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Chapter I

Introduction

Background of the Study

Student behavior problems in schools have been a rising concern for the general public. Jones (1998) reported that the school environment, educators, students and the community have had negative consequences from poor behavior, such as a disruption of the school environment (Schrupp, 1993), teaching time used to address discipline problems (Levin & Nolan, 2000), students missing school because of fear (Edwards, 2004), teachers leaving the profession (Hall, 1988), and teachers frustration and stress (Charles, 2002). Problems with students interfere with teaching, decrease student achievement, increases safety concerns for teachers and students, and contribute to frustration and stress in all stakeholders.

Schools have established and implemented discipline policies in an effort to offset the impact of student misbehavior. Since colonial times, the use of corporal punishment has been thought to be a desirable and acceptable means for disciplining child misbehavior. Due to excessive use, and in some cases, abuse of corporal punishment by some educators, corporal punishment has been outlawed in 28 states, although 22 states continue to allow corporal punishment to be used at the discretion of local school districts (Randall, 2003).

Corporal punishment as a means of disciplining students for classroom disruptions and misbehavior has been replaced by other forms of school and classroom management techniques. Many states and school districts have been forced to establish other forms of student discipline, such as adopting safe school acts, creating codes of student conduct, and establishing classroom management techniques.
At the same time discipline was been ranked as the biggest problem facing public schools (Levin & Nolan, 2000). Student behavior problems have been a major concern of teachers, administrators, and parents for many years. These problems have caused the nation to become concerned about student achievement and the relationship, if any, between the two (Jones, 1998).

Maximizing time spent on learning and increasing student achievement can be obtained when student misbehavior and student violence is managed properly (Levin & Nolan, 2000). Student achievement is negatively effected when educators have poor classroom management skills (Jones, 1998). Supporters of corporal punishment maintain that corporal punishment has had a positive effect on student discipline, school order, and classroom order. It has been argued that students have the right to receive an education, uninterrupted by a single individual, disruptive student (Imbrogno, 2000).

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects of corporal punishment on student achievement in the United States. This study will use data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress test and state mandated tests. A secondary purpose of the study is to investigate differences among demographic characteristics between states that allow corporal punishment versus states that have banned corporal punishment. As race and poverty have been shown to be variables that affect student achievement, these two factors were held constant.

**Student Misbehavior**

**Concerns.**

Student behavior problems have been a major concern of teachers, administrators, and parents for perhaps forever. National concerns about students' achievement have intensified, with public interest focusing on student behavior in
schools (Jones, 1998). Frieman (2001) found that at-risk students tend to perform at lower levels on achievement tests than students not at-risk. Since 1969, the annual Gallup Poll of the ‘Public’s Attitudes toward the Public Schools’ found school discipline to be the public’s primary education concern on 16 occasions. From 1986 through 1991, discipline was viewed as second to drug use as the biggest problem facing U. S. public schools. The 1992 and 1993 polls found school discipline ranked third behind concerns regarding school funding and drug use. In 1994, violence and poor discipline were rated the most serious problems in local public schools.

Impact.

School violence and student misbehavior have had negative effects on the school environment, teachers and other students. In 1991, 44% of teachers nationwide reported that student misbehavior interfered substantially with their teaching (Jones, 1998). Data from the Safe Schools Study of 1978 revealed that schools' disorder was extensive (Barton, Coley, & Wenglinsky, 1998). During the 1996-1997 school year, principals reported 188,000 fights or physical attacks, 115,500 thefts, 98,490 incidents of vandalism, 11,000 fights or physical attacks with weapons, 7,150 robberies, and 4,170 incidents of rape or sexual battery (Barton et al., 1998). Teachers also reported increasing concern regarding student behavior problems. In 1991, 28% of teachers reported moderate or serious physical conflicts with students. By the 1993-94 school year, these types of misbehaviors had risen to 40%. Numerous studies have shown discipline as a substantive factor in teachers leaving the profession (Hall, 1988). Discipline problems resulted in frustration and produced stress reflected in symptoms of lethargy, exhaustion, tension, depression, and high blood pressure among teachers (Charles, 2002).
School Discipline

School discipline is an important part of providing a learning environment conducive for all students (New South Wales Department of Education, 2002). Discipline is intended to minimize and redirect misbehavior into positive behavior. The purpose of school discipline is to reduce the need for teacher interventions by helping students learn to control their behavior (Charles, 2002). Every student has a right to a learning environment free from bullying, intimidation and to feel safe and happy at school (New South Wales Department of Education, 2002).

Corporal punishment.

Corporal punishment inflicts pain upon a child when a child’s behavior becomes unacceptable and traditional forms of punishment (e.g., time out, suspension, etc.) are ineffective. Corporal punishment has been a well-entrenched tradition and remains an integral component of both the American family and American school (Imbrogno, 2000). Corporal punishment is the only state-sanctioned disciplinary technique in elementary and secondary public schools, although 28 states have outlawed corporal punishment. The other 22 have left it to the discretion of individual school boards, which are increasingly making it an offense punishable by dismissal (Randall, 2003).

Opponents of corporal punishment.

Opponents of corporal punishment have asserted that it was morally offensive, ineffective, could have harmful effects on children, and was linked to increased violence by the recipient in both childhood and adulthood (Imbrogno, 2000). The American Academy of Pediatrics recommended that corporal punishment in schools should be abolished in all states. The Academy stated that physically disciplining a child could adversely affect a student’s self-image and school achievement and contribute to
disruptive and violent student behavior (Tonsall, 2003). Other opponents of corporal punishment include the American Medical Association, the National Education Association, and the American Bar Association (Imbrogno, 2000).

Supporters of corporal punishment.

Advocates of corporal punishment argued that it has a deterrent effect, teaches children to learn to obey and to respect authority, and builds student character. Imbrogno (2000) maintained corporal punishment to be the right of the parent and, because of the doctrine of in loco parentis, teachers and schools as well. Proponents also suggested that corporal punishment was consistent with the right of all students to receive an education, uninterrupted by a single individual, disruptive student (Imbrogno, 2000).

Corporal punishment replacements.

As the debate over corporal punishment continues, new policy is being developed, either as a replacement for corporal punishment or as an alternative to corporal punishment. Some of these policies include: state and federal safe school acts, state and local student code of conduct guidelines, and comprehensive classroom management programs.

Federal, state safe schools acts.

Recent policy has been developed at federal, state and local levels to reduce violence and increase order and discipline. The 1994 Gun-Free Schools Act required schools to automatically expel weapon-toting students for at least a year. ‘Goals 2000: Educate America Act’ indicated that every school will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning by the year 2000 (Bear, 1998). West Virginia passed the Productive and Safe Schools Act in 1995 that created a zero-tolerance for guns,
violence, and drugs on school grounds. Texas also passed its Safe Schools Act in 1995, which defined conditions for student expulsion, requests written documentation of disciplinary actions and mandates each school district to adopt a student code of conduct (Barton et al., 1998).

School and Classroom Management

In an attempt to increase student achievement, classroom communities have altered the concept of discipline. For these communities to be successful, they must be effectively established and maintained, which is known as classroom management (Jones, 1998). According to Jones (1998) classroom management has been identified as the most important factor that can influence student learning. Research found that a teachers' ability to create a safe, supportive classroom is a major factor that impacts student motivation, achievement, and behavior.

Classroom management and student achievement.

Research on teacher effectiveness, conducted largely in the 1970s and 1980s has consistently demonstrated that proactive classroom management reduces classroom disruption and increases student learning (Bear, 1998, p. 6).

Purpose of Schools

Responsible citizenship was the Founding Fathers' primary goal for education when it was established in America (Bear, 1998). Teaching students to use self-discipline is a primary role of schools. In American society, schools have three primary functions:

1. Schools sort children based on their academic abilities.

2. Schools play an important role in socializing children by teaching the values and norms important to central society and social order.
3. Schools operate as institutions of social control and order, where adults are respected and rules are followed (Noguera, 2003).

**Student Achievement and Outcomes**

In 1994, Congress adopted eight National Education Goals. Communities across the country are working on raising academic standards by adopting fair, and rigorous, codes of discipline that create classroom environments conducive to learning (Tonsall, 2003). Several suggestions for codes of discipline include: (a) families, communities and school personnel set high academic standards and occupational standards for students; (b) families, communities and school personnel establish guidelines and standards for safe schools and disciplined student behavior. When children and teachers feel safe in their schools, teaching and learning are significantly improved (Tonsall, 2003).

**Effect of No Corporal Punishment on Student Achievement**

School order has been closely related to student achievement, according to Barton et al. (1998), (American Federation of Teachers [AFT]: Parent Page, 2004). A study was performed to explore key school discipline-related issues using data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the National Educational Longitudinal Study of 1988. One of the studies major findings was that achievement in math, reading, science, and the social sciences diminished substantially when discipline problems increased. Disorder in schools caused greater disorder that eroded the learning environment for all students (Barton et al., 1998). Albert Shanker, former president of the AFT asserted that safe and orderly schools are necessary for learning to occur.
National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

The NAEP, also known as “the Nation’s Report Card,” is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America’s students know and can do in various subject areas (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2004). The Commissioner of Education Statistics, who heads the National Center for Education Statistics in the U. S. Department of Education, carries out the NAEP project. The NEAP provides results regarding subject-matter achievement, instructional experiences, and school environment for populations of students and subgroups of those populations. NAEP reports information for the nation and specific regions of the country and includes students from public and nonpublic schools in grades 4, 8, and 12.

Purpose of the Study

As behavioral and empirical research results on the effects of corporal punishment on children is largely inconclusive, a need exists for more research concerning corporal punishment. The purpose of this study is to determine if states that have made corporal punishment illegal differ in terms of demographic characteristics (e.g., racial breakdown, socioeconomic status, school-related factors, etc.) and student achievement from states that continue to use corporal punishment in their schools. Data used in this study were measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state achievement tests.

Research Questions

The following research questions are addressed in this study:

1. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment have a larger percentage of minority students than states that have banned the use of corporal punishment?

2. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding economic factors that include:
percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, Title 1 funding, and per pupil expenditures?

3. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding school-related factors that include: pupil-teacher ratio, number of full time teacher equivalencies (FTE), percentage of individualized education programs (IEPs), and percentage of students in limited English proficiency programs?

4. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding student achievement based on NAEP outcomes for fourth and eighth grade students and state achievement tests?

5. Is there a difference in student outcomes in school districts that are located in a state that allows corporal punishment and school districts in a state that has made corporal punishment illegal?

Significance of the Study

While the majority of states (n=28, 56.0%) have banned corporal punishment in their schools, the remaining 22 (44.0%) continue to use corporal punishment to control student behaviors. Most support for innovative school discipline policies comes from anecdotal evidence or small-scale evaluations of individual schools or school districts. Little national research has been conducted, largely due to the lack of national data on schools, student delinquency and academic achievement (Barton, Coley, & Wenglinsky, 1998). Educators, state and federal law makers would benefit from a study that would examine the relationship between corporal punishment and academic achievement in a nationwide study on selected demographic data. Most research on the effects of corporal punishment on student achievement was conducted in the middle 1980s. As the incidence of discipline behaviors has increased substantially since that time, additional research is needed that reflects more current data.

Definition of Terms

Behavior Is what one does (Charles, 2002)
Character  The product of experience in the family, the church, the community and the school. (Jones, 1998)

Classroom Management  Is all the things a teacher must do to foster student achievement and cooperation in classroom activities and to establish a productive working environment. (Jones, 1998)

Corporal Punishment  A discipline method in which a supervising adult deliberately inflicts pain upon a child in response to a child’s unacceptable behavior and/or inappropriate language. (Tonsall, 2003)

Discipline  Is what teachers do to help students behave acceptably in school. (Charles, 2002)

Disruptive Behavior  A violation of school expectations interfering with the orderly conduct of teaching. (Levin & Nolan, 2000)

Misbehavior  Behavior that is considered inappropriate for the setting or situation in which it occurs. (Charles, 2002)

Teaching  The use of preplanned behaviors, founded in learning principles and child development theory and directed toward both instructional delivery and classroom management, that increases the probability of affecting a positive change in student behavior. (Levin and Nolan, 2000)

Limitations of the Study

- This study is limited to information obtained from groups (e.g., NAEP, NCES, state department of education). Since these data are not my data, the researcher has no control over the data collection.

- The study is limited to data from 4th and 8th grade students. The results may not be generalizable to students at other grade levels.

Assumption

- The researcher assumes that data obtained from the Internet is free from errors in reporting.
Chapter II
Review of Literature

Introduction

This chapter presents a comprehensive review of literature related to student discipline and the use of corporal punishment as a factor in classroom management. Many states have now legally banned the use of corporal punishment by teachers and administrators. In other states, the use of corporal punishment is allowed. The effect of corporal punishment on student achievement is the focus of the present study.

Student Misbehavior

Concerns

Student behavior problems have been a major concern of teachers, administrators, and parents for many years. National concerns about student achievement have intensified, with public interest focusing on student behavior in schools (Jones, 1998). Since 1969, the annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes toward the Public Schools found school discipline to be the public's primary education concern on 16 occasions. From 1986 until 1991, school discipline has ranked second to drug use, while in 1994, 1995 and 1996 it ranked first in two out of the three years. In 1997, the Gallup Poll found that discipline was again ranked as the biggest problem facing public schools (Levin & Nolan, 2000).

A 1980 survey of urban and suburban teachers in two schools of a metropolitan area revealed that 60% of teachers perceived that the public's concerns were warranted (Levin & Nolan, 2000). Levin and Nolan (2000) also reported that a nationwide sampling of teachers in 1984 revealed that 95% of teachers believed that efforts to improve school discipline should have a higher priority than they have. A national poll that same
year revealed 19% of teachers surveyed felt that discipline was the most serious of the problems facing public schools. By 1988, this percentage had increased to 25% (Levin & Nolan, 2000). According to Bender (2003), teachers reported increases in discipline problems during a 2-year period from 2001 to 2003, along with associated decreases in student self-discipline at almost every age and grade level (Bender, 2003). Students are also aware of the frequency of disruptive student behavior. In 1993, a nationwide study of students in grades 8, 10, and 12 revealed that student disruptions were fairly common in their classes (Levin & Nolan, 2000).

Definitions of Nonviolent Acts

Misbehavior has been defined in many ways and has many synonyms that are used interchangeably in the literature. For example, disruptive behavior is often used as another term for misbehavior. These definitions generally have their basis in psychology and sociology. Feldhusen (1978) defined disruptive behavior as a violation of school expectations that interfere with teaching. According to Emmer et al. (as cited in Levin, 2000), misbehavior is defined as: "Student behavior [that] is disruptive when it seriously interferes with the activities of the teacher or of several students for more than a brief time" (p.187). Shrigley (as cited by Levin 2000) added to Emmer's definition, indicating that misbehavior is behavior that can be psychologically or physically unsafe.

Many classroom discipline problems have been sources of stress or distress for teachers for centuries (e.g., teasing, talking without permission, getting out of one's seat, disrespect toward teachers, and bullying; Bear, 1998). Stradley and Aspinall (as cited in Schrupp, 1993) grouped discipline problems into four groups.
1. *Self-image problems* are expressed through concern for personal cleanliness, rowdiness, rudeness, physical deviation, bullying, showing off, defensiveness, moodiness, and lack of personal pride.

2. *Respect for Authority problems* are exemplified when students display obscene literature, refuse to follow rules, abuse drugs, swear, smoke, show no respect, gamble or steal.

3. *Student-Peer Relationship problems* include teasing, ostracism, preferring to be a loner, getting negative-attention, gossiping, being over-aggressive, carrying weapons, fighting, having ethnic/cultural conflicts, and tattling.

4. *Student-Teacher Conflict problems* involve refusal to recognize authority, shock effects, nuisance behaviors, student power structure, personal disrespect and cheating.

*Impact of Nonviolent Acts*

Student misconduct can be detrimental to student academic progress and the physical and psychological safety of everyone in the school (NSSC, 1992). School violence and student misbehavior have had negative effects on the school environment, teachers, and other students (Jones, 1998). Schrupp (1993) asserted that these discipline problems could disrupt the normal teaching and learning environment and/or violate some code of conduct. According to Levin and Nolan (2000), the teaching and learning environment have been negatively affected when disruptive behaviors are prevalent in classrooms. These off-task behaviors exist in all classrooms to some degree and take time away from learning. While most incidents of school misbehavior are nonviolent and petty, they can inflict a heavy toll on the psychological health of a
school and negatively affect faculty, staff, administration, students and the community at large (NSSC, 1992).

**Teaching.**

The definition of teaching is "the use of preplanned behaviors, grounded in learning principles and child development theory and directed toward both instructional delivery and classroom management" (Levin & Nolan, p. 4). According to these same authors, effective teaching can increase the probability of affecting a positive change in student behavior. Some teachers spend as much as 30 to 80% of their teaching time addressing discipline problems. In 1991, 44% of teachers nationwide reported that student misbehavior interfered substantially with their teaching (Jones, 1998). A more recent national poll, conducted in 1997, reported that 58% of the surveyed teachers noted that behavior that disrupted the class occurred most of the time or fairly often in their schools (Langdon, 1997).

**Students and staff.**

Students develop a fear of going to school because of their participation as a witness and/or victim of school violence. Thousands of children miss school on a regular basis, with some fearing for their lives, because of bullying (Edwards, 2004). This fear could interfere with a student's ability to learn by approximately 25% (Levin & Nolan, 2000). A 1993 survey found that nearly 50% of 6th to 12th grades had witnessed bullying, robbery, or physical assault at school. Results from the same survey showed that one out of eight students reported being victimized at school (U. S. Department of Education, 1995).
Student misbehavior is extensive and increasing. Data from the Safe Schools Study of 1978 revealed that school disorder was extensive (Barton, Coley, & Wenglinsky, 1998). During the 1996-1997 school year, principals reported:

- 188,000 fights or physical attacks,
- 115,500 thefts,
- 98,490 incidents of vandalism,
- 11,000 fights or physical attacks with weapons,
- 7,150 robberies, and
- 4,170 incidents of rape or sexual battery (Barton et al., 1998).

According to the U. S. Department of Justice, most schools have experienced increases in school violence. In 1989, public school students (9%), private school students (7%), and non-sectarian school students (6%) reported being victims of violent acts or property crimes (Hoffman, 1996). In 1991, Hoffman reported that 28% of teachers reported moderate or serious physical conflicts with students. By the 1993-94 school year, these types of misbehaviors had risen to 40%.

Teacher mobility.

Teacher effectiveness and career longevity can be negatively impacted by classroom discipline problems (Levin & Nolan, 2000). Levin & Nolan reported that teachers enter the profession because they enjoy working with children and put their efforts toward their students’ intellectual growth. Teachers can become emotionally vulnerable to discipline problems when their efforts are met by disinterested, off-task students.

Hall (1988) indicated that almost 30% of public school teachers had considered leaving the profession because of student discipline problems. According to Eaton and
Phillips (as cited by Schrupp, 1993), teachers are witnessing an increase in problem behaviors, with many acquainted with teachers who quit the teaching profession because of these problems. Numerous studies indicated that discipline was a substantial factor in teachers leaving the profession. Discipline problems that resulted in frustration and produced stress were reflected in physical and emotional symptoms, such as lethargy, exhaustion, tension, depression, and high blood pressure among teachers (Charles, 2002).

*Violent Acts*

Newer, more serious discipline problems have emerged in classrooms that reflect many of society's problems (Bear, 1998). Although less common, some classrooms and even entire schools are inundated by threats, violence, and vandalism, drug abuse, fighting, and gangs (Levin & Nolan, 2000). These problems were practically unheard of around the turn of the 20th century (Bear, 1998).

Violent crimes in schools represent a relatively small, but serious portion of the total number of misbehavior problems. This type of behavior can result in distractions and, at times, create disabling fears in innocent students and staff members (NSSC, 1992). Results of the National School Boards Association survey, "Violence in the Schools", reported that “1,216 administrators indicated that 54% of suburban and 64% of urban school officials reported more violent acts in their schools in 1993 than five years earlier” (Hoffman, 1996, p. 8).

During the 1999-2000 school year, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) administered a school survey on crime and safety. The 2000 School Survey on Crime and Safety (SSOCS) concluded the following:
1. Seventy-one percent of all public elementary and secondary school children experienced at least one violent incident at school.

2. Public school principals reported approximately 1,466,000 violent incidents that occurred during the school year.

3. Twenty percent of schools experienced a serious violent incident during that year, which represents about 61,700 incidents of serious violence occurring in American public schools (NCES, 2003).

Tolan and Guerra (as cited by Breunlin et. al, 2002) defined four patterns of adolescent violence:

1. Psychopathological violence, although rare, is committed by seriously disturbed and chemically-imbalanced adolescents.

2. Predatory violence can involve assault with bodily injury, armed robbery, and rape. This type of violence is committed for some type of personal gain.

3. Situational violence occurs as a result of a particular situation where violence appears to be the only alternative.

4. Relationship violence, arising from interpersonal disputes between students who know each other, escalates until violence becomes the attempted solution (Breunlin et al., 2002).

Causes of Student Misbehavior

According to Dewey (as cited by Levin, 2000) schools are microcosms of the larger society, with discipline problems in the schools reflecting problems facing society. Strahan (as cited by Schrupp, 1993) identified five basic needs that may explain students' behavior: (a) to survive, (b) to belong and be loved, (c) to gain power, (d) to be free, and (e) to have fun. When any of these needs go unmet, the student may
misbehave. Childs (1991) listed several environmental factors that can explain student disruptive behaviors, including

- correlation between parental control and student achievement,
- family's socioeconomic status,
- life-changes in the family structure,
- national political policy toward education,
- school-business partnerships, and
- private sector attitudes toward discipline.

Educators share the public's concern about school discipline problems. They attribute them primarily to the children and their home lives. The nature of the community, (e.g., increased mobility, less cohesion), the family, (e.g., more single mothers raising children, more mothers working, more divorces), and the media (e.g., increased television viewing, especially viewing of violence) have contributed to an increase in the seriousness and the frequency of discipline problems in the past several decades (Bear, 1998).

The roles of the home, society, and school have been cited as causes of school discipline problems. Various home experiences (e.g., little parent-child interaction, poverty, divorce, abuse, or neglect) have an influence on children's behavior (Edwards, 2004). According to Edwards (2004), many societal factors (e.g., gangs, drugs, peer pressure, racial conflicts, class conflicts, and technology in the form of television, videos, music, and the internet) can exacerbate school discipline problems. The school plays a part, as well, in school discipline problems. The school can promote misbehavior in students and create conditions that put students at risk, by misunderstanding learning conditions, failing to encourage independent thinking,
neglecting to establish inflexible conditions for students, exercising excessive control over students, and using discipline procedures that promotes misbehavior (Edwards, 2004).

*School Discipline*

Discipline, along with drug abuse, remains the single most common and pernicious problem that educators face in their day-to-day teaching, according to Edwards, 2004). In an effort to curb school violence and increase academic achievement, many parents and politicians have called for stricter disciplining of children in public schools (Way, 2004). School discipline is an important part of providing an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning (New South Wales Department of Education, 2002). Because of widely disseminated reports of crime and violence on school grounds, schools must develop, implement, and enforce effective student discipline policies and procedures to maintain order and control (NSSC, 1992).

*Definitions*

Discipline has been defined as "training that is expected to produce a specific character or pattern of behavior, especially training that produces moral and mental improvement" (NSSC, 1992, p. 9). Discipline is a process that a teacher uses to help students behave acceptably in school (Charles, 2002). School discipline policies should include school rules and strategies that promote appropriate behavior and effective learning within the school. The discipline policy should be designed to recognize and reinforce student achievement and include strategies for dealing with unacceptable behavior (New South Wales Department of Education and Training, 2002). This discipline policy should prohibit violence or threats of violence, possession of illegal drugs and offensive weapons, persistent disobedience, as well as criminal behavior.
Discipline must be consistently, consciously, and energetically pursued and taught. Discipline is the vehicle used to nurture students to help them develop responsibility, and ultimately control their actions (NSSC, 1992).

**Purpose of School Discipline**

Discipline problems have traditionally been resolved through some form of punishment. Punishment implies control through fear or pain and uses negative consequences to discourage unacceptable behavior (McCluney, 1987). The goal of discipline is to minimize and redirect misbehavior into positive behavior. The purpose of school discipline is to reduce the need for teacher intervention by helping students learn to control their behavior (Charles, 2002). Schools with more restrictive school discipline policies were associated with higher levels of educational commitment and academic achievement. This association suggested that restricting student behavior could increase student compliance in regard to basic day-to-day school activities (e.g., completing homework, bringing supplies, reducing tardiness and truancy; Way, 2004).

When public education was established in America, Jefferson and others who supported democracy, anticipated that public schools could help children overcome their self-interest or egoism by a moral instinct of care for and duty to others. When Jefferson began his model school of learning, he was in favor of self-government and a minimum of discipline. A student riot at his school made him realize that more stringent regulations were needed for discipline (Bear, 1998).

Freud's pleasure-pain principle provides one explanation for the use of punishment as a disciplinary method. The pleasure principle asserts that the organism attempts to function in such a way as to achieve pleasure and avoid the opposite.
Corporal punishment should make the discomfort so intense and immediate that the child would not consider repetition of the act that precipitated the punishment.

*Corporal Punishment*

*History of corporal punishment.*

Corporal punishment is a form of school discipline that has deep historical roots in the United States. As a well-established tradition, corporal punishment gets the source of its entrenchment from religion (Imbrogno, 2000).

According to McCluney (1987), corporal punishment as a way to correct and train a child, has its roots in the Bible. "[Proverbs 23, 13-14]: . . . do not withhold discipline from a child; if you beat him with a rod, he will not die. If you beat him with the rod you will save him from Sheol." "[Hebrews 12: 9-11, reinforced the use of discipline]: . . . we have had earthly fathers to discipline us and we respect them. Shall we not much more be subject to the father of Spirits and live? For they disciplined us for a short time at their pleasure, but he disciplines us for our good, that we may share his holiness. For the moment all discipline appears to be painful rather than pleasant; later it yields the peaceful fruit of righteousness to those who have been trained by it (p. 77)."

During Colonial times, corporal punishment was thought to be both a desirable and necessary instrument for restraining sin and immorality in children (Imbrogno, 2000, p.127). This tradition was brought by immigrants who came to America in the 18th and 19th centuries. As schooling moved away from the home to a more formal setting, corporal punishment was extended to the classroom, with the public school teacher and the administrator using it to control inappropriate student behavior. While the severity of punishment decreased during the 20th century, corporal punishment remained an integral part of the American family and the American school (Imbrogno, 2000).
Corporal Punishment under attack

Corporal punishment is under attack from much of the modern world today. The use of corporal punishment has been abolished in Denmark, Finland, Norway, Holland, the former Soviet Union, Israel and Japan. Many state legislatures are beginning to confront the issue of the legality of corporal punishment in the United States (McCluney, 1987).

The United States and Somalia are the only two countries worldwide that have not ratified the Convention of the Rights of the Child, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in November 1989, that prohibited the use of corporal punishment on children. The Convention was the first legally binding instrument that incorporated the full range of human rights for children (Imbrogno, 2000). As other countries move toward greater protection of their children, the United States' national policy still allows corporal punishment in its schools. Throughout other developed, industrial nations, the use of corporal punishment is forbidden.

The existence of policies supporting the use of corporal punishment is dependent on decisions made by state policymakers, while local school officials retain no discretion on the matter. States that permit corporal punishment either do not address the issue or have drafted a statute allowing schools to use physical force in disciplining their students. In these states, local school administrators retained the discretion to prohibit the practice of corporal punishment in their schools (Imbrogno, 2000). Legislatures in 27 states and the District of Columbia have passed state laws prohibiting the use of corporal punishment (Hinchey, 2003).

According to McCluney (1987), the use of corporal punishment in American Public Schools is widespread in the states that allow its use. In these twenty two states,
teachers continue to use corporal punishment. If school boards and school administrators do not want to be held accountable for misuse of corporal punishment, they have to develop policies and procedures governing its use. To do this effectively, schools need access to trends and legal aspects of corporal punishment (McCluney, 1987).

*Trends of corporal punishment.*

A study conducted at East Texas State University identified national trends relating to the practice of corporal punishment as a disciplinary technique for public school systems in the United States. Several trends were established by court decisions, state legislatures, state education agencies, and national professional organizations (Cook, 1990). Data revealed that most state and federal court decisions involved the following major issues:

1. The concept of *in loco parentis*;
2. Reasonable force;
3. Constitutional rights; and
4. Consequences of alleged teacher insubordination.

In 1645, the concept of *in loco parentis* (i.e., acting in place of parents) was established through regulation in Dorchester, Massachusetts, to allow the schoolmaster to administer disciplinary correction when needed, with parental authority (Cook, 1990). Around 1850, the public's concern began to grow concerning abusive corporal punishment, causing the trend for *in loco parentis* to be questioned. Toward the beginning of the 20th century, judicial decisions allowed reasonable punishment and held teachers liable for excessive punishment. The trend for the use of reasonable force moved from abusive corporal punishment with no consideration given to teacher liability...
to reasonable corporal punishment with the teacher held liable for excessive or unreasonable correction.

In early America, constitutional rights and civil liberties were limited. By the mid-1900s, more concern was shown for the welfare of individuals and for human rights. By the 1980s, numerous court cases had been heard claiming a violation of constitutional rights resulting from the use of corporal punishment. “The trend associated with constitutional issues was a growing movement from no consideration for protection from corporal punishment under the Constitution to recognition of human rights and ultimate bodily security guaranteed by substantive due process under the Constitution” (Cook, 1990, p. 231).

As American society became more concerned about abusive corporal punishment, teachers were restricted to reasonable and moderate use of corporal punishment (Cook, 1990). Teachers who used abusive physical punishment were administered penalties. Since the 1960s, school authorities implemented policies and procedures to regulate the use of corporal punishment, according to Cook (1990). As a result, teachers could be dismissed for insubordination if they failed to follow discipline policies and administrative directives. The trend involving teacher dismissals was a shift from total teacher autonomy in the use of corporal punishment to accountability and possible termination upon violation of school district formal policies and procedures on discipline (Cook, 1990).

Trends that developed as a result of state legislation and directives from state education agencies relating to the practice of corporal punishment in the public school system in the United States include:
1. Movement from a time when abusive corporal punishment was common for all citizens to a time when laws were established to protect adults but not school children;
2. Movement to recognize and promote children's rights where none previously existed;
3. Movement with northern states consistently opposing the use of corporal punishment, first with adults and later with schoolchildren; and southern states supporting the practice with citizens for a longer period of time. In 1990, many southern states continued to use corporal punishment in public schools (Cook, 1990).

According to Cook (1990), national professional organizations noted the existence of three trends:

1. An increase in the number and types of organizations that actively endorsed the prohibition of corporal punishment in the public schools.
2. Support for the increase in the number of professional associations, including teachers, that opposed corporal punishment, while administrator associations continued to sanction its use.
3. A large majority of organizations, representing widely-varying memberships, publicly opposed to the use of corporal punishment (Cook, 1990).

*Effects of corporal punishment.*

The possible effects of corporal punishment continue to be extensively debated by academicians, although behavioral and empirical research on the effects of corporal punishment on children is largely inconclusive. Supporters of corporal punishment pointed to the positive effects corporal punishment had on discipline and order. Other
researchers indicated findings that corporal punishment teaches children to learn to obey and respect authority, while building character. Proponents argued that corporal punishment was consistent with “the right of all students to receive an education, uninterrupted by a single individual, disruptive student” (Imbrogno, 2000, p. 128). Others viewed corporal punishment as an alternative to suspension. Finally, proponents asserted that corporal punishment is an inherent right of parents, teachers, and administrators through the doctrine of *in loco parentis* (Imbrogno, 2000).

Opponents of corporal punishment asserted that it was morally offensive, ineffective, and could affect children negatively. Research has linked corporal punishment to increased violence by recipients during childhood and adulthood. Corporal punishment could legitimize violence in the eyes of the child. In addition, corporal punishment could be linked to aggression through social learning. The idea is that children will act out the aggression that is implemented on them through the use of corporal punishment. Corporal punishment has been linked to juvenile delinquency and violent adult criminal behavior. Corporal punishment has been associated with diminished occupational and economic achievement (Imbrogno, 2000). Another criticism of corporal punishment is grounded largely on its perceived psychological impact on children and can result in feelings of alienation, depression, suicidal ideation, rage and indignation in children. Imbrogno (2000) cited researchers who have argued that children's responses to corporal punishment are to repress their feelings that could result in aggressiveness, inability to empathize, and a tendency toward either authoritarianism, or unquestioning obedience.
Corporal punishment replacements.

As the debate over corporal punishment continues, new policies are being developed, either as a replacement, an alternative, or a supplement to corporal punishment. When states legislatures and school districts adopt non-corporal punishment laws for their citizens, educators need to develop new ideas to replace the old, highly controversial discipline strategy. These new ideas have produced state and federal initiatives that have resulted in state and local student code of conduct mandates and guidelines, preventive programs and strategies, uniform policies, conflict resolution programs and comprehensive classroom management programs to eliminate the rising youth violence found in society.

Federal and state initiatives.

Recent policy has been developed at federal, state, and local levels to reduce violence and increase order and discipline. Local school boards, in response to state legislative mandates resulting from the increase in youth violence, are developing school discipline programs that focus on reduction of violent and aggressive behavior through punishment (e.g., time-out, suspension, expulsion, etc.; Gretchen, 1998). Government, communities, and schools have devised many promising types of antiviolence strategies that focus both on effective discipline as well as social and personal transformation (Schwartz, 1996).

Legislation has been created by all levels of government to reduce the availability of guns, particularly the sale of weapons to minors. Former President William Clinton signed the 1994 Gun-Free Schools Act to deal specifically with violence in schools. This act requires schools to automatically expel weapon-toting students for at least a year.
This Act also supports the "zero tolerance" policies for weapons that some states and school districts had already established (Schwartz, 1996).

The federal government and most states, as well have made funds available for prevention activities through anti-crime and education legislation, including anti-gang programs, prevention education, and recreational activities (Schwartz, 1996). Goals 2000: Educate America Act mandated that every school will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning by the year 2000 (Bear, 1998). West Virginia passed the Productive and Safe Schools Act in 1995 which created a zero-tolerance for guns, violence, and drugs on school grounds. Texas also passed its Safe Schools Act in 1995, which defined conditions for student expulsion, requests for written documentation of disciplinary actions, and mandates each school district to adopt a student code of conduct (Barton et al., 1998).

Codes of conduct.

The purpose of school codes of conduct is to have clearly defined and comprehensible rules. The existence of these rules is necessary to achieve the goal of effective schools (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1985). Codes of conduct are needed to balance rights and responsibilities of students. Students need to understand their rights and responsibilities with respect to behavior in the school environment that can prevent unfortunate consequences.

When codes of conduct are institutionalized, commitment to violence prevention is demonstrated and staff and students feel safe. These school safety policies should explain school rules and delineate punishments for offenses. Development of school safety policies, such as codes of conduct, should include administrators, teachers, parents and students to ensure that the policy is respected and enforced. All policies
should be reviewed periodically for appropriateness, effectiveness, and completeness, with copies distributed to administrators, teachers, parents, and students. Students also may need to have the rules explained to them to assure that they understand the codes of conduct and the reasons for them (Schwartz, 1996).

A study was conducted by the National School Safety Center (NSSC, 1992) of 713 secondary schools in 48 states. The study determined that the most frequently mentioned regulations in student handbooks, also known as codes of conduct, are as follows:

1. Assault, battery or harassment of school property;
2. Bullying;
3. Care of school property;
4. Fighting;
5. Gambling;
6. Gang attire and activity;
7. Guidance services;
8. Narcotics, alcoholic beverages and stimulant drugs;
9. Search and seizure;
10. Students rights and responsibilities; and

General standards of conduct are also included in the many student handbooks. These standards include general rules concerning: (a) forms of rowdiness; (b) student traffic; (c) fire drills; (d) designated food and drink areas; (e) physical attacks or verbal abuse against faculty or staff members, use of profanity, classroom and study hall conduct; (f)
care and use of school property; (g) office and hallway permission; and (h) gum and candy rules (NSSC, 1992).

Legal authority for school discipline has been given to governing boards, usually through state law. In many states, the board is instructed to develop and adopt standards of conduct that must be met by all students as a condition of attending the public school district. The regulations outline proper student conduct, penalties for students who fail to meet the required standards, and increasing penalties depending on the severity or frequency of student offenses, including suspensions and expulsions (NSSC, 1992).

Preventive programs and strategies.

In an attempt to prevent youth violence, government officials, community members, and educators have created different initiatives and policies. Despite their efforts, preventive programs and strategies are needed. Schools have increased the number of hired security guards to patrol the building and promote safety at all levels. The most common form of school security is student monitoring. School security is mostly needed when students are moving through the hallways and in places where students congregate, such as the cafeteria and the restrooms (Schwartz. 1996).

A comprehensive violence prevention program is needed that can eliminate all types of violent acts and effect every violent student. Administrators face a dilemma because their choices are limited for dealing with various types of school violence. Universal programs, such as climate improvements and conflict skills training, which targets all students, have not been shown to reduce violence among at-risk students. The need for secondary prevention programs that target violent at-risk students is
growing. Schools can modify their disciplinary codes to offer prevention programs in place of suspension (Breunlin et al, 2002).

As a preventive strategy, some schools use parents and teacher’s aides as monitors. Students may be more reluctant to behave badly when watched by someone they regularly see in the neighborhood. Other schools use metal detectors as well as systematic and random searches of students to keep them from bringing in weapons. Teachers and other school staff members are involved in youth violence prevention through discussions at staff meetings about violence issues and training to help the staff feel safer and more secure (Schwartz, 1996).

Early intervention is also viewed as a way to help prevent youth violence. Some school districts initiate training for anger management, impulse control, appreciation of diversity, along with mediation and conflict resolution skills in elementary schools. Age-appropriate training in self-esteem development and stress management and reduction is also made available in some schools. Other types of training cover development of "refusal skills" to help students learn to:

1. Resist using substances and engaging in sexual activity; and
2. Prevent date violence, with particular attention to battering during teenage pregnancy.

Specially-trained safety coordinators or committees to coordinate anti-violence programs are used by schools to respond to crisis situations by offering counseling and mediation. Other schools try to prevent violence through the use of positive reinforcements for good behavior, such as incentives or rewards (Schwartz, 1996).
The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) polled high school students in regard to school violence. Their results revealed the following solutions to the problem of school violence:

1. Confront and discuss issues of racism and cultural conflict;
2. Institute "safe corridor" programs to protect students on their way to and from school;
3. Secure school entrances;
4. Establish more extracurricular activities and clubs;
5. Hold open mike assemblies where students can express themselves;
6. Establish programs to help students find part-time jobs; and
7. Teach conflict-resolution techniques, (Siegel, as cited by Lumsden, 2001).

Schools that are plagued with gangs have developed anti-gang strategies. A first step is to establish and publicize a zero-tolerance philosophy to all stakeholders. These policies should include establishing a dress code for students, prohibiting flashing of gang signs and shouting gang slogans, as well as banning gang graffiti on school or personal property. These schools make an extra effort to involve potential and active gang members in academic, extracurricular, and counseling programs. Parents of children in gangs are encouraged to provide the school with information about their children's gang activity. These schools also provide services from outside agencies that offer counseling to gang members. As a last resort for resistant gang members, school administrators can transfer them to alternative schools or expel them (Schwartz, 1996).

*Uniforms.*

Concerns about school violence have led to the increased interest and acceptance of school uniforms. According to Ronald D. Stephens, (White, as cited by Lumsden, 2001) executive director of the National School Safety Center, many
communities and schools have embraced school uniform policies to enhance school safety. In 1996, President William Clinton wrote in a memorandum to Richard Riley, the Secretary of Education, "If school uniforms can help deter school violence, promote discipline, and foster a better learning environment, then we should offer our strong support to the schools and parents that try them" (p.1). As a result, manuals on school uniform adoption were sent to 15,000 school districts in the nation. (Portner, as cited in Brown, 1998). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (as cited by Lumsden, 2001) added that uniforms were once the trademark of private and parochial schools.

Today, the number of public schools adopting uniforms and/or strong dress codes is growing annually (NAESP, 2000, as cited in Lumsden, 2001). Six of the largest school districts (i.e., Birmingham, Alabama; Chicago, Illinois; Dayton, Ohio; Long Beach, California; San Antonio, Texas; and Oakland, California) have adopted mandatory policies (Brown, 1998). More than 30 additional school districts have voluntary policies, while countless others are considering implementation of some type of school uniform policy. This trend began in the fall of 1987, primarily in inner city locations, such as Baltimore, Maryland and Washington DC. By 1996, school uniform guidelines in most elementary and middle schools had been established in 10 states (Stanley, as cited in Brown, 1998).

The purpose of student school uniforms is to improve the climate for learning by eliminating "label competition" and peer pressure with regard to clothing (Elam, 1996). Proponents of school uniforms cite the following as benefits of instituting school uniform policies: (a) improved discipline; (b) increased respect for teachers; (c) increased school attendance; (d) decreased distractions; (e) improved academic performance; (f)
increased self-esteem and confidence; (g) decreased overall clothing costs; (h) promotion of group spirit; (i) reduction in social stratification and fashion statements; (j) improved classroom behavior; (k) lower rates of school crime and violence; and (l) easy identification of strangers on campus (Caruso & Stanley, as cited by Brown, 1998).

Support for school uniforms has come from government sources and school administrators (Brown, 1998). Many administrators have required students to wear uniforms to reduce the risk of violence and create a positive, productive learning environment. In 1996, a survey of principals conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) found strong support for uniforms (Brown, as cited in Lumsden, 2001). Of 5,500 principals included in the study, 70% said they believed "requiring students to wear uniforms to school would reduce violent incidents and discipline problems" (p.1). Many administrators also "believe that uniforms will reduce discipline referrals, while improving attendance, achievement, self esteem, and the school climate" (Brown, as cited in Lumsden, 2001, p.1).

Many educators and some students believe the use of school uniforms can reduce discipline referrals, while improving student attendance, student achievement, student self-esteem and the school climate (Brown, 1998). Middle school students polled in the Charleston School District indicated that school uniforms did not alter student perception of the school climate, (Wilson, as cited in Lumsden, 2001). Another study revealed that students required to wear school uniforms perceived their school climates were more positive than students who were enrolled in schools that did not require uniforms. High school students polled by the ACLU did not feel that restrictive dress codes or uniforms could be helpful in reducing violence (Lumsden, 2001).
A number of school systems and school districts would like to know if school uniforms have a positive effect on school violence and other disciplinary problems (Elam, 1996). Success with mandatory school uniforms has been documented by the Long Beach School District in California. In a study conducted over a 2-year period, the researchers found a 34% drop in assault and battery cases in grades K-8, a 51% drop in physical fights, and a 32% drop in suspensions (Elam, 1996). According to Phi Delta Kappa’s Gallup poll, results remain inconclusive for the rest of Americans on the effect of mandatory school uniforms. Respondents endorsed mandatory school uniforms by a small margin of 53% to 44%. The highest support came from African-Americans (66%), Catholics (66%), and college graduates (64%; Elam, 1996).

Some research supports the use of school uniform policies as a way to affect student achievement and student behavior in a positive direction. A 1996 study that examined the influence of school uniforms on academic achievement and discipline infractions in two Florida school districts revealed several findings: (a) Elementary school students in both rural and urban school districts demonstrated improvement in academic achievement for the first year following implementation of the school-uniform policy; (b) The discipline infractions leading to out-of-school suspensions and juvenile referrals had a significant improvement, excluding middle-school students for discipline infractions for 1996-1997; (c) the number of students not promoted to the next grade showed a significant effect by district type, but not by gender (Pate, 1999). Another study was conducted during the 2000-2001 school year included 19 separate schools, with 8,194 students. Data included 766 discipline cases that were recorded over a 153-day period. On the days that students were dressed down (i.e., not in uniform), a large increase (38%) was noted in the discipline cases compared to days students wore
regular school uniform attire. Sommers (2001) concluded that (a) the type of school
dress has an effect on school discipline; and (b) in most cases, school dress also
affects the degree of severity of discipline infractions (Sommers, 2001).

Conflict resolution.

Conflict resolution is a classroom management skill that teaches problem-solving
skills. These programs encourage young people to grow into responsible citizens by
helping them resolve immediate disagreements in a manner that facilitates working out
future difficulties. Conflict resolution contains a high degree of student involvement
where teachers help students think through behavioral decisions that can assist them in
developing values. Teachers help students learn to respect one another, develop
problem-solving skills by finding solutions that work, and take charge of their individual
behavior (Sloane, 1998).

The basic steps of conflict resolution programs include:

1. Define the problem.
2. Develop possible solutions.
3. Reach agreements.
4. Implement solutions.
5. Evaluate whether problems are solved (Fields & Boesser, as cited in Sloane,
   1998).

A study was conducted on a conflict resolution program designed as an
alternative to out-of-school suspensions, called Alternative to Suspension for Violent
Behavior (ASVB). The study was conducted with 165 students who had been previously
suspended for disciplinary actions. Results of the study found statistically significant
differences between previously-suspended students who took ASVB training (n=73)
versus suspended students who had not received ASVB training (n=92). Students who had completed the program were less likely to receive another suspension for fighting, or to receive post-intervention school disciplinary acts than those who did not complete the program (Breunlin et al., 2002).

School and Classroom Management

Introduction.

In an attempt to increase student achievement, some schools have established classroom communities that have replaced the traditional concept of discipline, using a process known as classroom management. Research on teacher effectiveness conducted largely in the 1970s and 1980s has consistently demonstrated that proactive classroom management could reduce classroom disruption and increase student learning (Bear, 1998). Classroom management has been identified as the most important factor that can influence student learning, as long as it is effectively established and maintained (Jones, 1998). Research found that the ability to create safe, supportive classrooms is a major factor that impacts student motivation, achievement, and behavior (Jones, 1998).

Definitions.

According to Sanford et al. (as cited by Jones, 1998), the concept of classroom management includes actions that teachers take to foster student involvement and cooperation in classroom activities and to establish a productive working environment. Good and Brophy (as cited by Jones, 1998) defined classroom management as a process of establishing and maintaining effective learning environments. McCaslim and Good (as cited in Jones, 1998) indicated that classroom management can and should do more than elicit predictable obedience. Classroom management should be a practice
to enhance student self-understanding, self-evaluation, and internalization of self-control. Rademacher (1998) defined classroom management as a classroom rule management routine that was a systematic instructional process used by teachers to guide students toward successful rule compliance in classrooms, on their jobs, and in their communities.

*Principles of classroom management.*

Effective classroom management requires the use of a variety of power bases. French and Raven (as cited in Levin & Nolan, 2000) identified four different types of power that teachers can use to influence social behavior:

1. *Referent power* – Students behave as the teacher wishes because they like the teacher as a person,
2. *Expert power* – Students behave as the teacher wishes because they view him or her as a good, knowledgeable teacher who can help them to learn.
3. *Legitimate power* – Students behave as the teacher wishes because the student views the teacher as the legal and formal authority for maintaining appropriate behavior in the classroom, and
4. *Reward/coercive power* – Teachers are consistent in assigning and withholding rewards and punishments and the teacher makes sure the student sees the connection between their behavior and the reward or punishment.

Levin and Nolan (2000) described three theories of classroom management:

1. *Student-directed management* – students have the primary responsibility for controlling their behavior;
2. **Collaborative management** – student behavior is the joint responsibility of the student and the teacher;

3. **Teacher-directed management** – students become good decision makers by rules and guidelines developed by the teacher to create a productive learning environment.

**Effectiveness of classroom management.**

Effective classroom management procedures promote independent learning and success for all students in classrooms that are productive, orderly, and pleasant (Rademacher, 1998). The process of establishing specific routines for managing materials, time, instruction, and student behavior can increase instructional time and student involvement (Rademacher, 1998). Teachers need a well-planned, individual approach to discipline. Teachers must understand various psychological theories of discipline, their assumptions, and their own values and educational philosophy (Edwards, 2004).

According to Brophy and Everston, (as cited by Jones, 1998) many surveys of teacher effectiveness report that classroom management skills were of primary importance to determine teaching success. Teachers who are successful are competent in managing student behavior to maximize the time spent on learning (Levin & Nolan, 2000). A teacher with poor classroom management skills will be less effective with educating students. Research found that teachers who established and maintained effective learning environments tend to be more successful than teachers who placed more emphasis on their roles as authority figures or disciplinarians.
Purpose of Schools

Introduction.

The educational system of the United States is one of the most important foundations of a democratic form of government (McCluney, 1987). Every society needs rules to assure orderly activities and to establish institutions that prepare children for the adult world. In American society, two of the many responsibilities of state government is to promote public welfare and to create a public educational system that can educate students effectively (New Jersey State Department of Education, 1985). The responsibilities of these educational systems are to:

1. Ensure that schools perform their educational function;
2. Maintain an orderly environment conducive to learning; and

"The collective perspective of educational philosophers on the purpose of education was to pass on to each new generation the best the western world had to offer" (Johnson, 1995, p. 5).

The primary purpose of schools is to guarantee that students develop their full potential academically, socially, and physically (NCCS, 1992). A school that fulfills its purpose is committed to effectively educating all students and responding to local needs and priorities (NSSC, 1992). According to Hess (as cited in Nathan, 2004), "Public schools should teach children the essential skills and knowledge that make for productive citizens and teach them to respect our constitutional order" (p. 440.)

In Phi Delta Kappan Gallup poll (Elam, 1996), several objectives were rated in regard to their importance relative to purposes of the nation's public schools. The
public's perceptions and beliefs about the goals of education and the role of public schools included:

1. To prepare students to be responsible citizens; and
2. To help people become economically self-sufficient.

*Culture.*

Schools in the United States have been given the responsibility of transmitting culture (Johansen, Collins, Johnson, 1986). Culture is defined as ways of living that societies have developed as people interact with each other and their environment. Culture includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, values, laws, language, tools, institutions, and ideas (Johansen et al., 1986). To transmit culture, schools were expected to accomplish two goals: (a) transmit knowledge, and (b) impart citizenship education.

*Citizenship.*

A primary goal of education is to produce individuals who are capable of moral judgment and self-control (Elam, 1996). When the founding fathers established public education in America, they argued that its primary goal should be teaching responsible citizenship. This goal was consistent with Thomas Jefferson's philosophy that democracy could be protected only by establishing a nation of independent-minded, self-governing learners. Schools in America were intended to instill a moral sense in students by developing reasoning linked to just and caring behavior (Bear, 1998).

Along with responsible citizenship, schools are expected to make efforts to enable students to appreciate and understand the system of government. An educated citizenry is one that uses the knowledge they have gained to produce an effective government of, for, and by the people. Overall, schools are expected to bring about a
congruency between American ideas and real life circumstances (Johansen et al., 1986).

*Academic achievement.*

The transmission of knowledge historically has been the responsibility of schools. In the early colonies, schools were meant to teach the young to read, write, and decipher, using the Bible as the basic textbook (Johansen et al., 1986). As the colonies grew and became a nation and the westward movement began, knowledge expanded to include vocational skills necessary to foster the growth of the nation. Secondary schools were introduced during this time to advance the development of this growing nation.

In the 1960's, unsolved social problems caused people to question the foundations of American society (Miller, 1992). This social ferment set off an educational uprising. Public education came under attack and was made responsible for American's social crises. Critics examined the social, cultural and political foundations of public schooling and “found these foundations to be so rotten that they called for a major overhaul of school administration or the dismantling of public schools altogether” (Miller, 1992, p. 141).

The agricultural and industrial revolutions changed what was expected of schools in preparing graduates for employment. Specialization, leisure time, compulsory attendance laws, and racial integration have contributed to unique problems that American schools have encountered for several decades (McCluney, 1987). In the 1970's, the conservatives asserted their control over education with a call for greater efficiency, better academic results and more discipline. This was an attempt to strengthen the system with more challenging curricula.
The back-to-school basics movement, emphasizing test scores, time-on-task and other heavy-handed control over the lives of children continued to gain momentum through the 1980's (Miller, 1992). During the 1990s, educational reform has meant rising test scores, improving cultural literacy (which is what every American must know), and reestablishing discipline which in turn supports traditional educational goals, academic and vocational skills, and the transmission of cultural values (Miller, 1992). Today, knowledge has become a more comprehensive term; representing reading, writing, decoding, social studies, biological and physical sciences, agriculture, home economics, industrial education, languages, business, art, and a multitude of other specialties (Johansen et al., 1986).

**Discipline.**

The American public believes that schools should play a primary role in teaching self-discipline. Phi Delta Kappa's 1996 Gallup poll revealed that 98% of the public believe that a primary purpose of public schools should be to prepare students to be responsible citizens. The public also believes that present methods of teaching discipline are not working. The public is not pleased with the way the schools handle discipline problems: 70% recently graded the schools a "C" or lower in this area (Bear, 1998). Schools are expected to achieve two traditional educational goals concerning school discipline:

1. Develop self-discipline, or self-regulation of behavior, among students.

   Teaching self-discipline is to help students internalize their motivation for their behavior and democratic values.
2. Use discipline when children fail to exhibit self-discipline. When children are disciplined, a safe, orderly, and positive school environment is created and maintained (Bear, 1998).

**Security and safety.**

As school violence continues to increase, both in and out of school, administrators continue to seek effective approaches to reduce or prevent violence. The three approaches used in schools include security, punishment, and school-based programs (Breunlin et al., 2002). Security approaches keep violence under control, with punishment said to deter school violence. School-based programs provide alternatives to violence.

The intent of security is to keep violence out of schools through the use of guards, metal detectors, identification badges, locked schools and lockers, as well as book bag checks. However, this approach is expensive. Another security approach is student profiling, where potentially violent students are observed and identified (Breunlin et al., 2002). Violence prevention programs are a second approach to school violence. These programs provide skills-based training to students and staff members to help identify, deal with, and prevent school violence problems. A comprehensive violence prevention program must (a) attack murder, physical fighting and bullying and (b) understand that violence exists in several forms and has several causes (Breunlin et al, 2002). A third approach to school violence is punishment, which has been used in schools since the inception of public education. The most common form of punishment is out-of-school suspensions. However, the effectiveness of suspensions has come under scrutiny for the following reasons:

2. Suspensions have not been fair to all groups of students.

3. Suspensions create serious negative consequences for suspended students.

4. Suspensions further disempower and isolate students who are already borderline (Breunlin et al., 2002).

The purpose of security in the school shared the same function as the need for an effective discipline policy. School security and school discipline policies supported students’ rights for safe schools. The following supports this right:

1. *General tort liability laws* - is the avenue for claims to a right for safe schools on the basis of negligence;

2. *Criminal laws* - deals with crimes and violence in schools for the protection of students and teachers;


Under the *in loco parentis* doctrine, schools are expected to protect students from harmful and dangerous influences. In 1982, California approved Proposition 8, commonly known as “The Victim’s Bill of Rights.” Public safety is protected, encouraged, and extended to public school campuses (NSSC, 1992). Although the United States constitution does not provide a constitutional right to an education – safe or unsafe, California, in providing safe schools, has encouraged other states to make school safety a priority (NSSC, 1992).

A safer school is a better school, where students and teachers feel protected when doing their jobs (NSSC, 1992). Establishing a climate for the development of self-control, as well as academic achievement, requires the use of external authority and control (Elam, 1996). According to *Phi Delta Kappa’s* 1996 Gallup poll, concerns were
raised regarding the need to improve classroom order and school security. The participants recommended the following procedures:

1. Remove persistent troublemakers from the classroom so that order can be maintained;
2. Ban smoking anywhere on school grounds;
3. Require students to remain on school grounds during lunchtime;
4. Rule out kissing and hugging anywhere on school grounds;
5. Approve security guards in schools;
6. Use trained dogs to sniff out drugs;

Millions of dollars are being diverted from academic programs to school security and protection systems to manage increasing student misbehavior problems. These funds could have been used for educational and academics programs, which is where the funds were originally allotted (NSSC, 1992).

*Standards Testing, Student Achievement, and Tracking Performance*

In the early 1990s, standards played only a minor role in school reform. The push for standards was created by critics who thought America's public school students were not achieving at desired levels. This lack of achievement caused policymakers to get serious about establishing standards (Lashway, 2002). After a decade of effort by policymakers, all state bureaucracies have began moving in the same direction:

1. developing comprehensive academic standards,
2. designing assessments,
3. implementing school report cards, and
4. offering performance based rewards or sanctions.
Standards-based accountability now plays a major role in school reform (Lashway, 2002).

The approach to standards-based accountability has several positive characteristics: (a) focuses on results; (b) focuses on academic achievement; (c) measures achievement with paper and pencil tests; (d) assumes rewards for teachers can lead to better teaching, and (e) challenges teacher assumptions about student capability (Lashway, 2002). The standards-based reform agenda has been embraced by every state and most school districts as a way to compare the quality of schools. This type of comparison shines the light on inequalities and helps improve student achievement. Parents support this agenda because it raises their expectations of their students, which have been too low for too long. (Gandal & Vranek, 2001).

In August 2000, a national poll was conducted for the Business Roundtable, an association of chief executive officers of leading U.S. corporations. The results of parents and nonparents were:

1. Eight out of ten said that raising academic achievement is a move in the right direction,
2. Three-fourths agree that students should have to pass a test to earn a high school diploma,
3. Approximately 8 out of 10 support such tests if students who initially fail the test receive extra help and more than one opportunity to pass (Gandal & Vranek, 2001).

A survey conducted in October 2000, revealed that:

1. Two percent of parents favor abandoning standards,
2. A majority of respondents want their schools to continue implementing standards rather than revert back to what was done previously,

3. Support in five large cities (Boston, Chicago, Cleveland, Los Angeles and New York) that use standards-based reform was as large as it was nationally,

4. More than 7 out of 10 parents believe that tests are useful in several ways: (a) identify students who need extra help, (b) cause students to pay attention to what is being taught, (c) to hold schools accountable for raising achievement.

5. One parent in 10 believes the following: (a) teachers put too much academic pressure on students, (b) schools require too many standardized tests, or (c) test questions are too difficult (Granek & Vranek, 2001).

In January 2001, a national survey was released by Education Week concerning teacher's views of standards, testing, and accountability. Eighty-seven percent of teachers agree somewhat or very much that raising standards is a move in the right direction (Gandal & Vranek, 2001). The public continues to support standards, as long as students are prepared to succeed in the next grade, in college, and in meaningful careers.

*Raising student outcomes.*

Administrators struggle to improve student achievement, meet increased standards for school improvement, and adhere to complicated legal mandates despite dwindling resources (Schrupp, 1993). The cumulative effects of new state standards, comprehensive assessment, and rewards and punishments associated with educational accountability programs have caused educator's attentions to become focused on student outcomes that are measured by standards-based tests (George, 2001).
Urban schools make a comeback.

America's urban public schools are staging a comeback. In 1999, the Council of the Great City Schools released a report and a poll confirming signs of improvement and optimism that big-city public schools across the nation are experiencing. In the report, Signs of Progress: Preliminary Evidence of Urban School Comeback, shows test scores in urban districts are on the rise, and stronger accountability systems are being implemented (Casserly, 1999).

The results of the report showed progress urban schools made in many different areas. One area of progress was the fact that 18 districts reported increased scores on national, state, and/or local student achievement tests. The single most important factor for the cause of the many improvements is a growing consensus of what needs to be done to improve urban education among parents, educators, business leaders, school principals, and government representatives. Two of the many ideas for improvement involved higher academic standards, and stronger accountability (Casserly, 1999).

Tracing American educational performance.

Understanding the dynamics of America's educational system is important for placing attention on accountability and understanding issues facing policymakers (Hanushek, 2001). The performance of America's schools is best assessed by considering the performance on examinations given by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP; Hanushek, 2001). The periodic NAEP exams in different grades and in different subject areas record student achievement of a random sample of American students over the past thirty years. Student achievement is monitored and communicated publicly. Then the information about student achievement is used to push innovation and/or competition (Hanushek, 2001).
National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)

The NAEP, also known as "the Nation's Report Card," is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students can do in various subject areas (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2004). The NAEP, established in 1969-1970, monitors the academic achievement of students in the United States. The NAEP is a federally-authorized survey of student achievement in various curriculum areas, such as math, reading, writing, science, U.S. history, the arts and foreign languages at grades 4, 8, and 12. Results of NAEP's research are descriptive and are not designed to establish cause-and-effect relationships. The NAEP is designed to serve the purposes of the law and provide the public and decision makers with useable information. The intent of the law is to provide the nation, the states, and various student populations with representative-sample data on student achievement and monitor educational progress over time (National Assessment Governing Board [NAGB], 2003).

NAEP collects background information on students and their families to track factors associated with academic achievement. By law, the NAEP is prohibited from asking questions about personal or family beliefs and attitudes. The NAEP can only collect information that is "directly related to the appraisal of academic achievement." Because No Child Left Behind places an emphasis on closing performance gaps among various student groups, such as race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, disability, and limited English proficiency, background information is needed. The background data are used to support NAEP's primary purpose - to provide sound, timely information on the academic achievement of American students (NAGB, 2003).
In 2002, the NAGB was granted final authority over background questions. The Background Information Framework was created to guide the gathering of important information used in reporting and understanding NAEP results. The Background Information Framework focuses on collecting and reporting background data by the NAGB and establishes clear priorities and limits. The NAGB (2003) also establishes policy for NAEP and determines the content framework for each assessment.

The NAEP project is conducted by the Commissioner of Education Statistics, who heads the National Center for Education Statistics in the U. S. Department of Education. The NEAP provides results regarding subject-matter achievement, instructional experiences, and school environment for populations of students and subgroups within those populations. NAEP reports information for the nation and specific regions of the country and includes students from public and nonpublic schools (NCES, 2004).

Summary

Student misbehavior has become a growing problem for educators across the United States, with discipline ranked as the second biggest problem facing public schools. Research found that student misbehavior has a negative effect on the learning environment. Most incidents of student misbehavior are nonviolent and petty. Violent crimes in schools represent a small, but serious portion of student misbehavior problems. Causes of student misbehavior range from problems at home to societal factors, as well as school experiences.

In an effort to decrease and eliminate student misbehavior and raise student achievement, schools have had to develop and implement student discipline policies and procedures. Traditionally, discipline problems were resolved through some form of
punishment. Corporal punishment was one form of school discipline. The effects of corporal punishment are inconclusive and have been extensively debated. Corporal punishment has been under attack through much of the modern world, and has been abolished in many countries. Corporal punishment has deep historical roots in the United States and continues to be permitted in some states, although 27 states and the District of Columbia have passed legislation banning its use in public schools.

As debate over corporal punishment continues, new policy is being developed to either replace corporal punishment or as an alternative to corporal punishment. Federal and state initiatives have been developed to assist with school discipline problems. Local school boards frequently mandate preventive strategies and programs (e.g., school codes of conduct, school uniform policies, conflict resolution programs, and classroom management communities) to reduce violent and aggressive student behavior.

The learning process and the learning environment continue to be affected by mandates implemented at the federal, state and local levels. The purpose of education must not be lost, or negatively altered, as schools attempt to meet the standards of these mandates. Schools are still expected to transmit culture, teach self-discipline and responsible citizenship, and convey knowledge to students. Having a school where teachers and students feel protected when doing their job is necessary for effective teaching and learning to occur. Administrators continue to seek effective approaches to reduce or prevent school misbehavior and violence, using various security measures to assure that the educational environment is conducive to increasing student achievement.
Student achievement has become a focal point for educational policy makers. As the push for school reform continues, a standards-based accountability system developed across the United States in an effort to trace America's educational performance. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), also known as the Nation's Report Card, is one of the ways the performance of America's schools is assessed. The NAEP is a federally authorized survey of student achievement in various subject areas. This study uses NAEP data and state achievement test scores to examine differences in demographic characteristics and student achievement between states where corporal punishment is allowed and states that have banned corporal punishment.
Chapter III

Methodology

The methods that were used to collect and analyze the data that needed to address the research questions that have been posed for this study are presented in this chapter. The topics included in this discussion are restatement of the problem, research design, variables in the study, data collection procedures, and data analysis. Each of these topics is presented separately.

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine if states that have made corporal punishment illegal and states that continue to use corporal punishment in their schools differ in terms of state department of education demographics (e.g., racial breakdown, socioeconomic status, school-related factors, etc.) and student achievement, as measured by National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state-mandated tests.

Research Design

An ex post facto research design was used in this study to compare state composite scores on achievement tests between states that allow corporal punishment in schools and states that have not passed legislation banning this practice. The data were obtained from state and federal governmental sources on the Internet that report student outcomes by state. This type of research design is appropriate when the independent variable is not manipulated and data have been collected independently (Kerlinger & Lee, 1999).

The three major limitations of this type of design were: (a) the inability to manipulate the independent variable, (b) lack of power to randomize, and (c) the risk of
improper interpretation (Kerlinger & Lee, 1999). Improper interpretation could result from more than one possible explanation of the results of the statistical analysis.

Variables in the Study

The variables used in this study were obtained from federal and state government sources, including data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), and departments of education for each state. Data on the variables were obtained from public domain websites, without contacting any officials from these organizations.

Information from NCES State Profiles included:

- Economic factors:
  - Percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch
  - Percentage of Title 1 schools
  - Per pupil expenditures

- School-related factors:
  - Pupil-teacher ratio
  - Percent of minority representation in schools
  - Number of teachers (full-time equivalents [FTE]) at elementary and middle school levels
  - Percentage of students qualifying for special education services
  - Percentage of students in limited English proficiency programs

Sources of data

- Corporal Punishment (legal or illegal) from the Family Education Network.

  State student achievement outcomes as measured by national test results for 4th and 8th grade students from NAEP

- Reading
- Mathematics

Individual State Boards of Education

- Results of students participating in statewide high stakes testing who have passed their tests
Individual school districts in selected states to obtain test scores for the districts.

School district student achievement outcomes as measured by state results

- Reading
- Mathematics

*Data Collection*

The data used in this study were collected from several Internet sites that provide statistical data on state education characteristics, school achievement, and student behaviors. For example, data were obtained from the NAEP regarding student test results on national testing for reading and math. State characteristics were obtained from NCES, and the state board of education websites were obtained on percentage of students who had passed the state high-stakes academic tests. Data obtained from these websites were entered in Excel data files for transfer to SPSS-Windows, ver. 13.0.

Selected school districts in six states, three allowing corporal punishment and three that had banned the use of corporal punishment in the schools, were selected for further examination. The selected school districts in the six states were matched in terms of ethnic representation (White and minority) and socioeconomic status (as determined by the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch). The researcher also matched the school districts in terms of enrollment to the extent possible. Data on academic outcomes and school variables from individual school districts were obtained from state or district websites. The school district outcomes were compared among the three states to further explore effects of corporal punishment on student outcomes.
Data Analysis

The data obtained from the different websites were analyzed using SPSS- Windows, ver. 13.0. The data were analyzed using crosstabulations and measures of central tendency and dispersion. The purpose of these analyses was to provide a profile of the states that allowed or disallowed the use of corporal punishment in their public schools. In addition, selected school districts within six states were matched by race and socioeconomic status (determined by the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch programs). Where either t-tests or crosstabulations were used to make a comparative analysis among the two types of states, an alpha level of .05 was used as the criterion level for all decisions regarding the statistical significance of the findings.

Inferential statistical analyses were used to address the research questions. These statistical analyses included t-tests for two independent samples and one-way multivariate analysis of variance. All decisions on the statistical significance of these findings were made using an alpha level of .05. Figure 1 presents the statistical analyses that were used to address each research question.
Figure 1

Statistical Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment have a larger percentage of minority students than states that have banned the use of corporal punishment?</td>
<td>Dependent Variable: Percent of minority students</td>
<td>A t-test for two independent samples was used to compare the percentage of minority students by corporal punishment group (legal/illegal).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent Variable: Corporal Punishment Group (Legal/illegal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding economic factors that include: percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, Title 1 funding, and per pupil expenditures? | Dependent Variables:  
  - Percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch  
  - Title 1 funding  
  - Per pupil expenditures  | A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was used to compare differences in economic factors by corporal punishment group (legal/illegal). If a statistically significant difference was obtained on the omnibus F, the univariate F tests were examined to determine which economic factor is contributing to the statistically significant result. The mean scores for corporal punishment group were used to determine the direction of the difference. |
|                                                                                  | Independent Variable: Corporal Punishment Group (Legal/illegal)           |                                                                                                                                                      |
| 3. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding school-related factors that include: pupil-teacher ratio, number of teachers (FTE), percentage of individualized education programs (IEPs), and percentage of students in limited English proficiency programs? | Dependent Variables:  
  - Pupil-teacher ratio  
  - Number of teachers (FTE)  
  - Percentage of individualized education programs (IEPs)  
  - Percentage of students in limited English proficiency programs  | A one-way multivariate analysis of variance was used to compare differences in school-related factors by corporal punishment group (legal/illegal). If a statistically significant difference was obtained on the omnibus F, the univariate F tests were examined to determine which school-related factor is contributing to the statistically significant result. The mean scores for corporal punishment group were used to determine the direction of the difference. |
|                                                                                  | Independent Variable: Corporal Punishment Group (Legal/illegal)           |                                                                                                                                                      |
| 4. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding student achievement based on NAEP outcomes for fourth and eighth grade students? | Dependent Variables:  
  - Reading outcomes  
  - Fourth & eighth grades  
  - Mathematics outcomes  
  - Fourth & eighth grades  
  - State high-stakes academic tests Fourth and eighth grades  | Separate one-way multivariate analysis of variance were used to compare differences in reading and mathematics academic outcomes for fourth and eighth grade students by corporal punishment group (legal/illegal). If a statistically significant difference was obtained on the omnibus F, the univariate F tests were examined to determine which academic outcomes is contributing to the statistically significant result. The mean scores for corporal punishment group were used to determine the direction of the difference. |
<p>|                                                                                  | Independent Variable: Corporal Punishment Group (Legal/illegal)           |                                                                                                                                                      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5.  Is there a difference in student outcomes in school districts that are located in a state that allows corporal punishment and school districts in a state that has made corporal punishment illegal? | **Dependent Variables**  
- Reading outcomes  
  Fourth & eighth grades  
- Mathematics outcomes  
  Fourth & eighth grades  
**Independent Variable**  
Corporal Punishment Group (Legal/illegal) | Separate one-way multivariate analysis of variance were used to compare differences in reading and mathematics academic outcomes for fourth and eighth grade students in school districts by corporal punishment group (legal/illegal). If a statistically significant difference was obtained on the omnibus $F$, the univariate $F$ tests were examined to determine which academic outcomes is contributing to the statistically significant result. The mean scores for corporal punishment group were used to determine the direction of the difference. |
Chapter IV

Results of Data Analysis

The results of the data analysis that were used to describe the sample and address the research questions are presented in this chapter. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section compares the states that have made corporal punishment illegal and those that continue to permit this type of discipline in terms of educational aspects. The second section of the analysis addresses each of the research questions.

Of the 50 states, information regarding the legal and illegal status of corporal punishment was obtained on 49 states and the District of Columbia. Information was not available regarding the legality of corporal punishment in schools for the state of Rhode Island. The data for Rhode Island were listed as 'restricted use', which was defined by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) as any data set that contains individually identifiable information that is confidential and protected by law (NCES, 2005).

Educational Factors

The data on school enrollment, percentage of students who qualified for Title 1 funding, the percentage of students who had individual educational plans (IEPs), percentage of limited English proficient (LEP) students, percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, percentage of minority students, expenditures per student, pupil/teacher ratio, and number teachers in the state were obtained from information available on the Internet. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize these data. Table 1 presents results of this analysis.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics
Educational Aspects by Type of State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Aspect</th>
<th>Number of States</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1061554.32</td>
<td>923407.30</td>
<td>745770.00</td>
<td>88116.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>881747.29</td>
<td>1271050.60</td>
<td>485641.00</td>
<td>76166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Title 1 Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52.21</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>54.30</td>
<td>35.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>14.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of IEPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.86</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>10.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of LEP Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Students Qualifying for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>45.10</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.22</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Minority Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.41</td>
<td>15.96</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>13.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.90</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures per Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6821.64</td>
<td>861.53</td>
<td>6669.00</td>
<td>5354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8345.21</td>
<td>1713.39</td>
<td>7889.50</td>
<td>4900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/Teacher Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>14.55</td>
<td>11.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67888.05</td>
<td>60665.53</td>
<td>47102.50</td>
<td>6795.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54616.68</td>
<td>68490.55</td>
<td>24770.50</td>
<td>5005.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of students in the legal states ranged from 88,116 to 4,259,823, with a median of 745,770.00. The mean number of students in the legal states was 1,061,554.32 (sd=923,407.30). The mean student enrollment in the illegal states was...
881,747.29 (sd=1,271,050.60), with a median of 485,641.00 students. The range of students in illegal states was from 76,166 to 6,356,348.

In the legal states, an average of 52.21% (sd=11.55%) students qualified for Title 1 funding, with a median of 54.30%. The range of percentages of students in legal states qualifying for Title 1 funding was from 35.20% to 74.60%. The percentage of students in illegal states that qualified for Title 1 funding ranged for 14.20% to 84.20%, with a median percentage of 44.30%. The mean percentage of students who qualified for Title 1 funding was 47.19% (sd=16.32%).

The percentage of students with IEPs ranged from 10.10% to 19.90% in the legal states. The mean percentage of students with IEPs in legal states was 13.86% (sd=2.19%), with a median of 13.55%. In illegal states, the mean percentage of students with IEPs was 13.87% (sd=1.65%), with a median of 13.65%. The percentage of students in illegal states with IEPs ranged from 10.80% to 17.80%.

The average percent of limited English proficient (LEP) students in legal states was 5.83% (sd=5.55%), with a median of 4.15%. The percentage of LEP students ranged from .50% to 20.40%. Illegal states had a mean of 5.89% (sd=5.22%) LEP students, with a median of 4.30%. The range of LEP students in illegal states was from .50% to 25.60%.

In legal states, the percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch had a mean of 42.47% (sd=14.04%), with a median of 45.10%. The range of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch was from 12.00% to 69.00%. In illegal states, the percentage of students qualifying for free/reduced lunch had a mean of 32.22% (sd=9.44%), a median of 30.55% and a range of 15.50% to 62.00%.
The percentage of minority students in legal states ranged from 13.10% to 66.40%, with a mean of 35.41% (sd=15.96), and a median of 35.85%. The percentage of minority students in illegal states ranged from 4.10% to 95.70%, with a mean of 30.90% (sd=22.65), and a median of 26.15%.

The range of per pupil expenditures in legal states was from $5,354.00 to $8,645.00. The average per pupil expenditure in legal states was $6,821.64 (sd=$861.53), with a median of $6,669.00. The range for pupil expenditures in illegal states was from $4,900.00 to $12,102.00. The average per pupil expenditure in legal states was $8,345.21 (sd=$1,713.39), with a median of $7,889.50.

The average pupil/teacher ratio in legal states was 15.67 students (sd=1.53 students), with a median of 15.40 students. The pupil/teacher ratio ranged of 13.00 students to 19.90 students. The mean pupil/teacher ratio in illegal states was 15.42 students (sd=2.84 students) with a median of 14.55 students. The pupil/teacher ratios ranged from 11.70 students to 21.80 students.

In legal states, the average number of teachers (full-time equivalents) was 67,888.05 (sd=60,665.53), with a median of 47,102.50 teachers. The number of teachers in the 22 states where corporal punishment was legal ranged from 6,795.00 to 288,655.00 teachers. In illegal states, the mean number of teachers was 54,616.68 (sd=68,490.55), with a median of 24,770.50 teachers. The number of teachers in the 27 states and the District of Columbia where corporal punishment was illegal ranged from 5,005.00 to 307,672.00 teachers.
Research Questions

Five research questions were developed for this study. Each of these questions were addressed using inferential statistical analyses, with all decisions on the statistical significance of the results made using an alpha level of .05.

Research question 1. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment have a larger percentage of minority students than states that have banned the use of corporal punishment?

The percentage of minority students in each of the states was used as the dependent variable in a t-test for two independent samples. The independent variable in this analysis was the legal/illegal status of corporal punishment in public schools. Table 2 presents results of this analysis.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>t-Value</th>
<th>Sig of t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.41%</td>
<td>15.96%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30.90%</td>
<td>22.65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obtained t-value for the comparison on the percentage of minority students in states where corporal punishment was legal and in states where corporal punishment was illegal was not statistically significant $t (48) = .79, p = .432$. This result indicated that the mean percentage of minority students in states where corporal punishment was legal ($m=35.41\%, 15.96\%$) was greater than in states where corporal punishment was not legal ($m=30.90\%, 22.65\%$), although this difference was not significant.

Research question 2. Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment
regarding economic factors that include: percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, Title 1 funding, and per pupil expenditures?

Three variables, percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch programs, per pupil expenditures, and percentage of students qualifying for Title 1 programs, were used as dependent variables in a multivariate analysis of variance. The legal/illegal status of corporal punishment of the states was used as the independent variable in this analysis. Table 3 presents results of this analysis.

Table 3
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
Economic Factors by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.46</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>3, 45</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Hotelling's trace of .46 was produced by this analysis. The associated F ratio was statistically significant $F (3, 45) = 6.89, p = .001$, indicating that economic factors differed between states where corporal punishment in schools was legal and in states where corporal punishment in schools was illegal. To further examine this statistically significant result, the univariate F tests were investigated. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.
Table 4

Univariate F Tests
Economic Factors by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Factor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.47%</td>
<td>14.04%</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.22%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures per Pupil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$6,862.71</td>
<td>$860.45</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$8,345.21</td>
<td>$1,713.39</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 1 Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52.75%</td>
<td>11.55%</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47.19%</td>
<td>16.32%</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A statistically significant difference was obtained for free/reduced lunch between states where corporal punishment was legal and states where corporal punishment was illegal, F (1, 47) = 9.34, p = .004. A significantly higher percentage of students in legal states (m = 42.47%, sd = 14.04%) qualified for free or reduced lunch programs than students in states where corporal punishment was banned (m = 32.22%, 9.44%).

Differences in expenditures per pupil differed significantly between states that allowed corporal punishment practices (m = $6,862.71, sd = $860.45) and states where these practices were illegal (m = $8,345.21, sd = $1,713.39), F (1, 47) = 13.18, p = .001. No statistically significant differences were found between the two types of states for Title 1 funding, although states where corporal punishment was legal had a higher percentage of schools qualifying for Title 1 (52.75%) than states that had made corporal punishment illegal (47.19%).

*Research question 3.* Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding school-related factors that include: pupil/teacher ratio, number of teachers (FTE), percentage of individualized education programs (IEPs), and percentage of students in limited English proficiency programs?
A one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if the pupil/teacher ratio, the number of teachers, percentage of students with individual education plans (IEP), and the percentage of students with limited English proficiency (LEP) differed between states where corporal punishment was legal and states where corporal punishment was illegal. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
School-related Factors by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling’s Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>4, 43</td>
<td>.951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Hotelling’s trace of .02 was obtained on the MANOVA. This result was not statistically significant, indicating that differences in student variables in states where corporal punishment was legal and in states where corporal punishment was illegal was not substantive F (4, 43) = .17, p = .951. To further examine this lack of statistically significant difference, descriptive statistics were obtained for each of the dependent variables. Table 6 present results of this analysis.
Table 6
Descriptive Statistics
School-related Factors by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School-related Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupil/teacher ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65,831.45</td>
<td>62,651.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54,616.68</td>
<td>68,490.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students with IEPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.87%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of students who are LEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.83%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>5.22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the two types of states (legal and illegal status of corporal punishment) were similar. These findings support the lack of statistically significant differences on these variables between the two states.

*Research question 4.* Do states that allow the use of corporal punishment differ from states that have banned the use of corporal punishment regarding student achievement based on NAEP outcomes for fourth and eighth grade students and state achievement tests?

The state-wide percentage of elementary and middle school students who passed their respective state assessment tests for reading was used as the dependent variables in a one-way MANOVA. The type of state (legal and illegal status of corporal punishment) was used as the independent variable. Results of this analysis are presented in Table 7.
Table 7

Multivariate Analysis of Variance
State-wide Assessment Outcomes
Elementary and Middle School Reading by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling’s Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2, 41</td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotelling’s trace of .02 obtained for the comparison of reading outcomes of elementary and middle school students was not statistically significant $F (2, 41) = .38$, $p = .687$. Based on this result, reading outcomes on the state assessment tests do not appear to differ by the legal status of corporal punishment. To further explore this lack of statistically significant difference, descriptive statistics were obtained for reading outcomes. Table 8 presents results of this analysis.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics
State-wide Assessment Outcomes
Elementary and Middle School Reading by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>69.84%</td>
<td>18.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69.95%</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>22.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63.91%</td>
<td>14.02%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the two types of states, legal ($m = 69.84\%, sd = 18.47\%$) and illegal ($m = 69.95\%, sd = 13.70\%$) status of corporal punishment on elementary reading scores were similar. While middle school scores for reading were higher in the states where corporal punishment was legal ($m = 66.67\%, sd = 22.96\%$) than in states where corporal punishment was illegal ($m = 63.91\%, sd = 14.02\%$), the
difference was not statistically significant. These findings support the lack of statistically significant differences on state-wide elementary and middle school reading outcomes between the two states.

The elementary and middle school math outcomes on the state-wide tests were used as dependent variables in a one-way MANOVA, with the legal status of the states used as the independent variable. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 9.

### Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2, 41</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotelling's trace of < .01 obtained on the MANOVA was not statistically significant F (2, 41) = .02, p = .980. This finding indicated that elementary and middle school mathematics did not differ relative to the legal status of corporal punishment in the states. To examine this lack of statistically significant differences, descriptive statistics were obtained for the elementary and middle school mathematics outcomes. Table 10 presents results of this analysis.
Table 10

Descriptive Statistics
State-wide Assessment Outcomes
Elementary and Middle School Mathematics by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.82%</td>
<td>19.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68.67%</td>
<td>17.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>56.48%</td>
<td>24.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56.90%</td>
<td>17.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean scores for elementary and middle school mathematics outcomes were similar for the states regardless of whether corporal punishment was legal or illegal. Based on the lack of findings, it did not appear that national test outcomes for either reading or mathematics differed by the legal status of corporal punishment.

The results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) for elementary and middle school reading outcomes were used as the dependent variables in a one-way MANOVA. The legal status of corporal punishment was used as the independent variable in this analysis. Table 11 presents results of this analysis.

Table 11

Multivariate Analysis of Variance
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Elementary and Middle School Reading by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling’s Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2, 47</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotelling’s trace of .06 obtained on the comparison of state-wide NAEP reading outcomes for elementary and middle school students was not statistically significant, $F (2, 47) = 1.49$, $p = .236$. Based on this finding, it does not appear that
elementary and middle school reading outcomes on the NAEP tests differed between states that permitted corporal punishment and states that had made this type of discipline illegal. To further examine this lack of statistically significant difference, descriptive statistics were obtained for elementary and middle school grades. Table 12 presents results of this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>215.36</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>219.46</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>260.64</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>263.89</td>
<td>7.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While states that have made corporal punishment illegal had slightly higher scores on NAEP testing than states where corporal punishment was legal, the differences were not statistically significant. Based on these findings it does not appear that the legality of corporal punishment had an effect on reading outcomes.

The NAEP mathematics outcomes for elementary and middle schools in states that have made corporal punishment illegal and those that have not made it illegal were compared using a one-way MANOVA. Table 13 presents results of this analysis.
Table 13
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Elementary and Middle School Mathematics by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling’s Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>2, 47</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Hotelling’s trace of .17 was obtained on the one-way MANOVA comparing elementary and middle school mathematics by legal/illegal status of corporal punishment in schools, $F (2, 47) = 3.91, p = .027$. This result indicated that students at the elementary and middle school levels were differing relative to whether corporal punishment was legal or illegal in their respective states. To determine which of the student levels were contributing to the statistically significant results, the univariate F tests were examined. Table 14 presents results of this analysis.

Table 14
Univariate F Tests
National Assessment of Educational Progress
Elementary and Middle School Mathematics by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>232.64</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1, 48</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>235.07</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>1, 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>274.14</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1, 48</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>279.00</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1, 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the omnibus F ratio for the MANOVA was statistically significant, this significance was not found when the elementary and middle school scores were examined using univariate F tests. For both the elementary and middle school results,
state-wide results for NAEP mathematics where corporal punishment was illegal were higher than states that continued to allow corporal punishment in schools.

*Research question 5.* Is there a difference in student outcomes in school districts that are located in a state that allows corporal punishment and school districts in a state that has made corporal punishment illegal?

Six states, three from the states where corporal punishment was illegal and three from states where corporal punishment was legal, were selected for additional analysis. A total of 123 school districts from legal states and 125 school districts from illegal states were selected to determine the effect of the legal status of corporal punishment on student outcomes. These districts were matched on demographic factors (size, poverty [as determined by percentage of students in the district that qualified for free or reduced lunch programs], and percent of minority students). A one-way MANOVA was used to determine if any statistically significant differences existed in demographic factors by legal/illegall legal status of corporal punishment in states where the districts were located. Table 15 presents results of this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multivariate Analysis of Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Demographic Factors by Illegal/Legal Status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling's Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>3, 244</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotelling's trace of .02 obtained on the analysis comparing the districts where corporal punishment was legal and illegal was not statistically significant, F (3, 244) = .19, p = .906. To further examine the lack of statistically significant differences between districts in states that had made corporal punishment in schools illegal and
those that continued to allow corporal punishment, descriptive statistics were obtained for each of the three demographic variables. Table 16 presents results of this analysis.

Table 16
Univariate F Tests
Demographic Factors by Legal/Illegal Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Factors</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>5197.40</td>
<td>10053.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>5649.17</td>
<td>14781.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>42.97</td>
<td>16.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>41.66</td>
<td>14.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Minority Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31.59</td>
<td>23.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences in the three demographic factors indicate that the school districts in the two types of school districts were not substantive. Based on the lack of statistically significant findings, the school districts appear to be similar in terms of size, percent of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch, and the percent of minority students.

The reading outcomes on state-wide tests were obtained for the included districts. These outcomes were used as dependent variables in a one-way MANOVA, with the legal/illegal status of corporal punishment in the state where the school districts were located used as the independent variable. Results of this analysis can be found in Table 17.
Table 17
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
State-wide Assessment Outcomes – Selected Districts
Elementary and Middle School Reading by Legal/Illegal Status (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling’s Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.36</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>2, 243</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotelling’s trace of .36 obtained on state-wide assessment reading outcomes between states where corporal punishment was either legal or illegal was statistically significant, $F(2, 243) = 43.67$, $p < .001$. This result indicated that school districts in these states differed regardless of whether corporal punishment was legal or illegal. To determine which of the grade levels, elementary or middle school were contributing to this difference, the univariate F tests were interpreted. Table 18 presents results of this analysis.

Table 18
Univariate F Tests
State-wide Assessment Outcomes – Selected Districts
Elementary and Middle School Reading by Legal/Illegal Status (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>76.89%</td>
<td>13.11%</td>
<td>1, 244</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>75.07%</td>
<td>11.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>75.07%</td>
<td>11.17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>72.50%</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>1, 244</td>
<td>67.79</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56.51%</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>56.51%</td>
<td>13.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The middle school level contributed to the statistically significant difference in state-wide reading outcomes for the selected school districts. School districts located in states where corporal punishment was legal ($m = 72.50\%, \ sd = 16.72\%$) had significantly higher reading outcomes on state-wide assessment tests than school
districts where corporal punishment was illegal (m = 56.51%, sd = 13.57%). The difference in elementary reading outcomes between the two states was not statistically significant.

The percentage of elementary and middle school students in individual school districts who passed their particular state-wide assessments for mathematics was used as the dependent variable in a one-way MANOVA. The independent variable in this analysis was the legal/illegal status of corporal punishment in their states. The results of the MANOVA is presented in Table 19.

Table 19
Multivariate Analysis of Variance
State-wide Assessment Outcomes – Selected Districts
Elementary and Middle School Mathematics by Legal/Illegal Status (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotelling’s Trace</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.28</td>
<td>35.05</td>
<td>2, 243</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hotelling's trace of .28 obtained on the one-way MANOVA that compared state-wide assessment outcomes for mathematics by legal/illegal status of corporal punishment was statistically significant, F (2, 243) = 35.05, p < .001. This finding indicated that the percentage of elementary and middle school students who passed their state’s assessment tests differed relative to whether corporal punishment was legal or illegal in their states. To further explore the statistically significant result, univariate F tests were examined. Table 20 presents results of this analysis.
Table 20

Univariate F Tests
State-wide Assessment Outcomes – Selected Districts
Elementary and Middle School Mathematics by Legal/Illegal Status (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>78.72%</td>
<td>18.07%</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>78.32%</td>
<td>12.65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>71.22%</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
<td>1,244</td>
<td>33.75</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>59.03%</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of middle school students who passed the state-wide assessment outcomes for mathematics differed significantly between school districts in states where corporal punishment was legal (m = 71.22%, sd = 17.34%) and those in school districts in states where corporal punishment was illegal (m = 59.03%, sd = 15.50%). The differences in the percentage of elementary students who passed the mathematics assessment tests in school districts where corporal punishment was legal and in school districts was not legal was not statistically significant.

Based on the findings of these two analyses, it appears that middle school students in school districts located in states that allow corporal punishment performed better in both reading and mathematics on state-wide assessment tests than students in states that banned corporal punishment. These differences did not extend to elementary school students in the two types of states.

Summary

The results of the statistical analysis that were used to describe the state and school district demographics and address the research questions have been presented in this chapter. Conclusions and recommendations based on these findings can be found in Chapter V.
Chapter V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This chapter provides a brief restatement of the purpose of the study, a summary review of the major elements of the research study, and a discussion of the findings. Also included in the study are the conclusions that are based on results of the statistical analysis as well as recommendations for further study.

The purpose of this study was to determine if states where corporal punishment in schools has been banned and made illegal differ from states that continue to use corporal punishment in their schools, in terms of demographic characteristics (i.e., economic factors, racial factors, and school-related factors), as well as academic achievement. As behavioral and empirical research results on the effects of corporal punishment on children is largely inconclusive, additional research is needed regarding academic achievement in reading and mathematics between states that allow corporal punishment in schools and states that have banned its use.

Student behavior problems have been a rising concern for all educational stakeholders, including educators, administrators, parents and political leaders. In 1997, the Gallup Poll found that discipline was ranked as the biggest problem facing public schools (Levin & Nolan, 2000). Teachers reported an increase in discipline problems from 2001 to 2003, according to Bender (2003). A nationwide study conducted in 1993 of students in grades 8, 10, and 12 revealed that student disruptions were fairly common in their classes (Levin & Nolan, 2000). The impact of student misconduct can be detrimental to the educational progress of students as well as the physical and psychological safety of everyone in the school (NSSC, 1992). In 1991, 44% of teachers...
nationwide reported that student misbehavior interfered substantially with their teaching (Jones, 1998). Most school misbehaviors are nonviolent and petty, but they can inflict a heavy toll on the psychological health of a school and negatively affect faculty, staff, administration, students and the community at large (NSSC, 1992).

Schools discipline remains the single most common and pernicious problem that educators face in their day-to-day teaching, according to Edwards, 2004). School discipline is an important part of providing an environment that is conducive to teaching and learning (New South Wales Department of Education, 2002). Schools need to develop effective student discipline policies and procedures to maintain order and control (NSSC, 1992). Discipline problems traditionally have been resolved through some form of punishment. The purpose of punishment is to minimize and redirect negative behavior into positive behavior, and reduce the need for teacher intervention (Charles, 2002).

Corporal punishment has deep historical roots in the United States and is a well-established tradition, whose origin comes from religion (Imbrogno, 2000). During colonial times, corporal punishment was thought to be both a desirable and necessary instrument for restraining sin and immorality in children (Imbrogno, 2000, p.127). Corporal punishment in the United States and across the globe is under attack. Many countries have eliminated corporal punishment. The majority of states in the United States have also banned corporal punishment in schools. The United States and Somalia are the only two countries worldwide that have not ratified the Convention that prohibits the use of corporal punishment on children.

As of 2005, 27 states and the District of Columbia have banned corporal punishment in their schools, while 22 states continue to allow the use of corporal
punishment in their schools (Hinchey, 2003). Possible effects of corporal punishment continue to be extensively debated by academicians, although behavioral and empirical research on effects of corporal punishment on children is largely inconclusive. As the debate over corporal punishment continues, new ideas have been discussed that became the basis for state and federal initiatives and policies either as replacements, alternatives, or supplements to corporal punishment. These policies included student codes of conduct, mandates, and guidelines; preventive programs and strategies; uniform policies; conflict resolution programs; and comprehensive classroom management programs to eliminate the increasing occurrences of youth violence.

A primary goal of education is to produce individuals who are capable of moral judgment and self-control (Elam, 1996). Phi Delta Kappa's 1996 Gallup poll revealed that 98% of the public believe that a primary purpose of public schools should be to prepare students to be responsible citizens. Schools in America were intended to instill a moral sense in students by developing reasoning linked to just and caring behavior (Bear, 1998).

The transmission of knowledge historically has also been the responsibility of schools. In the 1960s, unresolved social problems caused people to question the foundations of American society (Miller, 1992). In the 1970s, conservatives asserted their control over education with a call for greater efficiency, better academic results and more discipline. In the 1990s, educational reform has been associated with improving test scores and cultural literacy, as well as re-establishing discipline (Miller, 1992). Standards-based accountability that measures student achievement and uses tests based on pre-determined academic standards, now plays a major role in school reform (Lashway, 2002).
Discussion of the Findings

Five research questions were developed for this study. These questions focused on examining differences in state and national test scores between states where corporal punishment was legal and states where these types of disciplinary practices had been banned.

No statistically significant difference was found in the percentage of minority students in schools located in states where corporal punishment is legal and in states where corporal punishment has been banned. The mean percentage of minority students in states where corporal punishment was legal was greater than in states where corporal punishment had been banned.

An analysis of economic factors showed a statistically significant difference between states with corporal punishment versus states where corporal punishment has been banned. States where corporal punishment was legal had a greater percentage of students who received free and reduced lunch than states where corporal punishment had been banned. Secondly, per pupil expenditures were greater in states where corporal punishment was illegal than in states where corporal punishment was legal. The higher expenses in illegal states may be due to the rising cost to provide safety and security for students and staff in these states. Lastly, Title 1 funding for legal states was larger than illegal states.

No statistically significant differences were found for school-related factors such as pupil-teacher ratio, number of teachers, percentage of students with individual education plans and percentage of students who are limited English proficient between corporal punishment states compared to states where corporal punishment is illegal.
An examination of statewide reading outcomes of elementary school and middle school students was not statistically significant in states where corporal punishment is legal versus states where corporal punishment is illegal. A further examination of the reading outcomes revealed that outcomes for reading in states with corporal punishment and states where corporal punishment has been banned are similar. An examination of statewide mathematics outcomes for elementary school and middle school students did not differ for states where corporal punishment was legal and states where corporal punishment was illegal.

An analysis of NAEP reading outcomes for elementary school and middle school showed no statistically significant differences between states where corporal punishment was legal and states where corporal punishment was illegal, although states where corporal punishment was illegal had slightly higher scores on the NAEP reading tests than states where corporal punishment was legal. A statistically significant difference was found for the NAEP mathematics outcomes for elementary school and middle school in states where corporal punishment is legal and states where corporal punishment is illegal. NAEP mathematic scores for states where corporal punishment is illegal had higher than states where corporal punishment is legal.

This study performed an investigation of student outcomes in schools districts in states with corporal punishment and states where corporal punishment has been banned. The findings revealed no statistically significant differences in demographic factors between states where corporal punishment is legal and states where corporal punishment is illegal. Also, no statistically significant differences were found for reading and mathematics between elementary school students in school districts located in the two types of states.
When student outcomes were examined for school districts for middle school students in states with corporal punishment and states where corporal punishment had been banned, statistically significant differences were found for reading and mathematics. Results showed that middle school students in school districts located in states where corporal punishment was legal had statistically significant higher reading outcomes and mathematics outcomes on state-wide assessment tests than school districts where corporal punishment was illegal.

Conclusions

Student behavior problems in schools have had a major impact on school environment and student achievement. In the past, corporal punishment was accepted as an effective disciplinary tool for controlling student behavior. In the last two decades, corporal punishment has lost much of its support in public education. The majority of states (n = 28) have banned the use of corporal punishment, while the remaining states continue to allow its use. This study compared states that allow corporal punishment with states that have banned the use of corporal punishment on the following variables: percentage of minority students, economic factors, school-related factors, and student achievement test scores from mandated statewide achievement tests, the NAEP, and statewide achievement tests for individually selected school districts.

States that allow corporal punishment have a higher percentage of minorities than states that have banned the use of corporal punishment in their schools. This difference may be due to the geographic location of the states that allow corporal punishment. A majority of these states are located in the southern or western part of the United States, which has a greater percentage of African Americans and Hispanics than northern states. According to a 1991 national survey of school districts commissioned
by the Office for Civil Rights, 68% of schools in the Southeast, 38% in the West, 27% in the Midwest, and 4% in the Northeast continue to use corporal punishment. A breakdown of this data found that 33% of urban districts, 35% of rural districts, and 22% of suburban districts used corporal punishment (Jackson, 1999).

States that allow the use of corporal punishment had a significantly higher percentage of students who qualified for free and reduced lunch. Free and reduced lunch qualifications are based on family size and income, which determines level of poverty. Therefore, states that allow the use of corporal punishment tend to have higher poverty levels and have students who are considered to be more at risk than states that have banned the use of corporal punishment. Previous research has indicated that at-risk students tend to perform at lower levels on student achievement tests than students who are not at risk (Frieman, 2001).

Results for per pupil expenditures supported these findings, with illegal states having higher per pupil expenditures than the legal states. States that have banned the use of corporal punishment tend to be richer than states that allowed the use of corporal punishment. As a result, states that have banned corporal punishment typically spend more money on education. No significant difference was found for Title I funding between states that use corporal punishment and states that have banned the use of corporal punishment. States that continue to allow corporal punishment had higher percentages of schools qualifying for Title I. As the percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch is one of the criteria for Title I funding, this finding was not surprising and supported the conjecture that states allowing the use of corporal punishment in their schools tended to have higher levels of poverty.
Similarities were found for both legal and illegal states in terms of pupil-teacher ratio, number of teachers, percentage of students with individual education plans (IEPs), and the percentage of students who are limited English proficient (LEP). Effects of these state-wide demographic factors on the use of corporal punishment have not been the focus of previous research.

States that use corporal punishment and states that have banned the use of corporal punishment were compared on student achievement using test implemented by each state and by the NAEP. Although student testing differed among the states, the outcomes used in these studies were measured by the percentage of students that passed the tests, based on state standards. The state-wide reading and math scores for elementary and middle schools showed no significant differences between the two types of states.

A lack of statistically significant differences found for both elementary and middle schools in reading and mathematics between the two types of states provides support that the use of corporal punishment does not affect students academically. However, the use of state-wide results may have produced results that negated individual school district differences within the states.

The study examined test scores for individual school districts in six states (three states had banned corporal punishment and three states allowed the use of corporal punishment). Similar results were found for NAEP reading and mathematics scores for middle and elementary schools. However, state achievement test scores for middle schools in selected districts in states where corporal punishment was legal showed statistically significant higher outcomes for reading and mathematics than school districts located in states where corporal punishment was illegal. The results for
elementary students in these districts did not provide evidence of statistically significant differences for state achievement tests in reading and mathematics.

Scores in both reading and mathematics for middle school students in states where corporal punishment was legal were significantly higher than states that had banned corporal punishment. These findings suggested the need for more control of student misbehavior at the middle school level. Schools with more restrictive school discipline policies have been associated with higher levels of educational commitment and academic achievement (Way, 2004). Establishing a school climate for the development of self-control, as well as academic achievement, requires the use of external authority and control (Elam, 1996).

Additional findings in this study indicated that states where corporal punishment is illegal typically are richer than states that have allowed the use of corporal punishment. Yet, test scores for illegal states in middle schools were significantly lower. While states that have banned the use of corporal punishment spend more money on education, the expectation was that their scores should be higher than those in legal states. As test scores were not higher, this finding suggested that corporal punishment may have been a contributing factor for better student achievement. States that continue to allow corporal punishment typically have more minorities and higher poverty levels which are considered to be risk factors that could affect student achievement negatively. Therefore, student achievement in states where corporal punishment is allowed should have been lower than scores of students in states where corporal punishment has been banned, leading to the conclusion that corporal punishment may have a positive impact on student achievement.
Limitations

This study used standardized assessment tests to assess student achievement. Standardized test scores may not accurately reflect student abilities. These type of tests may not be the best measure for comparing states with corporal punishment to states where corporal punishment has been banned because scores in most cases have continued to increase due to pressure by state and federal mandates and possible reprimands schools face for not raising test scores.

Many school districts in states where corporal punishment is legal have banned the use of corporal punishment. Therefore, a state that has not banned the use of corporal punishment may have school districts with policies that prohibit the use of corporal punishment in their schools. And, in states where corporal punishment has been banned, corporal punishment replacements (e.g., in- and out-of-school suspensions, school code of conduct, uniforms, conflict resolution, etc.) could be factors in reasons that student achievement and test scores increased.

State achievement test results were used in this study. The tests are developed by each state and direct comparison of test outcomes is not possible. The states used different criteria in determining the percentage of students who had passed the tests. For example, some states used four levels, with three levels indicating passing, while other states used three levels, with two levels indicating passing. For the purpose of this study, the percentage of students passing the tests in each state and included school districts was used as the measure of academic achievement.

Recommendations for Practice

The results showed a statistically significant difference for school district comparisons for middle school student outcomes in reading and mathematics. This
finding suggested that students in middle school in states where corporal punishment was illegal are performing at a lower achievement level than students in states where corporal punishment was legal. As a result, middle school students’ misbehaviors across the nation appear to be having a negative impact on student achievement. Some form of discipline for middle school students that is more effective than the present form of discipline is suggested as another way to increase achievement test scores. By minimizing student misbehavior by using effective disciplinary strategies, students may be able to concentrate on learning than on worrying about their safety in their classes.

The results for educational expenditures indicated that states where corporal punishment is illegal spent more on education on a per pupil basis. Research by National School Safety Center (NSSC, 1992) indicated that rising costs associated with keeping schools safe and secure are deflecting monies that could be better spent for academic programs. In American, Schools where corporal punishment has been banned continue to have student misbehavior problems. A solution to this dilemma may be to develop a disciplinary plan that includes input from all stakeholders (e.g., administrators, teachers, parents, students, and community members) that is more effective for dealing with student misbehavior problems. By obtaining agreement on disciplinary procedures and consistently applying the process, student misbehaviors may be controlled effectively.

Recommendations for Further Research

Little research was found on corporal punishment and its effects on the nation’s educational system. Additional research is needed to examine the influence of corporal punishment on the nation, schools, educators, students and community. The following recommendations are made for further study:
1. Examine additional student outcomes (e.g., attendance, number of disciplinary referrals, graduation rates, etc.) between school districts in states where corporal punishment is legal and states where corporal punishment is illegal.

2. Compare student achievement using student grades and/or grade point averages in selected school districts located in states where corporal punishment is legal and states in which it is banned.

3. Investigate the relationship between elimination of corporal punishment and increase in school violence.

4. Study the perceptions of parents regarding the types of disciplinary policies that should be used to control negative student behaviors in their children’s schools.

5. Use a longitudinal research design to determine if students change their behaviors and its relationship with academic achievement as they move from elementary to middle school.

6. Examine if school districts in states that continue to allow corporal punishment are using this type of discipline, the methods they are using to control student misbehaviors, and the frequency of its use in classrooms or administrative offices.
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List of States with Corporal Punishment Status
## List of States and Corporal Punishment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>1=Legal / 2=Illegal</th>
<th>Year of Ban</th>
<th>States</th>
<th>1 = Legal / 2 = Illegal</th>
<th>Year of Ban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This paper examined the effects of corporal punishment in the United States on student achievement in reading and math. This study also determined if states that have made corporal punishment illegal differ in terms of demographic characteristics (e.g., racial breakdown, socioeconomic status, and school-related factors).

Student misbehavior has become a growing problem for educators across the United States, with discipline ranked as the second biggest problem facing public schools. Traditionally, discipline problems were resolved through some form of punishment. Corporal punishment was one form of school discipline. The effects of corporal punishment are inconclusive and have been extensively debated. As debate over corporal punishment continues, new policy is being developed to either replace corporal punishment or as an alternative to corporal punishment.

The majority of states (n=28, 56.0%) have banned corporal punishment in their schools, the remaining 22 (44.0%) continue to use corporal punishment to control student behaviors. Data used in this study were measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and state achievement tests. The data was obtained from state and federal governmental sources on the Internet that report student
outcomes by state. School districts in six states, three allowing corporal punishment and three that had banned the use of corporal punishment in the schools, were selected for further examination. The findings with significant differences were as follows: States where corporal punishment was legal had a greater percentage of students who received free and reduced lunch than states where corporal punishment had been banned. Per pupil expenditures were greater in states where corporal punishment was illegal than in states where corporal punishment was legal. NAEP mathematic scores for states where corporal punishment is illegal had higher than states where corporal punishment is legal. Middle school students in school districts located in states where corporal punishment was legal had statistically significant higher reading outcomes and mathematics outcomes on state-wide assessment tests than school districts where corporal punishment was illegal.
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