The research team is glad to report that could maintain parity in terms of the number of girls and boys it interacted with.

Table 4.1.3.2 The Study Coverage: Children (%)

Survey States	Children Interacted with (%)					
	W/o counting CF* members & others		Counting CF* members & others			
	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	CF	Others
Uttar Pradesh	46.55	53.45	35.17	40.39	24.42	--
Bihar	59.62	40.38	48.31	32.72	18.96	--
Rajasthan	48.11	51.89	48.11	51.89	--	--
Andhra Pradesh	48.76	51.24	26.08	27.41	27.59	18.90

* CF – Children's Forums

4.2 Research tools: The contents

- 4.2.1 In chapter two, particularly in sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 (pp 21, 22), there is a reference to the research team's tool kit on the field. As explained then, it comprised of group exercises, focused group discussions, and interviews. In the present section, a brief description of the tools' contents is given.
- 4.2.2 Whenever the research team members interacted with the stakeholders in the field, individually or in groups, they conducted group exercises, carried out focused group discussions, and held interviews (as the case may be). These interactions, in one way or the other, focused on seven (07) basic issues concerning corporal punishment.
- 4.2.3 In other words, the study's research tool typology can be summarized as shown in the table given below:

Table 4.2.3: The Contents of the Research Tools used

Sr. No.	Research Tools	Contents
1	Group exercise 1	Punishments: prevalence, types, extent, reasons
	Group exercise 2	Responses on FIVE given statements
	Group exercise 3	Punishments: Negotiable and Non-negotiable
	Group exercise 4	Children's perceptions on related issues (to corporal punishment)
2	FGD 1	Key concepts
	FGD 2	Learning and Teaching
	FGD 3	Stakeholders proximity to the core of education
3	Interview	Both structured and freewheeling depending on the interviewee and the case study child
4	Case Study	

4.2.4 The following paragraphs describe the contents, in brief:

4.2.4.1 Punishments: prevalence, types, extent, reasons

- In this exercise, the children's groups were asked to (a) discuss among the respective members and (b) write or list down on a piece of paper or on the black board, the prevalence of punishment -and corporal punishment -in their schools and homes. They were also further expected to list / narrate the punishment types, their extent, and the reasons they thought they were always punished for.

4.2.4.2 Responses on five given statements

- The children's groups were given a set of five sentences to which they had to respond- in terms of yes; no; or anything else that came to their minds then - in writing. The statements were:
 - **Children should never be punished;**
 - **Children should be moderately punished;**
 - **Children should be punished physically;**
 - **Children are meant to be punished; and,**
 - **There should be a legal ban on corporal punishment**

4.2.4.3 Punishments: Negotiable and Non-negotiable

- In this particular group exercises the children were asked a very pointed question, "If you do not know a punishment free school or a home – and this will be ideal – how about thinking of punishments that you all can take into your stride and those you can't?"
- They were to discuss this in groups and write down their opinion and views.

4.2.4.4 Children's perceptions on related issues

- The children participants were asked to (a) discuss in a group and (b) write or list down on a piece of paper or on the black board their perceptions on issues related to corporal punishment. A set of issues were given: Education, Teacher, Schools, and parents. They could also speak on a related issue / issues not found in the set given to them.
- After the list was prepared, the members were asked to prioritize its contents.

4.2.4.5 Discussion on key concepts

- The stakeholders' groups were asked to look at a set of cards. Each of these cards had a word written/printed on it which referred to the list of concepts given in the table in 2.1.2 (pp 21). These exercises had to be carried out in the open as a large group of people had to look at these cards simultaneously and choose the concepts they would like to speak on later during the group discussions. Ideally, the team would have liked one participant to elaborate only on one concept but very rarely did it happen that there were same / more numbers of participants than the number of concepts. In Andhra Pradesh, these cards had the Telugu equivalent of the concepts printed/written on them. As it turned out, the exercises pertaining to this particular research tool were carried out in the schools' courtyards, in

the shaded corners of the playgrounds, under the trees (in Uttar Pradesh particularly) and in some cases – where enough space was available – even in the staff rooms. Once the participants made their respective choices (of the concept cards), the ensuing discussion/s were facilitated by the team member/s through three stages.

- **Stage one**

- The member should speak on her/his preferred concept/s;
- The member can speak on more than one concepts; and,
- The member should not get into a general discussion. S/he should try to define the concept as s/he thinks fit and elaborate in the context of the children as well prevailing social environment.

- **Stage two**

- After all the members had their say, the group was asked to prioritize these concepts as they relate to the prevailing education and social environs; and
- Their reasons for constructing a particular order.

- **Stage three**

- In the last stage of the discussion, the members were asked to categorize the concepts they have defined and discussed into: (a) those who have shown positive change in the last decade; (b) those who have not changed; and (c) those who have deteriorated.

4.2.4.6 **Learning and Teaching**

- The stakeholders were presented with a specified topic to think aloud and discuss their views. The topic was: “Who do they think is more important in schooling; Learning or Teaching? And, why? ”

4.2.4.7 **Stakeholders’ proximity to the core of education**

- The stakeholders were presented with a specified topic to think aloud and discuss their views. The topic was: “Among the stakeholders concerned with corporal punishment, who they think is at the core of the education process?” (the stakeholders responses are given in the chapter that follows.

4.3 Research tools: The application

- 4.3.1 The picture that emerges after the tools have been applied in the field and the survey was completed in all the four case study states is given in the form of a table on the following page.
- 4.3.2 The table quite succinctly reveals how the research tools were received in the field by the audience. In fact, it provides a very good feed back not only on the compatibility of the tools, but also indicates the quality of interaction that the research team has had with the audience and how it varied across the states.
- 4.3.3 Before concluding the present chapter, a set of observations made on the basis of the table mentioned above merit a place here. In the chapter that follows, the analytical findings of the project are presented.
- 4.3.3.1 The foremost observation from the table is regarding the number of exercises the team could involve the stakeholders into. Even though, as mentioned in section 2.2.1, the team had already decided to accord the top priority to children as a stakeholders group before the survey commenced, the sheer difference in the volume of interactions the team could conduct with them and the rest is a good indicator of not only the (quality of) overall response the team enjoyed in the field but also the level of concern the stakeholders share on corporal punishment.
- 4.3.3.2 The total number of interactions (530) the research team could conduct and their distribution both across the stakeholders groups and the states are shown in the table that follows (Table 4.3.3.2). Among these, 57.3 % of interactions were with the school children, followed by the members of the children's forum (15.5 %). Put together they amount to more than 70 % of the total interactions barring some overlap.. The next noticeable figures are the number of interactions the team has had with teachers (15.3 %) and the PU staff members (5.06 %) respectively.

Table 4.3.3.2: Interactions with the Stakeholders Groups

States	Research Tools used	SH 1	SH 2	SH 3	SH 4	SH 5	SH 6	Total
Uttar Pradesh	Group Exercise 1	11	06					017
	Group Exercise 2	11	10					021
	Group Exercise 3	12	03					015
	Group Exercise 4	07	03					010
	FGD 1			07	03		02	012
	FGD 2			07	03		02	012
	FGD 3			07	02		02	011
	Interviews					03		003
	Case Study	12						012
Sub Total		053	021	022	008	003	006	114

Bihar	Group Exercise 1	22	09					031
	Group Exercise 2	16	09					025
	Group Exercise 3	04	07					011
	Group Exercise 4	16	10					026
	FGD 1	05	02	05	01		04	017
	FGD 2	05		05	01		04	015
	FGD 3	05		05	01		04	015
	Interviews					03		003
	Case Study	07						007
Sub Total		080	037	015	003	003	012	150
Rajasthan	Group Exercise 1	32						032
	Group Exercise 2	19						019
	Group Exercise 3	10						010
	Group Exercise 4	19						019
	FGD 1			04	02		02	008
	FGD 2			04	02		02	008
	FGD 3			04	02		02	008
	Interviews					03		003
	Case Study	05						005
Sub Total		085		012	006	003	006	112
Andhra Pradesh	Group Exercise 1	11	05					016
	Group Exercise 2	11	05					016
	Group Exercise 3	11	05					016
	Group Exercise 4	11	05					016
	FGD 1	09	04	11	02	01	01	028
	FGD 2			11	02	01	01	015
	FGD 3			11	02	01	01	015
	Interviews							---
	Case Study	33						033
Sub Total		086	024	033	006	003	003	157
Grand Total		304	083	081	023	012	027	530

Legend: SH1 to 6 refer to school children, children forum members, teachers, community groups, government officials, and the PU staff respectively. For the research tools' description, kindly refer to table 4.2.3.

4.3.3.2 There was much more to it than what the sheer difference in the volume indicates. As clearly brought out later (see chapter five), the difference in the quality of interactions almost matched the difference in volume. Everywhere the team went; children not only came out to meet them in huge numbers, but readily shared their tales of woes. This "sharing" was frank, candid, and to the full; a heady mix of sadness and wry humor. On the other hand, the team found the rest of the stakeholders - except for a couple of groups of PU staff both in Bihar and Rajasthan respectively - to be secretive, disinterested, and indifferent to the subject on hand.

- 4.3.3.3 If, both the volume and the quality of interactions together are any indication of the CONCERN the case-state communities have towards (the prevalence of) corporal punishment, a very alarming scenario emerges. The way this “curve of concern” (if plotted using the above figures) nosedives away from children should cause utmost concern to all.
- 4.3.3.4 The total number of interactions (comprising of group exercises, focused group discussions, interviews, case studies etc.) the research team has had with all the stake holders across the four states presents an interesting scenario (Table 4.3.3.4):

Table 4.3.3.4: A summary of state-wise interactions held

States	SH 1	SH 2	SH 3	SH 4	SH 5	SH 6
Uttar Pradesh	53	22	22	08	03	06
Bihar	80	37	15	03	03	12
Rajasthan	85	00	12	03	03	06
Andhra Pradesh	86	24	33	03	03	03

- In terms of the team’s interactions with the school children (SH 1), Uttar Pradesh offer the lowest value while Andhra Pradesh the highest. At the time of the team’s visit, the schools were in a spate of holidays. In all the remaining three states, children flocked to interact with the team.
- With respect to the members of the children’s forums (SH2), the team’s visits to Bihar and Andhra Pradesh were the most fruitful. The villages the team visited have large children’s forums. In order to effectively interact with them, the team had to divide them into more groups than it did in Uttar Pradesh and hence the increased number of interactions. Rajasthan looses out on this count because the villages the team visited did not have similar organized groups of children.
- In Andhra Pradesh again, the team could interact with the teachers (SH 3), in each and every school it visited. It was not the case so for the other states. In Rajasthan, the remoteness of the villages meant not enough number of teachers on many occasions to initiate any exercise or discussion. The team had to satisfy with informal chat only. In Uttar Pradesh, despite the holidays the team could meet a sufficiently large number of teachers.
- The team had to struggle through out the survey to meet enough number of community groups (SH 4) to have real meaningful interactions. These village level groups are officially entrusted with managing the affairs related to education and schooling. Both in UP and Bihar the team was told that these groups exist in every village but on “paper only”. In Andhra Pradesh the

government had just passed an ordinance dispersing all the existing village level education committees. Of the 25 meetings the team could have with such groups across the four states, most of them were either the parents' groups or the parents-teachers associations. The team could not meet a genuine village level education committee that was alive and functioning.

- There were two exceptions to the above, however. One in Bihar; the other in Rajasthan. In Muzaffarpur town, the team had a very fruitful conversation with a *mohalla* (a neighborhood) education committee, comprising of parents, politicians, social workers, college going youth etc. , that seemed to take its job very seriously. The other exception the team came across in Rajasthan was the “desert school” in village Kailaan, where also the community group charged with such responsibilities did show up for the meeting.
- Almost in the same vein were the team's interactions with the government officials (SH 5) concerned with education and school affairs; limited in number and short on conversation. Again, Andhra Pradesh proved to be a saving grace for the team could engage a tidy little team of block level officials in more than an hour long discussion and brain storming.
- With regard to the team's interactions with the staff of Plan's partner NGOs in the four states, it was a different experience. Even though (dealing with the prevalence of) corporal punishment does not formally figure as an agenda in their work plans, the team could easily see the rapport these NGOs, especially their field level workers, share with the communities and children.



Chapter Five

Analytical Findings

5.0 Introduction

- 5.0.1 The present chapter on the findings of the study follows a particular structure. This structure has enabled the research team to present the essential residue of all the interactive, participatory, and learning processes it held with the stakeholders during the course of the study.
- 5.0.2 The study's findings are divided into main findings and general findings. The former are specific in nature and substantiated by both qualitative and quantitative data. They are further categorized by the respective research outputs the team had envisaged when the study began. In order to extract patterns that are not only realistic but context specific, the findings have also been examined both for their commonness and distinctiveness across the states. The analysis is further strengthened with the research team's comments on each of the main findings. The latter, on the other hand, are generic in nature and have emerged from the research team's intuitions, observations, broad interpretation of the situations in the field and the data it has gathered using different research tools. These findings are non specific in nature and are, in majority part, common across the four case study states.

5.1 Main Findings

5.1.1 Research Output: **Corporal Punishment; Nature, Types, and Prevalence**

- **The Punishment Matrix**
 - The research team has made an effort to capture the essence of corporal punishment as prevalent in the case study states by constructing a "**Punishment Matrix**" (given below). The matrix categorizes punishment into two basic types: Non Physical and Corporal (Physical). Both are further examined along a scale of intensity that has four notches respectively of moderate, high, severe, and torturous. The contents of each punitive act given in the matrix are again seen respectively from the viewpoint of its commonness across the four states and its uniqueness. Lastly, the source of the punishment – both at the home and the school – completes the matrix.
 - The matrix also indicates that there are thirty one (31) punishment types common to the case study states of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, and Andhra Pradesh. Also, there are seventeen (17) punishment types unique to the respective case study states.

Table 5.1.1: The Punishment Matrix

← P u n i s h m e n t s * →					
Type	Intensity	Common		Unique	
		Home	School	Home	School
Non Physical	Moderate	Coaxing others to punish	Threatening	The women-folk abusing (verbal) the girls ^{3,4}	Tearing up notebooks ²
		Threatening			
	High	Scolding	Scolding		Monetary Penalty ^{2,4}
		Verbal Abusing	Verbal Abusing		
		Locking up			
P h y s i c a l o r C o r p o r a l	Moderate		Hands above the head		Stand for long with the nose touching a wall ²
			Rooster position		
			Chair Position		
			Sit Ups		
			Running		
	High	Making children Work	Ear pulling	Hitting hard on the head with Knuckles ¹	Standing on one leg for a long time ¹
		Pencilng**	Pencilng **	Headstand ¹	Overthrowing ¹
	Severe	Beating with hands	Standing in the Sun	Beating with cooking tongs ³	Beating with a rubber belt ³
		Beating with Fists	Palming***	Beating with a broom ³	Beating with footwear ³
		Beating with a stick, Cane		Denying Sleep ²	
		Beating with Footwear	Beating with Hands		
		Hair Pulling	Beating with fists	Throwing by pulling hair ³	
		Kicking	Bearing with a Stick, Cane		
		Denying Food			
	Torturous	Lock up and beat		Making a child swallow chilly powder to stop her / him from crying ³	
		Tie hands or feet or both and then beat		Keep a child suspended from the ceiling ⁴	
					Beat till bleeds ¹

* Reported by Children ** Keep a pencil between two fingers & twist *** Hitting the palm with a stick

1 – Uttar Pradesh; 2 – Bihar; 3 – Rajasthan; 4 – Andhra Pradesh

- Further insights into the issue can be gained using two sub-matrices - one each for the two punishment types; common and unique – formulated from the main matrix.
- **Sub-matrix One: Common Punishments**
 - The following table (Table 5.1.1.1) lists the common types of punishments the different stakeholder groups reported, especially the children, to the research team during the survey.

Table 5.1.1.1 Common Non-Physical and Corporal Punishments

Punishment Type	Intensity	At Home	At School	Total
Non Physical	Moderate	02	01	03
	High	03	02	05
Corporal	Moderate	---	05	05
	High	02	02	04
	Severe	07	05	12
	Torturous	02	---	02
Total		16	15	31

- Of the sixteen (16) common types of punishment inflicted at home, non-physical punishments constitute a mere thirty one (31) per cent. In other words, every ten times a child is punished at home in these areas, seven times s/he is likely to receive corporal punishment. The data also suggest that at schools, his/her chances of receiving corporal punishment are even higher [non physical punishment component is only twenty (20) per cent].
- Another look at the table however reveals that this is not true at all. Homes hardly provide children with any friendly environs. In fact, within the realm of corporal punishment,
 - (a) The chances of a child receiving only a moderate corporal punishment are high at school while at home they are non-existent. In fact, there are no moderate corporal punishments given at home.
 - (b) The intensity of corporal punishment is the key factor here. Of the eleven (11) types of corporal punishment inflicted at home, more than 80 per cent are of either severe or torturous intensity. At schools, children do not receive torturous punishments at all. Even within the types of corporal punishment inflicted at schools, forty one (41) per cent are of moderate intensity.

- **Common Findings**

- Corporal Punishment (CP) is an accepted way of life in schools and at homes. In all the forty-one (41) schools and surrounding communities the team visited, corporal punishment stood out as a common theme. The children also mentioned that the situation was no different at home.
- Almost all teachers and parents, covered under the study, had no hesitation in accepting that they punish children physically. Many argued the children can not be disciplined without punishment. As one of the parents met in Rajasthan put it, "Children invite punishment by their behavior but whether they should be punished moderately or severely depends on the stamina the children possess.
- The research team saw a stick in the classroom or in the hands of the teachers everywhere it went. In more than twenty (20) schools the team visited, the students actually showed or pointed out the stick with which they are beaten.
- The most common forms of punishments are hitting with hands & stick, pulling hair and ears, and asking the children to stand – for long periods - in various positions. Threatening to be physically violent is also used as a punishment to create fear among the children.
- The team also intermittently came across more severe forms of corporal punishment afflicted on children; such as: Being kicked severely, making them starve (at home), tying them (with rope) to chairs / poles followed by beatings, assigning physically strenuous work both at home and outside (usually in the fields) etc.
- A child often faces a series of punishment for the same /single "offence". The team came across a number of cases where the sequence of punishments started with the teacher. The same child is then punished by the head teacher for having "invited" the punishment. Yet another round of punishment – generally, beating – awaits the same child at home if the parents come to know that s/he had been punished in the school.
- At schools, the incidence of corporal punishment was found to be quite common and alarmingly frequent. In all the schools the team visited there would be at least five (05) beatings per class per day, not counting other moderate forms of punishment.
- Inflicting punishment on children is a part of the teachers' tool kit or a "justified" extension of the teachers' repertoire!
- The team did not witness any act of corporal punishment being inflicted on school children in its presence, it caught a good number of teachers in the acts of

threatening (Uttar Pradesh); rushing towards a group with a cane in his hand (Bihar); shouting abusively (Rajasthan); and even merely using the language of the eyes (Andhra Pradesh).

- Discussions with teachers across all the four (04) states - especially in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Andhra Pradesh – revealed that there were just too many students for them to handle. “Punishments come handy to control this crowd”, said a teacher in Uttar Pradesh pointing out the class he is expected to “teach” every day. The team did not find a single school (from those visited) where the teacher/s’ did not bring up the issue of a very lop-sided teachers to students ratio.
- Almost all teachers point out, particularly in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar, at the severe lack of time they have to spend inside (a) classrooms with students, and (b) in schools. They are held accountable to so many non-teaching tasks by the government that they could hardly concentrate on their job. Their inability to say “no” to the employer (read government) leaves them frustrated and angry; children often becoming handy victims when these feelings vent out.
- The team received a general feeling that while the younger crop of teachers are not very prompt at inflicting punishment, very senior teachers also now repent the fact that they have used the rod too frequently. It is the middle aged and mid-career teachers who both believe and are engaged in punishing.
- The teachers of “private” schools in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Rajasthan revealed that it was “competition (in the market)” that discourage them to beat students. Of course, it does not stop them from punishing as the students of those schools reported.
- The survey very clearly identified Home as the source of most severe and cruel forms of punishment meted out to children. In comparison, the punishments meted out in schools pale in severity.
- At homes, the child is at a severe disadvantage because generally it will be one against many. The team did not come across any case where the child has a respite from either of the parents. Both inflict beatings. In many cases, even the elder siblings will join.
- In schools, teachers are hesitant to punish beyond a limit because of the perceived pressures from the parents and the communities. In extreme cases even the children could retaliate. At home, inside four walls, the parents do not face such pressures. They are the “owners” and “masters” of their wards!
- The research team also found that at home it is NOT just a question of mothers beating daughters and fathers beating sons. Both parents are involved in beating all their wards, irrespective of gender.

- That Mothers beat softly, is also a myth. Children, all across, reported that mothers can also thrash and severely at that. Smaller children who generally hover around their mothers are the worst sufferers. Many children reported of getting beaten by wares used in cooking, such as iron tongs, iron rods, grippers etc. Not only these items have pronounced edges and corners, but they can leave burns as well.
- Both in Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh, the favorite punishment of mothers were found to be abusing and kicking. A woman member of a parents-teachers' association the team met in Andhra Pradesh confessed in all seriousness that she (and other women she knew) thrash children out of no particular reason. They just happened to be in her way when she is angry or frustrated or is looking to vent out her feelings.
- A large number of children (above 40 %) report that they consider "WORKING" as yet another form of punishment only. They referred to working as what they are forcefully made to do – against their will - at home and outside. A children's group when in Rajasthan, when asked to list the punishment its members receive at home, promptly listed about ten household and related chores. The list did not include a single conventional punishment such as scolding, beating, slapping etc.
- The team, however, found some students-groups in Rajasthan (particularly in the villages of Dhirdaan and Kailaan) tried to play down the status of violence in homes by reporting that their parents did not beat them but their neighbors' children are subject to severe corporal punishment!
- **State specific findings**
 - In all the four states the team visited, it came across a large number of vociferous groups of children reporting some of the cruelest forms of punishment they receive at homes. These are given below.
 - **Uttar Pradesh:** Making children starve; Inflict burns on their hands
 - **Bihar:** Tying to a chair with rope followed by severe beating; Making children starve
 - **Rajasthan:** Beating followed by pouring chilly powder down the throat of the child if s/he cries
 - **Andhra Pradesh:** Tying a thick wooden rod along the child's underarms and the back of the knee and then keep her/him suspended from the ceiling for long hours.

- **Sub-matrix Two: Unique Punishments**

- The team also came across (as given in the punishment matrix) a number of punishments (both non-physical and physical) that are unique to each of the case study state. Interestingly, there are punishment types in this category too that is shared by more than one state (Table 5.1.1.2).

Table 5.1.1.2: Unique Non-Physical and Corporal Punishments

Punishment Type	Intensity	UP	Bihar	Rajasthan	AP	Total
Non Physical	Moderate	---	---	---	---	---
	High	---	02	01	02	05
Corporal	Moderate	---	01	---	---	01
	High	04	---	---	---	04
	Severe	---	01	05	---	06
	Torturous	01	---	01	01	03
Total		05	04	07	03	19

- (a) The research team relates unique punishments – especially of the severe and torturous varieties – to what can only be termed as perverse creativity, available in plenty with parents mostly.
 - (b) Interestingly, none of the four case study states display any moderate types of non physical punishment of the unique category.
 - (c) Non physical punishments that are unique in nature form only twenty six (26) per cent of the total. Within the category of corporal punishments that are unique to these states; sixty four (64) per cent are of the severe and torturous intensities.
 - (d) In terms of individual states, Rajasthan stands out both in terms of the type and intensity of unique corporal punishments. Its share of fifty (50) per cent in terms of the total types of unique punishments and eighty five (85) per cent in term of their intensities being severe and torturous, is well ahead of Uttar Pradesh (35; 20); Bihar (29; 50); and, Andhra Pradesh (21).
- The twin states of Bihar and Andhra Pradesh stand out in one more aspect too (Table 5.1.1.3).

Table 5.1.1.3: Bihar & Andhra Pradesh–Offences & Punishments for School Children

Bihar (in Schools)		Andhra Pradesh (in Schools)	
“Offence”	Punishment	“Offence”	Punishment
No Uniform	Sent back	Late coming	50 sit ups; Beating
Homework not done	Tear the notebook	Homework not done	2 beats on the hand
Talking in the class	Sent out	Not taking down notes in the class	Stand like a chair
Late for the prayers	Stand in a corner the whole day	Absent during the prayer	70 sit ups
Lessons not done	Note to parents	Can not answer the questions	5 beats
Late paying of fees	Not allowed to seat in the exams	Making noise in the class	Stand on the bench
Dirty uniform	Keep standing with the nose touching the wall	Waste food (mid day meal)	Beating
Oversized Nails	Beating	Long absence	Monetary Fine (Rs.1)
Long absence	Monetary Fine	No proper pleating (hair)	Monetary Fine (Rs. 0.50)
Mistakes at the Roll Call	Stand on the bench	No Uniform	Beatings
		No bathing	Stand in the Sun
		Fine not paid	10 hits on the knuckles

- The research team’s earlier observations about homes / parents being stronger sources of corporal punishment than schools / teachers have to be also seen in the light of the above table. The schools, in general, may not inflict torturous punishments on the students; they can be quite clinical in their approach to “designing” punishment for the erring children as the above example might suggest. During the course of the study, the research team met several groups of children who strongly associated a particular type of punishment with a particular offence, no where did it find the schools having very precisely worked out – almost a manual - as to what type of offences deserve what kind of punishment than the two cases depicted in the above table. The two cases refer to Bihar (A girls’ high school in Muzaffarpur town) and Andhra Pradesh (An upper primary school in Raynanguda village in Nalgonda district).

- **Comments**

- Levying monetary penalties – however meager they may be - on the students as an alternative to corporal punishment (at schools) will bring additional burden on the parents whose economic and social positions in the first place are a deterrent factor to their wards' education.
- In general, girls might be seen as receiving less / less intensive types of corporal punishments, but they are more vulnerable to several prevailing social practices such as child marriage, dowry, imposed marriage, early marriage etc and are perceived as punishments by them. This social warp also underlines the inherent insensitivity the society harbors towards its children as they befall punishments that might have life threatening repercussions.
- It is apparent, from what the research team has observed that Andhra Pradesh has more children friendly schools than the other three states. Perhaps, the banning of corporal punishment in schools in 2002 is finally bearing some fruit. Moreover, this is one state (from among the four studied) where school children are better organized as groups.
- Also in Andhra Pradesh, especially in the areas that the team visited, the community based monitoring of schools and teachers, initiated by local community institutions and / or local political parties, seem to be working well. It is another issue that even for such “enlightened” community entities corporal punishment as a social issue is not an important agenda.

5.1.2 Research Output: **Corporal Punishment; Children's Perceptions and Understanding**

- We have divided their views in two categories. The first category comprises of views the children of all the four study-states hold in common. These views are part of a larger belief system and do not vary with geography or culture. The second category comprises of views that are very specific.
- **Common findings**
 - Corporal punishment is desirable as it has a huge corrective value
 - Punishment-free schools and homes do not exist
 - Parents and teachers have a right to subject children to corporal punishment otherwise they would go astray
 - The injury (resulting out of a punishment) is not as painful as the act of punishment
 - Corporal punishment is a just reward for bad behavior

- Legislation banning corporal punishment to children is neither desirable nor acceptable
- **State specific findings**
 - *“Punishment ought to be made mandatory for children.”* (A primary-school boy student, village Bargadai, Maharajgunj district, Uttar Pradesh)
 - *“.....sir is a good teacher; so what, if he beats?sir does not beat, but does not teach either.”* (A primary school girl student, village Badkidali, Maharajgunj district, Uttar Pradesh)
 - *“If we wear a colorful dress to the school on a non-uniform day, the teacher punishes us.”* (A group of secondary-school girl students, Muzaffarpur town, Bihar)
 - *“I feel depressed when my mother beats me but I continue to do mischief.”* (A drop-out boy student from village Parati (East), Muzaffarpur district, Bihar)
 - *“We are beaten mercilessly at the school. As a result, we are no longer able to sit properly.”* (A group of boys from upper primary school, village 465 RD, Bikaner district, Rajasthan)
 - *“None of us agree with these exercises aimed at finding out how and why and by who we are punished”* (A group of girls of upper primary school, village Malkisar Pimpri, Bikaner district, Rajasthan)
 - One illustration of what the children (N=33) of a primary school (village: Gunjaluru; district: Nalgonda; Andhra Pradesh) go through, in terms of the punishments, at their homes and school respectively is given in the following table (Table 5.1.2).

Table 5.1.2: Countering Punishments

At	Type	% (to total)
Home	Scolding	100.00
	Beating	100.00
	Standing like a chair	72.00
	Denial of food	21.00
	Burning of hand	03.00
	Tied and beaten	03.00
School	Scolding	100.00
	Pinching of ears	36.00
	Beating	100.00
	Hitting on knuckles	30.00
	Standing in the Sun	87.00
	Standing like a chair	100.00

Source: FGD sheet of the concerned group

- *“I have a model of discipline to tackle the students....Between the Baalwadi and the Primary School, there should not be any punishment; little punishment for students between primary and upper primary; moderate punishment for the students belonging to class above upper primary but up to high school; and, corporal punishment – if required – for the students of the high school and above...”* (a girl student from secondary school, village Chandupetla, Nalgonda district, Andhra Pradesh)
- **Comments**
 - The children also accept corporal punishment as way of life. They also believe that it is required to some extent and in some form. During the interaction with the team, however, they rated violence (involved in corporal punishment) in a descending order of preference. They have, however, differences of opinion in terms of the severity of punishments.
 - The children are at the receiving end all the time. During the team’s discussions with members of children’s forums – in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Andhra Pradesh – children voiced the need to be consulted for matters directly related to them / their life. It was observed that dialogue between teachers and students or parents and children is completely missing. The teachers and parents even questioned the need for having dialogue with the children.
 - Children harbor varied views on corporal punishment. They share them matter-of-factly and with candor that sometimes borders on rare humor. It is to their great credit that despite having no respite in violence meted out to them, by parents and by teachers, they want to just carry on with living.

5.1.3 Research Output: **Corporal Punishment; Children’s Stand.....1**

- Even though in terms of voicing their feelings about corporal punishment the team found that the children formed a mixed group. There were children; some of them have been covered under the case studies, who were very emotional about the issue. There were others who have been not abused so badly and hence have taken a matter-of-fact view of the same subject.
- From the view point of research, however, the team wanted the children to objectively respond to such a sensitive issue too. The concerned research tool was thus geared towards facilitating the children to look at corporal punishment both from subjective and objective viewpoints. The foregoing section (5.1.2) gave a glimpse of the subjective component while the present section makes an effort to share, in a more formal manner, what objective stand the children seem to take on corporal punishment.

- The research tool used for this particular purpose sought, primarily from the children, answers / responses to two sets of questions. In one (given below), the children’s groups were given a list of five statements for them to take a stand by writing whether they agree or don’t to the contents. In the other (see the following section), they were asked to objectively suggest, should the corporal punishment could not be wished away, what are non-negotiable and negotiable punishments.
- The list contained the following five statements:
 - Children should never be punished (1)
 - Children should be moderately punished (2)
 - Children should be punished physically (3)
 - Children are meant to be punished (4)
 - There should be a legal ban on corporal punishment (5)
- The children’s (as in groups) responses to the above statements are presented below through a series of tables. The figures in brackets correspond to the figures given at the end of each statement above. The figures in the cells, however, refer to the percentage distribution of the children’s responses in terms of their either agreeing or disagreeing to the statements.
- There are four types of tables:
 - Type One: Common for all the four states;
 - Type Two: Disaggregated at the state level;
 - Type Three: One case (Andhra Pradesh), where stakeholders other than children were asked to respond to the statements; and,
 - Type Four: For each state; one typical response and one atypical response
- **Common Findings**
 - Were all the children the team interacted with across the four states to take a common stand on the different aspects of corporal punishment as given above, it would be akin to what is given below:

Table 5.1.3: A Common Stand by the Children

States	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Agree	Don't								
All the four states N = 664	25.4	74.6	92.3	07.7	32.2	67.8	3.9	96.1	21.3	78.4

- Just about 1/4 of children feel that they should never be punished. But the rest do not agree. What is notable about this particular information is that the figure is much higher than the team expected after completing the survey in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The children from Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh have pushed up this figure considerably (see later).
- All the children, however, overwhelmingly agree with the idea that moderate punishment is required.
- More than 1/3 of children agree that they deserve corporal punishment. They counter so much violence, mostly in terms of punishments that involve physical abuse, in the two environs - home and school - they spend their entire time during their growing years that they tend to accept it as a life-defining phenomenon. Again, the per cent of children not agreeing to accept corporal punishment is higher than expected.
- As expected, a negligible number of children agree that they are meant to be punished only.
- What was not expected, however, was such a high figure for not agreeing to a legal ban on corporal punishment. The team's observation in this regard was that most children equated legal ban on corporal punishment to their teachers ending up behind the bars. Despite them being a major source of corporal punishment, teachers still remain a very revered figure for children. How can one punish the person who retains the power to punish others?
- **State Specific Findings**
 - State specific findings are given below (Table 5.1.3.1). The state of Rajasthan stands out for registering more normal distribution in terms of the children's stand on corporal punishment than the other three states who have registered a polarized stand from the children. Among these, Uttar Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh have more children taking a polarized stand than Bihar.
 - On comparing the data with what was actually seen and observed in the field, the team found that both Uttar Pradesh and Bihar typify the reality not only in terms of the prevalence of corporal punishment but also in terms of the children accepting it as a cultural trait of the society they live in. Their stand is almost unanimous in all the five queries: Most children (Uttar Pradesh 90.6 %; Bihar 93.8%) disagree that they should never be punished; Most (91.3% and 95.5) agree that they should be given moderate punishment; Many(79.7%) in Uttar Pradesh only agree that they could be subjected to corporal punishment also; even though all (100 % and 100 %) disagree that they are meant to be punished; and, of course many of them (68.8% and 71.2%) feel that there can not be a legal ban

on corporal punishment. Bihar throws up a surprise in the manner that 77.8% of the children disagree that they deserve corporal punishment. It is difficult to explain this statistical aberration at this juncture, except that in comparison to the other three states, the team could engage significantly less number of children to this particular research query.

- At first glance, the children from Andhra Pradesh also seem to take a common stand with their counterparts from Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. A re-look suggests that they differ in three critical aspects. One: A more than 1/4 of the children agreed that they should never be punished. Two: Almost all (94.7%), among the four states the highest figure, believe that they did not deserve corporal punishment. At the same time almost the same per cent (96.8), again the highest among the four, are not in favor of legally banning corporal punishment.

Table 5.1.3.1: State-wise Stand by the Children

States	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Agree	Don't								
Uttar Pradesh N = 173	09.2	90.6	91.3	08.7	79.7	20.3	--	100	31.2	68.8
Bihar N = 45	06.2	93.8	95.5	04.5	22.2	77.8	--	100	28.8	71.2
Rajasthan N = 126	54.7	45.3	77.3	22.2	38.8	66.2	19.0	81.0	51.5	48.5
Andhra Pradesh N = 317	25.5	74.5	99.0	01.0	05.3	94.7	0.6	99.4	3.2	96.8

- The research team would want to relate the above phenomenon to the fact that in Andhra Pradesh and in the areas that it visited, the children's groups are well organized and at the village level they have found some footing, some space of their own. As a group they can easily voice their feelings and therefore express them clearly in two aspects that stop them from being typical: They do agree that they should never be punished; they do not agree with corporal punishment at all.
- Another factor that seems to influence these children's stand is the effective functioning of community institutions such as village education committees (presently disbanded though), parents associations, youth groups and so on unlike in the other three states. Children perhaps know that at times of disputes, the community organizations have played a significant role and therefore are convinced that corporal punishment as a phenomenon can be controlled by these forces rather than resorting to a legal ban which may rob the community off its decision making powers. Even though Uttar Pradesh and Bihar also have

children's forums in place what they lack is there is no actual participation of the community in such critical and local social processes and issues.

- It is the state of Rajasthan that stands out in terms of its children having taken a very different stand from those of the other three states. The differences are:
- It is the only state in the sample where more than half of the children (54.7%) the team met agree that they should never be punished. This is significantly more than what the children in the others states of Uttar Pradesh (9.2%), Bihar (6.2%), and Andhra Pradesh (25.5%) respectively think.
- It also has the highest per cent of children (22.2%) agreeing that children should not even be moderately punished. This is a very different stand the children have taken from their counterparts in the other sample states where more than 90% of the children have agreed that moderate punishment to children must be retained.
- It is also incredible to note that 19% of the children in Rajasthan believe that they are meant to be punished where all the other three states' children have echoed a vociferous "No!" This is a significant finding in a sense because it clearly suggests how deep rooted the malice of corporal punishment is in that society. Just a less than 1/5 of the children are not in a position to visualize an environment without corporal punishment and therefore believe that as children one of their major "tasks" in life is to get abused by the adults.
- It is not surprising that the children in Rajasthan also have a very different stand to take from the other three on the issue of legally banning corporal punishment. Again, more than half of the children (51.5%) agree that it must be legally banned! Once again, it is notably high when compared to the others. Uttar Pradesh registers the next high (31.2% agree with the ban) but the remaining two states have registered as low figures as 28.8% (Bihar) and 3.2% (Andhra Pradesh) respectively!
- Here, the research team would like to relate the above finding to the finding (d) derived from the sub matrix two where it was noted that both in terms of the type and intensity of unique corporal punishments, Rajasthan stood out. Of the total types of unique corporal punishments that the team was informed about in the four states, Rajasthan's share was fifty (50) per cent. In terms of the intensity of these punishments, eighty five (85) per cent were of severe and torturous types. It is no wonder that so many children want a ban on corporal punishment!
- The team could use this particular research tool with stakeholders other than the school children only in Andhra Pradesh. The stakeholders groups who responded were (a) A parents' group (b) two children's forums, and (c) a group of block level education department's officials.

Table 5.1.3.2: Non-Children Groups' Stand on Punishments in Andhra Pradesh

Andhra Pradesh	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Agree	Don't								
Parents' Group N = 7	--	100.0	100.0	--	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	100.0
CF 1 N = 11	100.0	--	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	100.0	--	100.0
CF 2 N = 26	--	100.0	100.0	--	--	100.0	--	100.0	--	100.0
Govt. Officials N = 08	--	100.0	100.0	--	75.0	25.0	--	100.0	12.5	87.5

A number of Interesting deductions can be made from the above table.

- One: Both the adults' groups present a very typical response. They do not agree to the statement that children should never be punished; agree wholeheartedly that both moderate punishment and corporal punishment are very much required; graciously agree that children are not meant to be punished; and, banning corporal punishment through legal means is not advisable.
- Two: The response of the government officials to the last statement is very interesting. In a state where corporal punishment is banned and where they are the people who have to implement the ban; they still opine that the ban is not required/not advisable!
- Three: Except for their stand on whether children should never be punished where the two children's forums have taken opposite stands, both toe the line of the adults groups only.
- **Comments**
 - The Supreme Court in India may have banned corporal punishment for children: only SIX (06) states have undertaken any efforts to follow that order. From these, three (03) states have completely banned corporal punishment [Delhi (2000), Andhra Pradesh (2002), Goa (2003)], while three (03) other states have sought prohibition on corporal punishment: Chandigadh (1990), West Bengal (2000), and Tamilnadu (2003).

- Even though corporal punishment is being recognized as a social malice by all the stakeholders the team met, including children, few agree with the idea of legally banning the same. The exceptions were the children themselves and, in some case the volunteers of the partner NGOs the research team worked with.
- Very few stakeholders, including the government officials and teachers, were even aware that such legislation is already in place in some states. Many of them, parents in particular, were genuinely shocked to hear the same.
- The *Mukhiya* – the head person – of a village in Uttar Pradesh looks down upon parents who complained about corporal punishment in the school as “Fools!” For him, banning corporal punishment is almost a sacrilege. A teacher in Andhra Pradesh, though not so emphatic, believed such move would lead to “the collapse of the entire education system!”
- In Rajasthan, the officials whom the team met tried to play down the seriousness of this legislation. According to them, there is no GR issued from the state government / the department of education in this regard; only a directive and a set of guidelines have been issued two years ago. None of the offices the team visited could, however, furnish a copy of the same.
- In Andhra Pradesh, where corporal punishment is legally banned, of the eight (08) education department officials the team had engaged in a group discussion, seven (07) disagreed with the legislation. They cited general reasons like “lack of control”, “bad behavior”, “too much of freedom is bad for children” etc. in favor of lifting the ban; one of them cited a specific situation – elderly boys indulging into sex related misbehavior /crimes in schools – where corporal punishment is the only alternative.

5.1.4 Research Output: **Case Studies and Interviews**

Please refer to Annex Two.

5.2 **General Findings**

- For the research team, the most striking overall finding of the study has been the sheer hypocrisy displayed by the adults when it comes to (discussing) the issue of corporal punishment on children. The word “hypocrisy” may sound very strong. It could also be argued whether another word such as “indifference” would suffice (to describe the phenomenon). The research team would like to underline the fine but critical nonetheless line that perhaps separates these two words. Indifference implies inattentiveness and lack of concern. If a person’s attention is drawn to the same, s/he might just agree to change (his/her ways). Hypocrisy on the other hand implies a malicious pretence. Here, the person in question is arrogantly sure that his/her being pretentious has already received a larger entity’s - in this case the society - sanction and therefore s/he can easily get away with it. Viewed from this

position, the team feels that the word “hypocrisy” is more apt. Every one denies the existence of corporal punishment, but almost every one inflicts it (on the children) at the first given opportunity.

- Children on the other hand, are all sincere and frank about revealing what they have to deal with, in terms of punishment, to get on with their lives. The research team’s experience was quite contrary to a general assumption made in the literature about the difficulties in conducting such surveys; about the children not willing to open up on this issue as “....parents and teachers are likely to under report, and very young children (who suffer the corporal punishment the most) can not be interviewed” (Ending corporal punishment of children-making it happen; A report by Save The Children, UK; 2001; p 4). Where ever the research team went, children just poured out their respective narrations, and more. Even when the afore-mentioned garb of hypocrisy was let down by many teachers and parents on some insistent probing, the team did not find any “under-reporting” from them. It is a different issue that they made light of its existence.
- Even as a phenomenon, punishment is not often talked about. It is all pervasive, however. It hangs heavily in the air wherever adults and children come together for an interaction. Especially at the schools the team has visited. In the ways the teachers address the students, the way they make eye-contact with them, the way students interact among themselves, the general gestures by all and so on.
- Despite being a huge independent community in their own right, and despite the excellent rapport they share with all the local NGOs of the areas the team visited, children were found to be quite alone in their fight against corporal punishment; both at home and school.
- Several social practices that inconvenience children in a large way are also seen as punishment by them. Examples include: work (both at home and outside), child marriages, dowry, and forced early marriages.
- The agrarian season, children, and absenteeism in schools are highly correlated. Children all over are forced to skip schools in favor of work.
- At the same time, children frequently defend corporal punishment. They attribute a cause-and-effect relationship between ‘wrong doing” and its repercussions. As is evident, these repercussions are always in the form of one type of punishment or the other. This mind-set of children can be traced back to a number of societal dictums they start living with ever since they begin to understand things. One deeply embedded among them is that parents always have their children’s interest at heart.
- Interestingly, children are ready to receive any type of punishment from their parents as they “owe” their lives to them. From teachers, however, they want only moderate punishment.

- The team came across, among all the children it interacted with during the survey, only seven (2 girls and 5 boys) who claimed they did not receive punishment at home.
- The team's efforts to "locate" children who receive punishment very rarely met with a very limited response. In one such instance, in Uttar Pradesh, the team could locate two large groups, one that received punishment very regularly while the other rarely did. Interacting with them gave a good insight (see later) into the
- Children contemplate a lot on punishments and the ways to deal with them. During the course of the study, the team was presented with at least three distinct models that spoke about not-so-harsh punishment regime.
- At the institutional level too, the team did come across a number of successful efforts undertaken by the state to provide children a congenial learning environment. The state government run residential school for a special group of girls (who are rejoining mainstream education after having taken a drop for anytime between 1-4 years) in Maharajgunj (Uttar Pradesh) is a notable case in point. The research team also visited other institutions that functioned on similar lines in the other three states but the sustenance of such models is yet to be ascertained.
- The research team did not find any gender discrimination when it came to punishing children. Some girl-groups (About 15 %) did report they receive lighter punishments at schools but in homes they too are punished as severely as the boys.
- In general, however, boys get punished more frequently. The perception parents particularly hold is, they (i.e. the boys) have far more free time to get into situations that disturb the adults around, and get punished in the bargain. The girls, on the other hand, are always busy in household work and are hardly noticed as "doing nothing" or "playing pranks" or "whiling away time". At the same time, if girls refuse work at home, the results are severe.
- Some parents also opined that the girls are punished less because of their utility value in household activities which, conveniently spills over to outside chores such as fetching water, helping in agriculture etc. as well.
- The Supreme Court In India may have banned corporal punishment for children: only SIX (06) states have undertaken any efforts to follow that order. From these, three (03) states have completely banned corporal punishment [Delhi (2000), Andhra Pradesh (2002), Goa (2003)], while three (03) other states have sought prohibition on corporal punishment: Chandigadh (1990), West Bengal (2000), and Tamilnadu (2003).
- Even though corporal punishment is being recognized as a social malice by all the stakeholders the team met, including children, few agree with the idea of legally banning the same. The exceptions were the children themselves and, in some case the volunteers of the partner NGOs the research team worked with.

- Very few stakeholders, including the government officials and teachers, were even aware that such legislation is already in place in some states. Many of them, parents in particular, were genuinely shocked to hear the same.
- The *Mukhiya* – the head person – of a village in Uttar Pradesh looks down upon parents who complained about corporal punishment in the school as “Fools!” For him, banning corporal punishment is almost a sacrilege. A teacher in Andhra Pradesh, though not so emphatic, believed such move would lead to “the collapse of the entire education system!”
- In Rajasthan, the officials whom the team met tried to play down the seriousness of this legislation. According to them, there is no GR issued from the state government / the department of education in this regard; only a directive and a set of guidelines have been issued two years ago. None of the offices the team visited could, however, furnish a copy of the same.
- In Andhra Pradesh, where corporal punishment is legally banned, of the eight (08) education department officials the team had engaged in a group discussion, seven (07) disagreed with the legislation. They cited general reasons like “lack of control”, “bad behavior”, “too much of freedom is bad for children” etc. in favor of lifting the ban; one of them cited a specific situation – elderly boys indulging into sex related misbehavior /crimes in schools – where corporal punishment is the only alternative.
- The children also accept corporal punishment as way of life. They also believe that it is required to some extent and in some form. During the interaction with the team, however, they rated violence (involved in corporal punishment) in a descending order of preference. They have, however, differences of opinion in terms of the severity of punishments.
- The children are at the receiving end all the time. During the team’s discussions with members of children’s forums – in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Andhra Pradesh – children voiced the need to be consulted for matters directly related to them / their life. It was observed that dialogue between teachers and students or parents and children is completely missing. The teachers and parents even questioned the need for having dialogue with the children.
- Children harbor varied views on corporal punishment. They share them matter-of-factly and with candor that sometimes borders on rare humor. It is to their great credit that despite having no respite in violence meted out to them, by parents and by teachers, they want to just carry on with living.

Chapter Six

Recommendations

6.0 Introduction

- 6.0.1 One key realization stemming from the present study refers to the apparent invisibility of corporal punishment at homes and in schools at large. It exists but its existence is denied by all concerned; especially the parents and the teachers. It is not viewed by them as a social malice at all. Like other social malice of similar ilk – gender discrimination, child labor, domestic violence, human exploitation based on social hierarchies etc. - corporal punishment too is all pervasive, highly ingrained, and most resistant to change. Not only such malicious practices are inherited; but they have become so common, so much part of life that they are seldom noticed. If noticed, they are rarely accepted. If accepted, they are almost never acknowledged. The question of viewing it from the prevailing global understanding, i.e. from the viewpoint of human rights perspective / human rights violation does not arise at all.
- 6.0.2 It is both tricky and complicated to provide a list of recommendations for overcoming such invisible social malice, the rigor and honesty of a study notwithstanding. It is tricky because, to succeed, it requires an act of honest implementation on part of each and every concerned individual. In the context of the present study, this includes not only the stakeholders the research team interacted with but the rest of the society as well. It is complicated because to implement the same, it will require – again on part of every concerned individual – changing one’s own belief systems and life style. Something that touches the philosophical realm within everyone.
- 6.0.3 The research team is thus inclined to believe that the recommendations to overcome the prevalence of corporal punishment will have to be both philosophical and pragmatic in nature. They will have to be philosophical to a level because they will essentially address the issue of understanding one’s own belief systems first; seriously questioning them; and, eventually changing them. At the same time, they will have to be pragmatic enough to be “doable” or “executable” at the ground level as well. In the following paragraphs, these recommendations have been detailed out.

6.1 Key Recommendations

- 6.1.1 The key recommendations are philosophical, and there are two of them.
- **Key Recommendation One:** Making each and every adult in the society understand the inevitability of internalizing non-violence as a life skill and then practicing it during all his/her interactions with children and others.

- **Key Recommendation Two:** Parents and Teachers will have to undergo a process of de-culturation by drastically reducing their respective “ownership” on children that enjoys societal sanction. This ownership exists in almost every interaction that occurs between the adults and the children.

6.2 “Doable” / “Executable” Recommendations

The study recommends the following to be included as a part of the field level operations for those organizations / NGOs wishing to put corporal punishment as an agenda of their work plans.

- 6.2.1 An effective set of strategy will be to influence the community through (a) dissemination (b) groundwork, and (c) advocacy campaigns. While it might appear tempting to employ the given set of strategy simultaneously, the concerned organizations will have to sufficiently weigh contextual factors and local situations before making this decision.
- 6.2.2 Whatever be that decision, the research team earnestly feels that it will be the parents who need to be worked with immediate effect. For children, parents are the most immediate connect while teachers and the rest of the community are outsiders.
- 6.2.3 One of the ways to go about practicing the above is to convince the community and its organizations, including children’s forums, not only about the seriousness of the issue but to develop a doable agenda and time frame wherein all efforts will be done to (a) understand the severity of the issue at the local level (b) work out ways and means to control the incidence of corporal punishment (c) reduce it, and (d) eradicate it.
- 6.2.4 In order to demonstrate that they are serious, the VLLs / VECs / PTAs can initiate a mechanism through which it can review complaints and seek remedies for children who suffer violent treatment or punishment in homes and schools in the vicinity.
- 6.2.5 Through the same mechanism serious complaints can formally investigated and disciplinary procedures can be exercised against the erring teachers and parents. While these organizations can levy pressure of dismissal or prosecution on teachers, only a social boycott or some other forms of sustainable social pressure can influence / convince parents.
- 6.2.6 Children’s forums are very active and they have lots of untapped potential. They have to become the “spoke-person” for the children at large (in a particular school / village / community) can have dialogue with the school authorities and the parents what would be, in terms of the adults’ behavior towards children, non-negotiable items and negotiable items. The team feels the local level NGOs have lot to contribute here. These groups can even be asked prepare status reports on corporal punishment in their respective home and school environs.

- 6.2.7 Use the mechanism of NGO-GO partnership effectively to bring the legislation banning corporal punishment under the “Rights to Information Act” and use the same to effectively advocate eradication of corporal punishment.
- 6.2.8 There is hardly any social advertising seen so far as corporal punishment is concerned. A multi-media strategy / advocacy campaign using innovative ideas / mechanisms can easily be initiated through PLAN support. One of such innovative ideas would be to propagate the advantages of not having corporal punishment in an environment where adults and children interact frequently.
- 6.2.9 The stakeholders groups will have to be convinced and involved in formulating innovative and context specific ground level strategies that could be easily implemented. For example, all schools could display on the notice board a copy of general resolution of the government / official guidelines banning the corporal punishment. The children’s forum / groups can also keep a copy.
- 6.2.10 At the community level, there needs to be a deeper understanding and sufficient details of the practical problems that lead teachers to inflict punishment on children.
- 6.2.11 There also appears to be a need to further understand the impact of corporal punishment on children. This understanding can be derived by formal research preferably with a psychologist on board.
- 6.2.12 The idea of targeting special groups such as adolescent groups, PRIs, caregivers, communicators etc. for a long term sensitization program needs to be explored further.
- 6.2.13 Either providing, if available, or designing tool kits for teachers and students on Positive Discipline.
- 6.2.14 Yet another need of the hour is to prepare a database on corporal punishment, preferably at the local level, to highlight the gravity of situation. The database can then be used to undertake advocacy activities; making presentations to the concerned govt. agencies, etc.
- 6.2.15 Making available a suitable compilation of govt.’s /rules/policies/guidelines/general resolutions as information available to the stakeholders in local language.

Annex One**Governments' View on Corporal Punishment**

A1.0 The research team met the following state government officials as a part of the study:

- Uttar Pradesh
 1. Director of District Institute of Education & Technology (DIET), Maharajgunj (01) and its teaching staff (05)
 2. District Project Officer (01), Maharajgunj
 3. Assistant Basic Shikshan Adhikari, Maharjgunj (01)

- Bihar
 1. Officials of Mahila Samakhya (02)

- Rajasthan
 1. District Collector (01)
 2. District Education Officer (01)
 3. The Commissioner, Elementary education (01)

- Andhra Pradesh
 1. Mandal Education Officer (02)
 2. Mandal Resource Persons (06)

A1.1 The respective views of the officials the team met are being summarized below:

A1.1.0 Government of Uttar Pradesh

- Teachers like to hit children in public as it gives them an assertion to power. They do not believe that despite the beatings children can learn. They have to be assertive when parents come and whisk away their wards (for work) from the middle of a session.

- Unless teachers are given attitudinal training, the issue of corporal punishment can not be addressed effectively.

- We shall have to examine and re-look at the very definitions of both discipline and punishment. Most of the education inspectors feel that a class (of students) with a “pin-drop” silence is a disciplined class. Such attitudes have to go.
- Children/students are more prone to punishment in private schools as parents do not complain. The government run schools have to be more transparent as at many places the village education committees do keep a good watch on the schools / teachers.
- Corporal punishment has decreased considerably in general terms.
- Teachers and parents should both inspire and threaten as the case may be. There are very few students who have improved after a beating.
- Teachers beat without any malicious intentions. Any code of conduct or attitudinal training can not be forced on the teachers.

A1.1.1 **Government of Bihar**

- Due to the ongoing/forthcoming state assembly elections the team could not meet any education officials who mattered. Even the program staff of Mahilka Samakhya that spoke to the team had no idea how under its prestigious Bihar Education Project, corporal punishment in schools is being addressed. They of course had their personal views to share on the subject.

A1.1.2 **Government of Rajasthan**

- Corporal punishment is banned in Rajasthan though the state government has not issued any GR for the same. A set of guidelines is available for reference.
- Home environment is the main source of punishment (or the lack of it). Corporal punishment should be done away with it but teachers need to be made aware of it.
- Threatening or creating fear is a part of affection and love. Corporal punishment should be treated as the very last step and anyway, punishment yields only temporary results.
- Positive discipline can evolve only if teachers are ready to act as role models.

A1.1.3 **Government of Andhra Pradesh**

- Learning environment, both at home and school, is the most critical aspect.

Annex Two

Case Studies

- K.Sandhya
D/o. Pullaiya
Chandupatla Village, Nalgonda districtl

She is the elder daughter in the family. She wakes up at 5'O clock in the morning. Her father works in Sudhakar Pipes Company, and mother goes for work in the field. She has one younger brother and younger sister. She is in class 5th and she is 11 years old. She cooks good and makes her younger brother and sister bath. She cleans vessels and floor and fill drinking water. If she don't do any one of the work, she was not allowed to school. After school she again starts with work and finish it with 8 O'clock.

Then she sit down and watch news till 8.30 and study and complete her homework. She was beat by her father and mother for every little thing. She is forced to do house hold work than the school home work. This girl wants to become a doctor and save people. She says "she likes school more than home". She likes Prabakar Sir who is a volunteer of ASM. She also likes her class teacher because she explains and teaches lessons with at more case and attentions. If she have any doubts she will be helped by her teacher (or) by HM. She receives heavy beating at home and less at school. She is also against law banning punishment because for her, parents are those who gave birth to her and have all rights. But she prefers moderate punishment.

- U. Mahesh
S/o. Lakshmaiya
Village: Thummagundam, Nalgonda district

He is very attractive and sharp. He is a good singer. When he was 3rd his maths teacher beat him badly with that incident he stopped going to school. When his gather came to know about that and he tied him with chain and left in sun for 2 days. His mother used to feed food. He was put mirchi powder in his eyes. Then he was sent to graze sheep and joined on near field for plucking mirchi and flowers. He worked for 1 year there. Then the volunteers approached the land lord and taken him to "Balakarmikalu Hostel (child labour hostel) in Thumangundam. It is a SC hostel. There, they have a bridge course for 1 year and then was trained for exams. Now he was joined in 5th class in Chandapotla Primary school.

Now he liked to study well and become a judge. He is again the law banning punishment. For him parents have right to punish but Teacher have right to give moderate punishment.

- Chandrakala A
D/o Ramakrishana A
Village: Chandupetla, Nalgonda district

She is 9 years old. She is older daughter in her family. She have 2 younger sisters. Her father was a Tailor. She was forced to stay at home and look after them. She make them bathe and feed to them. She was punished very badly by her parents. She comes late to school, because of domestic work. She was punished by her class teacher. Though she says her condition at work, teacher does not listen to it. But now in this Chandupatla School, she feel very happy. She says that teachers understand and guide her very nicely.

Note: She is the only girl I face who was fur to the “how banning punishment:”. She feels that there should be a ban. Then only no one will scold and punish her. She feel that children are not meant to punish, but they have to play.

At that home she want to play with her co-mates but her mother beats her if she don't do domestic work and look after her sisters. So, she strictly decided that there should be a ban on punishment.

- R. Praveen
Gungalur, Nalgonda district

He is youngest in the family. In his childhood he was beat very badly by his father and also by his school teacher. His father always beats him when he don't study well.

Once his father tied his hand and feet in sitting position and left him for the whole day. After coming to the school he felt very happy because teacher were give a moderate punishment and understand him. According to his opinion they guided him very well. He was a school dropout at IV th class and he was forced to joined daily labor by his family. He worked for 9 months then ASM volunteers approached him and sent him to camp, from there he was shifted to Gunjalur school. But still he feels there should be a ban on punishment because of the impression which he had in his child hood.

He is only student who supported the law banning punishment.

- Yadura - Saidula
S/o. Rangaiya (Siikanda village)

He was the middle son in the family. His father was a farmer. So he was asked to graze the cattle. When he is going to school, his father and brother forcefully took him to work. Teachers at school also beat him of not coming to school. So he left the school. Then his mother, want him to study. His parents felt the importance of hosted and was joined in hostel (MVF Hostel)

In hostel he was been threatened by his senior, if he will not share what ever he eats, and given by the hostel.

- N. Renuka
D/O. Ramulu
8TH Class, PUP School, Thimmapuram
Chivemla village

I was not going to school during my childhood. My parents used to scold me and sometimes they used to beat me also, but later they started giving me biscuits and chocolates so then I started going to school and studying well in the school teachers are so encouraging but I was often absent to the school because of the work at the home. But I worked hard so passed in the examination with first marks. In the 7th class board examination I got good marks so my parents, teachers and neighbours appreciate me, ----- lot so I was becoming so interested in the studies I want to study well and become a police and settle in the life, I want to look after my parents.

- G. Rangareddi
S/O. Venkat Reddi
8TH Class, Thimmapuram
Chivemla village

I was not regular to school during my childhood. My parents and grand parents used to give chocolates and biscuits to send me school. I am studying in this school since my first class. I never attended private school. I wake up every days at 5 o'clock in the morning. I help my mother in the household work later I study for some time and go to school. Aarthika Samartha Mandali is helping me for my studies by providing books, bags, uniforms, albums, cycles etc. I am very happy as I am getting support from ASM for my studies. I want to study well and work hard to get a good position. I want to look after my parent. I am taught like others but my parents help me at home in my studies. They will not disturb me while I am studying so I can study well. I will study well and get good name to my parents.

- B. Sireesha
D/O. Mokund Reddi
8TH Class, Thimmapuram
Chivemla village

I was so lazy and not used to go to the school. Every body in the school and village used to discourage me a lot. I was so upset but not willing to school, my parents and grand parents used to beat me and scold me. In my fifth class I met with D. Sree Ramula Sir he was so friendly with me and used to tell me that "if you study well, you will be in a good position" and convinced me a lot to study. I got interested in studies, started studying well. I passed 7th class with good marks. I am helping my parents (mother) in the

domestic work. I want to study well, and settle in a good position. I like my school and my teachers. I go to meetings every month and tell whatever I know try to learn what ever I don't know.

- B. Gopi
S/O. Venkataiah
8TH Class, PUP School
Chivemla village

I am quite irregular to the school I like to play and want to stay at home mostly but my parents scold me and me for not going school. Our teacher is good, he always asks me to come to school. If I absent for 2 or 3 days continuously I was stood in the sun for quite a few minutes like 5 to 10 minutes. My parents and grand parents used to scold me for not going to school, I was very much depressed. I was hurt by their beating. I thought to be regular to the school so I started coming school. But some times I may not be able to concentrate on the lessons. But I want to continue my studies.

- B. Vennela
D/O. Chandraiah
5TH Class, M. P. Primary school
Chivemla village

I wake up in the morning at 6 o'clock. I assist my mother in the domestic work, after having bath I go to school. I am studying in this school from my first class onwards. I am always standing first in the class my mother and father scold me, some times beat me, not so regular but on and off, for not listening to them. In the school teachers also don't beat me, they just warn me not to make noise. I will do my home work regularly. I like gardening in the school, songs and games s well.

- P. Sreekanth
5TH Class
M. P. Primary school
Chivemla village

I used to study in M. P. Primary school at Settigudam, but there the studies are not so progressive so, discontinued in the 3rd class. I joined in the 1st class again in Tabernacle School at Chivemla. I improved my studies over there. I always became first in the school, teachers also encouraged me a lot. I joined in the school this year in the 5th class as we don't have 5th class in the Tabernacle School have also I am getting good marks and standing in the first place teachers are also very cooperative and encouraging me to study well.

- Kalpana
5TH Class, M. P. Primary school
Chivemla village

I have no mother, one sister and two brothers. One among them is a handicapped. My father is working in the agricultural field. My father don't beat me, he likes me very much. Some months ago my sister was put in jail on some problem. My neighbours used to discourage me and scolded me a lot. I was so depressive, I didn't like to have food even, because of those scolding. I have undergone lot of stress. After some days my sister returned from the jail, my neighbours started scolding her and blaming her. She was frustrated with them and beat me a lot. It was so painful, I wanted to die. Meanwhile I got fever and joined in the hospital. My sister has taken a lot of care on me and remembered my mother. So, I started loving my sister. During this period I was so irregular to the school. I didn't like to come to the school as I was unable to concentrate on lessons but now I want to study for my father and sister. So, I am coming to the school regularly. When ever my neighbours scolding or blaming me I was feeling like to beat

- Renu kumari
Father: Sri Baiju Sahani
Mother: Srimati Kanti Devi
 - They are three brothers and sisters.
 - She is the eldest and only daughter.
 - She gets beatings from mother when she fights with her brothers.
 - Mother beats them with hands.
 - She also gets beatings when she refuses to do any work.
 - In school sir beats us with *danda*
 - He beats me because I don't do home work.
 - When she complains about it at home mother says it is good for studies ,we use to also get punishments in our times.
 - When all punishments goes beyond her limits she refuses to go to school ,then explains her saying it is for her benefit , she will improve herself by going to school.
 - She believes that fear of punishment stops us to do anything wrong.
- Chandan kumar
Father: Sri Ambika Ram
Mother: Srimati Sunita Devi
 - They are five brothers and sisters.
 - Chandan is the eldest.
 - No one beats him at home.
 - If he does anything wrong parents explain him and convince him accordingly.
 - In school sir beats him, if he does not listen to him .
 - Sir beats him hands.

- According to him children should not be punished.
 - By this child spoils himself and no improvement.
 - He never complains about his punishments at home because he believes teacher only beats when we are wrong and it is good for us.
 - The boy was confident and was proud that he is not punished at home, he was totally against corporal punishment. He gave the example of a boy who never studies .he takes tuition at home still very weak in studies. He gets maximum beatings from his father and teacher.
 - Father beats him with *danda*, hand, *chappal*. He is receiving punishments since many years still there is no improvement in his studies and behaviour.
 - According to Chandan he should be explained by parents/teachers that education very important for life. and he should feel it.
- Mukesh kumar
Father: Sri Namri Shah
Mother: Srimati Radha Devi
 - They are seven brother and sisters (6 brothers+1sister).
 - He gets maximum beatings at home as well as at school.
 - Mother gives him slaps because he refuses to go to school, do not go to collect leaves for cow, he steals eatables from home.
 - He cries when gets beatings, but no one comes to save him.
 - He still says that he still do not listen to his mother.
 - The boy was a bit mentally weak. He was the weak student of class.
 - His mates told us that he never listen to his mother or teacher, so he gets punishments from them.
- Mamta
Father: Sri Jagdish kumar Shah
Mother: Srimati Rukmani Devi
 - They are five sisters and two brothers.
 - Her father beats every one at home.
 - If anything does not go according to him then he beats us.
 - My mother always comes forward to save us but she is either scolded or beaten by father.
 - My father also love us a lot, he talks to us, shares jokes with us .whenever I get angry he comes to me and makes me laugh.
 - But when I get late in taking his lunch on time then he beats me a lot, limit crosses when he ties up my legs and thrash me by *danda*.
 - While Mamta was telling us about this, her eyes were full of tears. In school I get punishment but I do not feel it in front of home.
 - I joined DPM my father permitted me for this. He wants to make me very successful.
 - In the end Mamta concluded saying that her father loves her very much .and for this love she is ready to bear any punishment from his side.

- Vinod kumar
Father: Sri Dwarika Sahani
Mother: Jaya Kali Devi
 - They are three brothers and one sister.
 - Names are: Poonam, Rajendra, Harendra, Vinod.
 - He never gets corporal punishment.
 - According to him corporal punishment should not be given to any child.
 - Child should be punished in a way that may affect him mentally.
 - He agreed to impose the law of no punishment.
 - It will definitely convince teachers to adopt the student teacher understanding relationship which may help in improving the present conditions.
 - My brother Rajendra gets maximum punishment because he abuses everyone, stays in a wrong company and wastes all his time.
 - He never tries to change himself so he gets beatings from my father.
In his school also Vinod tries to change the behavior of his class mates in a right direction

- Surya Bahadur Ambedker
 - This boy was only child in whole school who was continuously threatened and thrashed by the teacher.
 - He was beaten by teacher on his back and head, still the boy was smiling and was attentive in class.
 - He told us that his daily routine is- in morning he comes to school, after school he goes to tailors shop to learn tailoring, and on holidays he goes to field for sowing seeds and other field works.
 - He gets beatings at both the places at home and at school.
 - Father beats him the most, he also asks teachers to beat him to keep him in discipline.
 - He has also accepted life as it is., sometimes this all hurts him but it was o. k. with him
 - In his tailoring training he gets Rs.10, he spends all money on himself.
 - He is ready to get beatings but is not at all ready to change himself.

- Kaushlendra Pratap Singh
Father: Sri Ram Karan Singh
Mother: Srimati Geeta Singh
 - His brother also studies in same school.
 - According to him no one should beat us, but on every faults elders punish us.
 - They should not love us and explain us the right path.
 - My younger brother is loved most by every one in home, I too love very much.
 - My brother always beats everyone at home and abuses them but I always save him from others if he gets punishments.
 - When I get angry with anyone at home I don't beat youngsters but I go out with my friends and come back in the evening.

- In school the lady teacher does not punish us but head master beat us with *danda*.
 - We get punishments for not doing homework, unable to solve mathematical problems.
- Sandeep
Father: Sri Ram Dev Yadav
Mother: Srimati Kohila Devi
 - He has one elder sister and three brothers.
 - His grand parents live with them and they love elder brother most.
 - The reason for this love is that he (Sukhu) is the first boy in the family.
 - He gets maximum punishment at home by his mother.
 - Mother beats him with *danda*.
 - In school teacher beats her with *danda*.
 - Head master gives slaps on any faults in the school.
 - He is not in the favour of the law of punishment, because he don't want to loose teacher, we can only ask her to be a bit soft and loving for students.
 - If he complains about his punishments in home, mother says it is good for the child like you.
 - He has also accepted punishments as way of survival.
 - Riyakat Ali
Fathers: Salamat Ali
Mother: Jamarakunisa
 - He has two younger sisters.
 - In school he is considered to be a good student.
 - Teachers say he is a well dressed and well discipline boy.
 - In school he gets very less punishment, but at home he gets punishment by his father most.
 - Father beats him by hand and by anything he has in his hand.
 - When he asks his sister to do any work and she refuses then he beats her and father beats him for deed.
 - According to him children should be punished otherwise they spoil themselves.
 - But only on severe faults they should be beaten but no child should be punished by *danda*.
 - Sunil Sharma
 - They are two brothers and one younger sister.
 - He says he gets punishment neither at home nor at school.
 - His grand parents live with and they love Anil (eldest son) most. Mother loves all of us and father loves him the most
 - The reason for no punishments is that he obeys everyone at home, likes working in field, home work any other work asked by elders.
 - His sister gets maximum beatings from mother by *danda* (reason is she abuses everyone at home).

- He says corporal punishment should be banned in our country.
- Elders should explain our faults and convince us in their favour as his father does.



Annex Three

Study Processes

No.	Particulars	Estimated Person Days
1.0	Arrival (Evening / Night)	
2.0	Interaction with the concerned PU staff	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Introducing the study ✓ Introducing the tools and discussion ✓ Reviewing the information already received ✓ Additional information to be collected ✓ Visit Plan / Non control school selection 	02.0
3.0	Preliminary meetings with Children, Teachers, PTA, VEC, Others (In at least two – three villages, schools)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Introducing the study ✓ Introducing the tools ✓ Discussion and Feedback ✓ Setting the time for working sessions 	03.0
4.0	Study related activities in sample villages, schools	12.0
5.0	Interviewing children for Case Studies	01.0
6.0	Meetings with select government officials / representatives	02.0
7.0	Meetings with other prominent actors	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ex Teachers ✓ Ex Principals ✓ Ex Education Dept Officials ✓ Respected community leaders / elders Any other “Must Meet” individuals the PU staff deems fit 	03.0
8.0	De-briefing session with the concerned PU staff	01.0

24

Note: The total number of person days may not match the number of days the researchers will actually spend in each state, as our team will comprise of three persons who will be working on different activities simultaneously.

Annex Four Study Tools

A. Basic Tools Used

1.0 TWO basic types (of tools): Primary and Secondary have been used

1.1 Secondary

1.1.1 Review of relevant documents

- ✓ Published documents of Plan International & SCF;
- ✓ Published documents of the concerned PUs;
- ✓ Published documents of the Government of India;
- ✓ Published documents of the concerned state governments;
- ✓ Relevant GRs / Notifications / Rulings of the state governments that have abolished corporal punishment for children; and,
- ✓ Others

1.1.2 Review of relevant and selected writings in literature

1.1.3 Reviewing the take of different education systems on corporal punishment

- ✓ The British / The Classical
- ✓ Montessori;
- ✓ Nai Talim (Gandhiji); and,
- ✓ Others

1.1.4 Exploring certain KEY CONCEPTS (see 1.2)

- ✓ By Definition; and,
- ✓ By their various interpretations in Education, Psychology, Sociology etc.

1.2 Primary

1.2.1 Exploring certain KEY CONCEPTS with the project stake holders

- ✓ Behavior
- ✓ Violence
- ✓ Punishment
- ✓ Discipline / Positive discipline
- ✓ Rules;

- ✓ Learning
- ✓ Rewards
- ✓ Social roles as teacher, parent, educator, elder, leader
- ✓ Choices
- ✓ Rewards
- ✓ Rights
- ✓ Freedom
- ✓ Independence
- ✓ Schooling
- ✓ Education
- ✓ Space to be one's own self
- ✓ Learning environment

1.2.2 **Interviews** (focusing on the research subject)

- ✓ Educators; Psychologists; Heads / senior personnel of NGOs; PU heads
- ✓ Case Study Children

1.2.2 **Focus Group Discussions with selected groups of stakeholders**

1.2.3 **Exercises with some groups of stakeholders**

1.2.4 **Free Wheeling and Structured Sessions (with Children Only)**

1.2.5 **Role Plays (with Children only)**

1.2.6 **Random Class room Observations (with Children only)**

2.0 **Methods**

2.1 The above tools will be applied in the field judiciously and with discretion. The primary tools in particular will be:

- ✓ Interactive; Participatory; Recreational (games, physical activities, mind-exercises)
- ✓ Rooted in Multi-media (the children will be asked to draw, prepare *rangoli*, use black boards, chart papers etc.)

3.0 Important points to be noted

- 3.1 Given the nature of inquiry and the time available for the study, school children and our interaction with them will be given the maximum attention. As a stake holder group they will be accorded the top priority.
- 3.2 The major stake holders groups as we see them are:
- ✓ Children
 - ✓ Teachers
 - ✓ Parents-Teachers Association
 - ✓ Concerned community groups such as VECs
 - ✓ PU staff
 - ✓ Government education machinery at the block & district level
 - ✓ Other NGOs (if present in the area of study)
- 3.3 It may be that all the Key Concepts (see 1.2.1) and all the tools would not be used with all stakeholders groups. While we shall have a very clear idea on this before we go to the field; it is obvious that children will form part of maximum number / types of interactions.
- 3.4 We understand that the research inquiry would essentially focus rural schools, rural children, and rural teachers. Within that universe, we will have to draw sample from the following categories:
- 3.4.1 **Children**
- ✓ Boys and girls
 - ✓ Primary and Secondary
 - ✓ School going and Dropped out
 - ✓ Control schools and Non-control schools
 - ✓ Abused (corporal punishment) and those benefited from positive discipline
- 3.4.2 **Teachers**
- ✓ Males and Females
- 3.5 Of the ten schools we are expected to cover during the inquiry in each state; five each from the control and non control groups would make a fair representation.

B. Primary research tools for field application: The Details

1.0 Exploring Key Concepts

1.1 Distribution across stakeholders' groups

Key Concepts	Children	CFs	Teachers	PTAs	VECs	PU	Govt.	NGOs
Learning Environment	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
Home Environment	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
Education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Schooling	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Learning	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Discipline	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Positive Discipline			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Punishment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rewards	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Rules	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Violence	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Social Roles			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Freedom	✓	✓				✓		
Independence	✓	✓				✓		
Choices	✓	✓				✓		
Rights						✓		
Personal Space	✓	✓				✓		

- * It may be noted that we have added one more stakeholder in the spectrum. Since it's the primary organization of children in the project, all group exercises will be carried out with them rather than with groups of children abruptly formed in the field at the time of applying the tools. It is assumed that the CFs represent the first three categories of children as given in 3.4.1 of our earlier note on the research tool framework.
- ** This category of children includes those who have dropped out; those in non control schools (assuming there are no CFs there); the abused ones; and, those who have benefited out of positive discipline processes / methods.
- *** Home environment and Positive Discipline have also been added as one ore key cone to be explored.

1.2 Distribution of Methods across stakeholders groups

Serial Number	Methods	Stakeholders Groups
1.0	Group Exercises	Children
		Children Forums
		PU Staff
2.0	Focused Group Discussions	Teachers: Males
		Teachers: Females
		Teachers: Mixed
		PTAs
		VECs
3.0	Interviews	Government Officials
		Case Study Children
		Must Meet Individuals
		Ex teachers
		Ex Principals
		Ex Govt. Officials

2.0 **Interviews**

Interviews will be both free wheeling and structured. We will carry a check list of Key Questions to be asked. With the case study children, the focus will be on drawing their response on the issue (depending on what category – as given below the table in 1.1 – they belong to). With other stake holders falling in “to be interviewed “category, the focus will be to go through a predetermined check list.

3.0 **Focus Group Discussions**

While the PTAs and the VECs will be involved in the FGDs as they are available; with teachers we would like to discuss both in homogeneous groups and heterogeneous groups: Male and Female Teachers separately and in mixed groups as well. The assumption is that some of the key concepts, especially when related to children, has a significant gender bearing on them.

4.0 **Group Exercises, Free Wheeling/Structured Sessions, Role Plays**

Kindly refer to 6.0

5.0 **Class room observations** (random)

We wonder whether classrooms observations with two or three absolute strangers amongst them shall draw any realistic responses both the children and teachers’ behavior will not remain normal. A better way to incorporate this variable will be to depend on the experience and viewpoints of the PU staff during the course of the project so far **(To be discussed)**.

6.0 Group Exercises

S.No.	Key Concepts	Children	CFs	PU
01	Learning Environment	1,8	1, 8	5
	Home Environment	2,8	2, 8	5
	Education	5	5	3, 1
	Schooling	5	5	
	Learning	2	2	5
	Discipline	1, 5	1, 5	1
	Positive Discipline			5
	Punishment	1, 3, 8	1, 3, 8	1
	Rewards	3	3	
02	Rules	1, 3, 8	1,3,8	3
	Violence			
03	Social Roles			5
04	Freedom	3	3	7
	Independence			
	Choices			
	Rights			5
	Personal Space	4	4	4

1. Ranking along a pre-determined / on the spot devised scale
2. Voting (on an opinion / viewpoint)
3. Wish List / Perception of an "ideal" variable
4. Drawing / making visuals on the black board and / ors chart papers
5. Group discussions
6. Responding to pre-written / designed cards
7. Making cards on the spot
8. Role Play

Annex Five

The Post-Application Distribution of Research Tools

Research Tools	SH 1	SH 2	SH 3	SH 4	SH 5	SH 6
Group Exercise 1	076	020	---	---	---	---
Group Exercise 2	057	024	---	---	---	---
Group Exercise 3	037	015	---	---	---	---
Group Exercise 4	053	018	---	---	---	---
FGD 1	014	006	27	08	01	09
FGD 2	005	---	27	08	01	09
FGD 3	005	---	27	07	01	09
Interviews	---	---	---		09	---
Case Study	057	---	---	---	---	---

The above table looks at the post-application distribution of the research tools across the stakeholders' groups in the four states.

- As can be seen in the table, group exercise 1 (prevalence, types, extent, and reasons) was conducted the most number of times with school children. This is a good indication of the survey's fruitfulness.
- Interestingly, group exercise 3 was a favorite of the children's groups. It indicates that when children are left to fend for themselves at schools and homes they may accept corporal punishment as a part of life. When organized and made conscious about corporal punishment as an issue, they do want to voice their concerns. Fears, doubts, and interest.
- Before the survey began, the team was apprehensive of conducting focused group discussion 1 (on the key concepts) with children. As it turned out, it could be done only in two states: Bihar and Andhra Pradesh. In fact, Bihar was the only state where the team could apply all the research tools on children.
- As mentioned in the text, it was only in Andhra Pradesh the team could properly conduct exercises with a group of government officials. Elsewhere, it had to be content with the tool of interviewing.
- It was Bihar again, where the team could interact the most with the field staff of the concerned NGO.

Annex Six The Research Team

The Research Team comprised of the following persons:

- Dr. Salil Mehta, SAATH, Ahmedabad Principal Investigator
- Mr. Mayank Joshi, SAATH, Ahmedabad Joint-Principal Investigator
- Ms. Shikha Sharma, Lukhnau Research assistance for Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, and Rajasthan
- Mr. Krishna Madhav, Hyderabad Research assistance for Andhra Pradesh
- Ms. Anuradha P, Hyderabad Research Assistance for Andhra Pradesh
- Mr. Pravin Veluvolu Research Assistance for Andhra Pradesh
- Ms. Pushpa M Research Assistance for Andhra Pradesh



