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Abstract
Corporal punishment (CP) has been officially banned since December 2006 in Taiwan. It would be useful to explore the perceptions and concerns of elementary school teachers on the issue of banning CP and on alternative methods of discipline in 2008, two years since the ban took effect. In this study, 323 teachers were stratified randomly and drawn from 42 schools in Keelung City for the survey and 5 teachers were interviewed. The main finding of this study is that while most teachers understand and support the policy of banning CP in schools, there remain certain concerns on the effect of such a ban in schools. These concerns and conflicting viewpoints are especially over issues related to the difficulty in disciplining students and respecting the students’ human rights. An overwhelming concern is that some teachers might ignore students’ misbehavior and passively discipline to cope with the new law.

Keywords
educational policy, educational reform, discipline, corporal punishment

¹National Taiwan Ocean University, Keelung, Taiwan, ROC

Corresponding Author:
Lwun-syin Laurence Lwo, 2 Pei Ning Road, Keelung, Taiwan, 20224, ROC
E-mail: lol@mail.ntou.edu.tw
Schools have always been viewed as an institution for the transfer of knowledge and culture to the future generation (Youssef, Attia, & Kamel, 1998). In schools, teachers play the important roles of educator and disciplinarian (Society for Adolescent Medicine, 2003). There are many alternative means that teachers can use to discipline student and on classroom management. Corporal punishment (CP) as a form of discipline has long been one of the most controversial issues in both academic and more general public discourses (Roy, 2001).

CP is defined as the infliction of physical pain on an offender for his offense or misbehavior (Wilson, 2002). In school, this type of punishment is interpreted as school authority’s use of physical force with the intention of causing a child to experience pain but not injury for the purpose of correcting or controlling a child’s behavior (Jambor, 2001; Straus, 2001; Vockell, 1991). In 1979, Sweden became the first country in the world to ban all CP of children. By passing their no CP law, Sweden set a good example for other nations (Paintal, 1999). Over the following decades, most countries, including communist block countries, abolished CP for school children, on the premise that it is inhumane, has some negative influence on learning, serves no educational purpose, and has no rational justification (Keeshan, 1989). This form of punishment has been academically shown to increase vandalism, stimulate violence, aggression and bullying, crime and delinquency, emotional disorders, sexual abnormalities, endanger health, and with potential to cause permanent physical damage (Jambor, 2001). However, the Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003) reported that there remained a strong undercurrent of opinion in the United States favoring CP in schools.

The use of CP on students had also been supported by Taiwanese educators for a long time, especially in maintaining classroom control, until the recent two decades. Several explicit or implicit provisions had been issued in Taiwan by education administrators prohibiting the use of CP on children and were further banned by a law in December 2006. The Ministry of Education provided some strategies to help schools and teachers put the CP banning policy into action, including posting a list of alternative disciplines and establishing a “Educational Love” website to encourage teachers to create warm and lovely learning environments at all levels of schools. Since CP is no longer allowed as a form of discipline after the passing of the law, what techniques can teachers employ to manage classroom and instill discipline for students’ misbehavior? Do teachers understand and recognize the law and policy? Are teachers satisfied with the support from school administrators? What are the issues that concern them regarding banning CP in schools? These questions were listed in a questionnaire and were asked of teachers of Keelung, a coastal city in
northern Taiwan. Hence, the purpose of this study is to explore the perceptions and concerns of elementary school teachers in Keelung City on the issue of banning CP and its appropriate alternative discipline.

Literature Reviews

Whether CP is an effective and appropriate strategy for disciplining children is a source of heated debate among those in the educational, legal, religious, and social scientific communities (Gradinger, 2005). The controversy of CP mostly comes from the pros and cons of its effects on children as well as the rationales of legal penalties for children’s misbehaviors. Many studies discussed the issues.

The Support of CP—the Pros

From the historical perspective, CP against children has received support for thousands of years from interpretation of legal, educational, and religious doctrines; for example, an old Western proverb says, “Spare the rod, spoil the child” (Slate, 1991). Until 2003, 23 states in the United States continued to authorize CP in their schools and about 2 to 3 million cases of CP in schools were reported each year (Society for Adolescent Medicine, 2003). For a long time, teachers’ adoption of such disciplinary means stemmed from the old philosophy that CP is the key to the development of a child’s conscience, build character, and the only language some children could understand (Wilson, 1982; Youssef et al., 1998). In East Asian societies, many proverbs such as “A rod makes an obeying child,” and “No rod, no good child,” are widespread. The historical prevalence and acceptance of the use of CP by teachers can be attributed to the conceptions of child-rearing philosophies. The rate of prevalence of CP in Japanese schools suspected of using it during the years 1990 and 1995 ranged from 600 to 850 per year—approximately 2% of all public schools in Japan. Of these schools, 25% to 85% received legal sanctions (Kobayashi, Tanimura, & Shimauchi, 1997). In the Asian cultural context, people assume that children are considered their parents’ possession or “chattels.” Many parents always asked teachers to treat their children strictly because they believe only strict teachers can result in outstanding students. It is also considered a prescribed duty for the teacher to be concerned with a child’s welfare and thought to be necessary for the development of positive qualities of obedience, respect for authority, and patience.

Although CP is usually considered harmful, it must be admitted that a very large number of well-adjusted, normal adults have received CP during their
formative years, and nearly all of these people can identify at least some occasions when it “did them some good” (Vockell, 1991). Vockell grouped three major advantages of CP in his article. The first major advantage of CP is that it is very likely to be perceived by the recipient as unpleasant (and therefore punishing), especially when it is physical rather than purely psychological pain. The second major advantage of CP is that it can be administered quickly and be over with quickly, in comparison to measures such as 3-day detention, and life can return to more productive activities. The third advantage of CP is that it has a very clear, specific, and obvious consequence. In many classrooms where CP is employed, students know exactly what will happen if they misbehave.

Wilson (2002) systemically listed six advantages for CP: (1) It is cheap and easy to administer; (2) it is effective as a deterrent because no one likes physical pain; (3) it is to some extent effective as a method of reform in that the fear of physical pain will characteristically motivate a person not to reoffend; (4) it is adjustable in that we may easily inflict different amounts of pain on different people for different offenses; (5) it is fair for all, since all people are similar in their dislike of pain; and (f) it leaves no permanent or irreversible damage.

From the philosophical or historical views, the meaning of punishment lies in the intention to inflict something unpleasant, with an assumption that the educator and the child share a view of what is unpleasant. That is why the educative meaning of beating the child is not that the child feels pain but that he or she feels shame and disgrace; that is, the child feels the punishment as an expression of negative intention of the educator (Locke, 1996; Weijers, 2000).

**The Disadvantages of CP—the Cons**

Many research studies have demonstrated that CP is both ineffective and is connected to negative outcomes (Robinson, Funk, Beth, & Bush, 2005). Clark (2004) listed four concise points to oppose Wilson’s (2002) declaiming merits of CP: assault, attack on a person’s self, cannot defend oneself from it, and cannot retain one’s dignity in the face of it. Gradinger (2005) explicated that the use of CP is linked to impaired relationships and decreased communication between children and their caretakers.

There are some side effects of CP that were backed by empirical research including lower grades (Bryan & Freed, 1982), running away (McCown, Driscoll, & Roop, 1996), fear of the teacher and/or school, high levels of anxiety (Biehler & Snowman, 1997), fear of helplessness, humiliation,
aggressive and destructive behaviors at home and at school (Cyan, 1995), immediate compliance, lower levels of moral internalization and mental health (Gershoff, 2002), and even cruelty toward animals (Flynn, 1999).

Vockell (1991) systematically listed seven disadvantages of CP. First, CP is not likely to be logically related to the misbehavior, so the punishment almost always has a merely temporary impact. Second, it is usually very difficult for the recipient to engage in a desirable behavior to terminate CP, whereas for many other forms of punishment, good behaviors are readily available. Third, physical punishment often models socially inappropriate behaviors to the child. Fourth, CP may inflict real injury or be related to child abuse. Fifth, a parent or teacher may feel a need to hit someone and vent his frustration or irritation on a relatively innocent child. Sixth, for many children, it is the demeaning of indignity involved in CP rather than the pain itself that is the salient component of the punishment. Seventh, serious injuries may occur, and lawsuits are likely to follow.

Paintal (1999) accumulated research and listed consequences of CP based on research: (a) Children whose parents use CP to control antisocial behavior show more antisocial behavior themselves over a long period of time, regardless of race and social-economic status and regardless of whether the mother provides cognitive stimulation and emotional support; (b) a consistent pattern of physical abuse exists that generally starts as CP and then gets out of control; (c) adults who were hit as children are more likely to be depressed or violent themselves; (d) the more a child is hit, the more likely it is that the child, as an adult, will hit his or her children, spouse, or friends; (e) CP increases the probability of children assaulting the parent in retaliation, especially as they grow older; (f) CP sends a message to the child that violence is a viable option for solving problems; (g) CP is degrading, contributes to feelings of helplessness and humiliation, robs a child of self-worth and self-respect, and can lead to withdrawal or aggression; (h) CP erodes trust between a parent or teacher and a child and increases the risk of child abuse; as a disciplinary measure, it simply does not decrease children’s aggressive or delinquent behaviors; (i) children who get spanked regularly are more likely over time to cheat or lie, be disobedient at school, bully others, and show less remorse for wrongdoing; and (j) CP adversely affects children’s cognitive development; children who are spanked perform poorly on school tasks compared to other children.

Overall, CP fails to suppress negative behavior or teach prosocial behavior, and that legitimizes hitting as a problem-solving option. However, Robinson et al. (2005) measured education majors’ beliefs about CP before and after
they read about CP research on its effectiveness and side effects. They found it is difficult to achieve greater affective-cognitive consistency if people do not care much for CP but still think that it is effective. Therefore, by simply telling them how well time-out works would not necessarily lead them to believe that CP does not work.

**Alternative Disciplinary Means**

Effective instructional management must include plans and skills for dealing with discipline problems. Diamantes (1992) proposed 10 alternatives to CP: (1) Home contact: This involves calling home and explain to the parent(s) exactly what happened and seek support in helping the child succeed in school. (2) Written statement: After arguing or antagonizing, it is not unreasonable to expect both students to write an explanation of (a) what happened, (b) who started it, (c) what resulted, (d) the seriousness of the offense, and (d) what can happen to those who are loud and disorderly. This writing process occupies the potential fighters. (3) Time-out: instruct the misbehaved student to the time-out room and designate a cooperative teacher to supervise time-out students. (4) Daily progress sheet: This strategy forces the student to get daily feedback on their behavior from each teacher. (5) Isolation: This is best for those who must be removed from the classroom for severe disruption. This alternative requires an empty classroom, cafeteria, or gym and an adult to monitor the behavior. (6) Work detail: This alternative requires a willing and capable custodian to monitor the student while he or she is out of the classroom to assist in the collection of litter and trash. (7) Detention: The misbehaved student is assigned detention for 1 hr or more depending on the seriousness of the offense. (8) Field trip: An after school or evening field trip can be very effective in impressing students, whether the trip consists of touring the local juvenile correction facility or merely touring a more senior school. (9) Saturday suspension class: This is for those persistent rule breakers who are very difficult to deal with, those who insist on talking in class, or appear with no supplies, and remain a constant source of disruption and annoyance. (10) Reinforcement system: This final strategy involves positive reinforcement systems used by individual teacher to reward proper behavior.

Paintal (1999) provided nine alternatives to CP for parents and teachers: (1) Set firm, consistent, age-appropriate, and acceptable limits. (2) Teach children conflict resolution and mediations skills, including listening actively, speaking clearly, showing trust and being trustworthy, accepting differences, setting group goals, negotiating, and mediating conflicts. (3) Reason and talk with children in age-appropriate ways; verbal parent–child interactions enhance
children’s cognitive ability. (4) Model patience, kindness, empathy, and cooperation. Parents and teachers should be aware of the powerful influence their actions have on a child or group’s behavior. (5) Provide daily opportunities for children to practice rational problem solving and to study alternatives and the effect of each alternative. (6) Encourage and praise children. A non-verbal response such as a smile or a nod, or a verbal response such as “good” or “right” not only provides incentives for accomplishment but also builds confidence in primary school children. (7) Allow children to participate in setting rules and identify consequences for breaking them; this empowers children to learn how to manage their own behavior. (8) Provide consistency, structure, continuity, and predictability in children’s lives. (9) Encourage children’s autonomy—allow them to think for themselves, and to monitor their own behavior, letting their conscience guide them.

The Legislative Yuan of Taiwan revised the Basic Education Act by adding a ban to CP bill in December 2006. The Ministry of Education provided 16 guidelines for positive disciplinary alternative means in 2007. They are (1) positive reinforcement, (2) verbal corrections, (3) change of seat, (4) verbal or written self-reflection, (5) daily progress sheet, (6) home contact, (7) completing unfinished assignment, (8) increase assignment or tasks, (9) sit quietly to reflect on own behavior, (10) reflecting on own behavior while standing, (11) removal of privileges, (12) after-school public service, (13) after-school counseling, (14) time-out, (15) switch to other class, and (16) demerit record on student profile. All of these were provided to every school for putting the CP banning into action.

Teachers in Taiwan have experienced some unpleasant discipline problems after the ban on CP was passed. Lawsuits filed by parents on CP or child abuse in schools are often broadcasted in the media. Conflicts between teachers and parents usually result in teachers apologizing to the student and parents or, in some cases, resign under the pressure of parents and lack of support from educational administrators. Some teachers are frustrated with student discipline. Are the alternatives provided by the government having positive effects or are they useless? It is a good time to evaluate the influence and the opinions of teachers.

**Method**

**Participants**

There are 42 elementary schools in the city of Keelung, with a total of 1,621 teachers as of the spring of 2008. A stratified random sample was taken to
draw the participants by the school district and size of schools. We selected 16 schools from all 7 school districts in Keelung, including 5 small schools (less than 400 students), 5 midsize schools (between 400 to 700 students) and 6 large schools (more than 700 students). A total of 7 teachers were selected from the small schools, 15 teachers were selected from the midsize schools, and 47 teachers were selected from large schools. Totally, 392 teachers were randomly selected from those schools to complete the questionnaire on “Banning CP and Disciplinary Alternatives” constructed by the researchers. Of the 364 questionnaires returned, 353 are valid and only 11 were not completed. The return rate is 90%, reaching 21% of the population of teachers in Keelung. After survey, a list of semistructured questions was used to interview five elementary school teachers for in-depth discussions of their concerns.

**Tools**

The Banning CP and Disciplinary Alternatives questionnaire has three parts: The first part contains questions to collect demographic information. The second part includes (a) teachers’ understanding about the laws and policy on banning CP, and (b) teachers’ perceptions on the strategies for zero CP and alternative disciplines in schools. The third part contains concerns of the effects after banning CP in schools, such as effects on students, effects on parents, effects on teachers, and effects on school administrators. There is an open-ended question at the end of the questionnaire for extra comments on banning CP. Semistructured questions were used to find teachers’ deep concerns and perceptions on the banning of CP in schools, including their feelings, concerning, and experience on CP and student discipline.

The questionnaire and semistructured questions were reviewed by seven experts, including three professors in education and psychology, two elementary school principals, and two mentor teachers, to construct its expert validity. After that, a pilot test was taken by selecting 30 teachers. The problems in the questionnaire were clear enough, and the first six questions about understanding of the law and policy on banning CP were consistent ($\alpha = .8426$). The interviews were conducted in their schools and lasted between 30 min and 1 hr. The whole process was recorded by digital recorder and rewritten into text.

**Results**

Both quantitative and qualitative data are analyzed to obtain the overall understanding, perception, and concerns of teachers on the issue of banning CP in schools and the alternative disciplines.
Teachers’ Understanding about the laws and prescriptions on banning CP is analyzed. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Teachers’ Understanding About the Laws and Prescriptions on Banning Corporal Punishment (CP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% of SD</th>
<th>% of PD</th>
<th>% of PA</th>
<th>% of SA</th>
<th>% of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I know the definition of CP declared in the government document.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I know the banning of CP stipulation in the Basic Education Act.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I know the appropriate alternative disciplines provided by the Ministry of Education.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I know any form of CP in schools is against the law.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I know our government is carrying out the zero CP campaign in schools.</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I know there is a website on banning CP and “Educational Love” established by our government.</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD = strongly disagree; PD = partially disagree; PA = partially agree; SA = strongly agree.

Teachers’ Understanding

Teachers’ understanding about the laws and prescriptions on banning CP is analyzed. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that teachers are well aware of the law and policy on banning CP in school, including knowing the definition of CP (87.8%), banning CP policy and stipulation (87%), alternative disciplines (83.3%), and the types of CP (80.4%). However, their knowledge on support provided by the government to ban CP is relatively low, as revealed by the campaign for zero CP (56.6%) and the website for banning CP (48.8%).

From the variables of teachers’ gender, age, years of teaching, concurrent post, educational level, some tests are implemented. The $t$ test shows no
significance between teachers’ gender ($t = 1.57, F = 0.18, p = .67$). The ANOVA analysis for ages (age groups: 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and more than 60) shows significant differences among teachers’ ages ($F = 2.89, p = .022$); however, after using the Scheffe’ analysis, we cannot find any significant difference between any two groups.

The ANOVA analysis for teachers’ years of teaching, concurrent post, and highest educational level, differences are found. The ANOVA analysis for teachers’ years of teaching is shown in Table 2.

After Scheffe’ analysis, we found there was significant difference between service years comprising less than 5 years and 16 and 25 years ($p = .007$). The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 3.

The ANOVA analysis for teachers’ concurrent post is shown in Table 4.
Scheffé analysis reveals significant differences between teachers without concurrent post and teachers with administrative post ($p = .000$). The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 5.

The ANOVA analysis for teachers’ highest educational level is shown in Table 6.

Scheffé analysis shows significant differences between teachers with college degree and teachers with master’s or doctoral degree ($p = .029$). The means and standard deviations are shown in Table 7.
Perceptions on the Strategies for Zero CP and the Appropriate Alternative Disciplines

After the law on CP ban was passed, the Ministry of Education derived some strategies to prevent CP in schools. Teachers’ agreement on 10 possible strategies is shown in Table 8.

Of the 10 most important possible strategies to put CP banning into actions, 9 out of 10 are mostly agreed upon by teachers; these include “reducing the number of students per class” (96.3%), “establishing counseling center or online service for discipline” (91.8%), “adding full-time counseling staff to schools” (91.2%), “holding conferences on discipline for pre- or in-service teachers” (90.7%), “providing funding for curriculum for students with high concerns” (76.5%), “encourage community groups to campaign for zero CP” (76.5%), “including CP as a demerit item in teacher evaluation” (57.2%), “including CP as a demerit item in school evaluation” (51.0%), and “publicizing schools breaking zero CP cases” (43.3%).

Note: SD = strongly disagree; PD = partially disagree; PA = partially agree; SA = strongly agree.

Table 8. Teachers’ Perceptions of the Strategies for Zero Corporal Punishment (CP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% of SD</th>
<th>% of PD</th>
<th>% of PA</th>
<th>% of SA</th>
<th>% of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reducing the number of students per class</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Establishing counseling center or online service for discipline</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adding full-time counseling staff to schools</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Holding conferences on discipline for pre- or in-service teachers</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Printing brochures on zero CP and good classroom management</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Providing funding for curriculum for students with high concerns</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Encourage community groups to campaign for zero CP</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Including CP as a demerit item in teacher evaluation</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Including CP as a demerit item in school evaluation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Publicizing schools breaking zero CP cases</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
schools” (91.2%), and “holding conference on discipline for pre- or in-service teachers” (90.7%) all of which have more than 90% agreement rates. Only one strategy is not supported by the teachers, that is, “publicizing schools breaking zero CP cases” (43.3%), with less than half the number of teachers agreed.

After the law on CP ban was passed, the Ministry of Education derived 16 appropriate alternative disciplines to prevent CP in schools that would help to correct students’ misbehavior. The frequency of using appropriate alternative disciplines is shown in Tables 9. We asked them to rank three most often used and three useful items. Their answers are counted by the weighed points as Table 9.

Of the 16 appropriate alternative disciplines provided by the Ministry of Education and used in daily classroom, the three most frequently used are “verbal correction,” “positive reinforcement,” and “reflecting on own

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Points for “used”</th>
<th>Ranks for “used”</th>
<th>Points for usefulness</th>
<th>Ranks for usefulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positive reinforcement</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verbal correction</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Change of seat</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Verbal or written self-reflection</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Daily progress sheet</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Home contact</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Completing unfinished assignment</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Increase assignment or tasks</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sit quietly to reflect on own behavior</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reflecting on own behavior while standing</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Removal of privileges</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. After-school public service</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. After-school counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Time-out</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Switch to other class</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Recording a demerit on student profile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. ranked 1 = 3 points; 2 = 2 points; and 3 = 1 point.
behavior while standing,” whereas the three least used are “switch to other class,” “after-school counseling,” and “recording a demerit on student profile.” The three most useful methods teachers considered are “verbal correction,” “home contact,” and “positive reinforcement,” whereas the three least useful methods are “recording a demerit on student profile,” “switch to other class,” and “after-school counseling.”

**Teachers’ Concerns on the Effects of Banning CP**

For our final statistical data analysis, we investigate teachers’ concerns on the various effects of banning CP, such as effects on students, parents, teachers, and school administrators.

**Effects of banning CP on students.** The law that was passed in 2006 to ban CP affected teachers in classroom management. The questionnaire listed both positive and negative effects on students, teachers, parents, and school administrators. The results shown in Table 10 are effects on students.

### Table 10. Effects of Banning Corporal Punishment (CP) on Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% of SD</th>
<th>% of PD</th>
<th>% of PA</th>
<th>% of SA</th>
<th>% of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It reduces injury or abuse in children.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It respects students’ human rights.</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It gives students a physically and psychologically sound mind.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>It helps students understand violence cannot solve problems.</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It increases students’ self-control and management.</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It reduces deviation behavior.</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD = strongly disagree; PD = partially disagree; PA = partially agree; SA = strongly agree.
Teachers believed that banning CP in schools can “reduce injury or abuse” (77.9%), “respect students’ human rights” (77.9%), and “give students a physically and psychologically sound mind” (64.3%). However, the effects on “reduces deviation behavior” (11.6%), “increases students’ self-control and management” (12.4%), and “helps students understand violence cannot solve problems” (42.0%) are lower than 50%.

**Effects of banning CP on parents.** The effects teachers thinking about banning CP have on parents are shown in Table 11.

Teachers agreed that banning CP in schools will “increase conflict between teachers and parents” (87.8%), “increase the frequency of home discipline,” (73.9%) and “make parents home discipline more difficult” (70.6%). However, the effects on “It helps parents become more trusting of school discipline” (29.2%), “It helps parents understand banning CP in school” (29.4%), and “It increases parents’ support for zero CP in schools” (41.6%) are less than 50%.

**Effects of banning CP on teachers.** The effects of banning CP on teachers are shown in Table 12.
Teachers believe that banning CP in schools have some effects on teachers, such as “It causes difficulty in discipline” (94.3%), “It increases the frequency of using school support system” (89.3%), “teachers ignoring students’ misbehaviors and passively discipline” (84.4%), “Teachers need to empower themselves in classroom management” (79.3%), and “teachers becoming the model of zero CP for society” (61.7%). However, the effect on “friendlier classroom environment” (47.6%) is less than 50%.

**Table 12. Effects of Banning Corporal Punishment (CP) on Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% of SD</th>
<th>% of PD</th>
<th>% of PA</th>
<th>% of SA</th>
<th>% of Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>It causes difficulty in discipline.</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It increases the frequency of using school support system.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers ignoring students’ misbehaviors and passively discipline.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers need to empower themselves in classroom management.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teachers becoming the model of zero CP for society.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Friendlier classroom environment.</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD = strongly disagree; PD = partially disagree; PA = partially agree; SA = strongly agree.

Teachers believe that banning CP in schools have some effects on teachers, such as “It causes difficulty in discipline” (94.3%), “It increases the frequency of using school support system” (89.3%), “teachers ignoring students’ misbehaviors and passively discipline” (84.4%), “Teachers need to empower themselves in classroom management” (79.3%), and “teachers becoming the model of zero CP for society” (61.7%). However, the effect on “friendlier classroom environment” (47.6%) is less than 50%.

**Effects of banning CP on school administrators.** The effects of banning CP on school administrators are shown in Table 13.

Teachers believed that banning CP in schools have some effects on school administrators, such as “Schools must follow the law to ban CP in school” (65.7%), “Schools must make more effort to set zero CP into action” (65.2%), and “School administrators can reduce teachers’ pressure in discipline” (52.1%). However, the effect on “School administrators can help teachers in disciplining students” (41.6%) is less than half 50%.
Semiopen Answers and Interview

The last question is open to any answer or comment associated with the issue of CP and discipline. Comments are coded by QE (questionnaire) and a serial number. The five interviewees expressed their opinions and viewpoints on banning CP in schools and appropriate alternative disciplines. Their opinions are retyped into computer text and coded by IW (Interview) and a serial number. After that, three interlinked subprocesses were conducted for qualitative findings: data reduction, data display followed by conclusion or theme drawing, and verification (Huberman & Miles, 1994). The most important themes can be drawn as followed:

The banning of CP in schools is a landmark policy toward respecting students’ human rights. This is a global concern on protecting children’s human rights. Banning CP explicitly by law is a milestone in respecting students’ human rights. However, some teachers are concerned that though they spend a lot of time and energy on those few who need special discipline, regular classroom activities may be interrupted and would be unfair to other students in class. Their opinions include:

The passing of the law to ban CP in school is the result of respect for human rights. (QE287, IW04)

Table 13. Effects of Banning Corporal Punishment (CP) on School Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>% of SD</th>
<th>% of PD</th>
<th>% of PA</th>
<th>% of SA</th>
<th>% of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Schools must follow the law to ban CP in school.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schools must make more effort to set zero CP into action.</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>School administrators can reduce teachers’ pressure in discipline.</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>School administrators can help teachers in disciplining students.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: SD = strongly disagree; PD = partially disagree; PA = partially agree; SA = strongly agree.
The idea behind the law is good. But it prefers students and parents. In other words, it assumes that teachers would inflict harm on students; it doesn’t consider the rights of teachers. (IW03)

Well-behaved students are the victims of zero corporal punishment; their basic human rights are robbed by the misbehaved ones. (QE91)

Since we cannot employ CP in school, we would need more effort to discipline the offenders. This is unfair to those who behave well and work hard on their tasks; this neglects their human rights. (QE312)

The definition of CP is still unclear and should be recognized case-by-case. It is difficult for teachers to identify to what extent reasonable discipline is. The psychological harm is also hard to evaluate, as each student is different. Many teachers might choose to give up their normal disciplinary practice to avoid getting into trouble with the law. Their opinions include:

The definition of CP is still not clear (QE148), and people exaggerate the problem. We need clearer definition. (QE310)

The unclear definition of CP may cause more conflicts between teachers and parents. (QE30)

I think psychological damage is hard to define and recognize. (IW01)

Most of the appropriate alternative disciplines provided by the Ministry of Education are clear, but they can’t cover all situations in schools, especially psychological damage. (IW01)

Some students and parents might misunderstand the concept of CP; they might sue the teachers over some small conflict. Good teachers usually fall victims to case like this. (QE203)

The law on banning CP in schools changed some teachers’ disciplinary practices. For a long time, teachers were the absolute authority figure of their classrooms. They were free to punish those who disobeyed classroom rules in any way they preferred. But after the passing of the law on CP ban, teachers are faced with the pressure to discard CP and use alternative disciplines. They need more skills to manage misbehaved students and need to change students’ misbehavior by means of appropriate alternative discipline. Their opinions include:

We teachers need to change our mindsets and concepts on discipline and classroom management. (IW02)

We have over 30 students in a class; if we pay attention to one or two misbehaved students and neglect the others, then violent events and bullying may occur often. (QE207)
Misbehaved students will always do what they want without fear of punishment. Without CP, teachers would have to rely on their personal charm to get these students on the right track. (IW03)

I am not going to take my job and my salary lightly; I have to safeguard my job, too. I won’t employ any kind of CP, because parents and society might not even appreciate our efforts on strict discipline. (IW04)

I have changed my concept and attitude on discipline. Because as a child, I was also a recipient of CP, so it was natural that I used CP on my students. But after the passing of the law, I stopped using CP in school. I think there are many other means to discipline our students. (IW05)

New challenges teachers have to face after the law and policies banning CP were passed. Most students come to school with good discipline, and they are willing to work hard and learn something that is useful to their future. However, we are seeing more and more students with behavioral problems. Post-modern values have left our students with little guidance to direct themselves. As a result, juvenile delinquency is on the rise, leaving many teachers with the feeling that education is a new challenge. Their opinions include:

Most students lack self-control. Advice works on some, but others might need more professional help. (QE23)

The policy on CP banning may make it hard for teachers to discipline their students. If more and more teachers begin to ignore students’ misbehavior, crime rate will increase in our society. (QE199)

The verbal correction approach has little effect on student’s misbehavior. (QE283)

Discipline is individualized. Both teachers and students need to be educated on what behavior calls for CP; otherwise banning it would be counterproductive. (QE70)

We need to set up a professional standard procedure to handle students who are difficult to deal with. (QE261)

While asking our teachers to treat students without discrimination, we hope people can respect our professionalism on individualized teaching as well. (QE77)

Teachers need more support from administrators and parents. Teachers have to deal with more than 30 children in a class everyday. It is not easy to maintain effective teaching and satisfy every student’s individual needs at the
same time. Teachers need someone to help them supervise misbehaved students that have been removed from the classroom. They especially need a standard procedure to help deal with irrational parents and students. Their opinions include:

I oppose any form of CP, but we need to face over 30 students everyday. School administrators cannot help that much. (QE20)

I hope our school can hire some professional counselors. But even then, I still feel only teachers themselves can do what is best in classroom management. (QE338)

I hope our school administration would set up a third-party office that can handle conflicts between teachers and parents objectively. (IW03)

I think that the connection between teachers and parents should be closer. We have to share the responsibility of child discipline. (QE69)

Parents should be given clear descriptions of the misbehaved conduct if teachers wish them to discipline their children at home. (QE274)

Teachers are aware of the necessity to ban CP in schools so that children’s human rights can be respected in a democratic society, especially when schools are considered a main place to practice democratic principles. Most teachers agree to the passing of the law on banning CP in school; however, they are still confused on the scope of CP and are concerned over the majority students’ discipline being jeopardized by a few misbehaved ones. Some of them still retain a traditional belief that CP is effective toward building students’ good conduct.

Conclusion and Suggestion

In this section, we would like to draw our conclusions on the basis of the study findings and propose some suggestions for those who are interested in school discipline.

Conclusions

Teachers are well aware of the policy and laws on CP banning, including the definition of CP, CP banning policy, appropriate alternative disciplines, and the types of CP. Teachers’ understanding of the law and policy on CP banning could be an advantage to prompting zero CP in school. This understanding is a firm promise to embody the respect for the rights of children (Gradinger, 2005; Roy, 2001). This also guarantees child’s needs, protections, and freedom
(Paintal, 1999). In the present study, we conclude that most teachers considered CP banning in terms of basic children’s human rights; this result differs from Kobayashi et al.‘s (1997) point that not only parents but also teachers fail to recognize children’s human rights.

The definition of CP, moral education, and the scope of alternative disciplines are still debated. Many teachers have trouble differentiating between CP and the appropriate means of disciplining children. They are still confused as to where to draw the line between educative punishment and its function in moral education. Weijers (2000) stated that punishment in education and upbringing should be seen as an interactive moral process. From an education point of view, two conditions have to be fulfilled before one can speak of educative punishment: Punishment assumes a relationship based on trust and on authority, and punishment that is worthwhile in an educative sense may be understood as an interactive process, implying mutual responsibilities. Weijers emphasized that the balance between a morality based on guilt and a morality based on shame is crucial to the moral authority of a culture’s upbringing. Ciminillo (1980) found that one major dilemma facing schools was how to define and apply relevant concept of discipline. Little by little, teachers in Taiwan have to come to face the same problem.

There are some significant difference in understanding of CP banning in ages, years of teaching, concurrent posts and educational background. However, there is no significant difference in gender. Prior research by Rust and Kinnard (1983) on personality traits of teachers who use CP showed that educators who use CP tend to be those with fewer years of experience and display a smaller repertoire of disciplinary techniques. In this study, age-level and years of teaching differences in understanding CP banning is found. Teachers with less than 5 years of teaching experience show lower understanding than those in the fields for 16 to 25 years. Though we cannot prove that understanding will result in teachers abolishing the use of CP, it is worth believing that understanding is the premise of abandoning CP as a means of discipline. Teachers who have concurrent administrative posts are more readily agreeing on CP ban than those with no direct accountability to school administration. However, difference between teachers with college degree and teachers with masters or doctoral degree is not found. Educational background does not seem to play a role in the understanding of CP banning because it is found that those with masters or doctorate degrees have lower understanding on CP topics.

Most teachers support some strategies for zero CP in schools, such as “reducing the number of students per class,” “establishing counseling center or online service for discipline,” “adding full-time counseling staff in schools,” and “holding conferences on discipline for pre- or in-service teachers.”. The first three strategies have
been lobbied by most teachers for a long time in Taiwan. Reducing the number of students allows teachers to concentrate better on their job. If the number of students per class is less than 30, teachers can fully focus their attention on teaching and students’ individual needs. A counseling center and full-time counseling staff can help release teachers’ pressure in daily routine; otherwise, some useful alternative means such as isolation and detention could not be employed.

Of the 16 appropriate alternative disciplines provided by the Ministry of Education, the three most commonly used methods in classroom are “verbal correction,” “positive reinforcement,” and “reflecting on own behavior while standing,” and the three methods teachers considered most useful are “verbal correction,” “home contact,” and “positive reinforcement.”. Verbal correction, which teachers use and believe mostly, is one of the best ways to maintain classroom order and change students’ misbehavior. As the paper of the Society for Adolescent Medicine (2003) cited, “An important technique in maintaining classroom control is to develop a milieu of effective communication, in which the teacher displays an attitude of respect for the students” (p. 390). School officials, including teachers, can exhibit cordiality to students and an attitude that they generally enjoy working with children in the academic setting. Reasoning and talking with children in age-appropriate ways is a nice alternative to enhance children’s cognitive ability (Paintal, 1999). Teachers can verbally correct the offender after class or during lunch. In Taiwan, this takes place in the lobby of the school building or at a corner in the classroom.

Comparing the 16 appropriate disciplines with Diamantes’ (1992) 10 alternatives, “Isolation” and “Work detail” in Diamantes’ alternatives need a spare room and a capable custodian to conduct. However, so far, conditions in Taiwan have made it difficult because of shortage of resources and with most teachers and administrators being busy. Field trips are also difficult to arrange because of transportation problem and requires chaperons. “Change of seat” is often used in Taiwan’s classroom when students talk to their neighbors during class. Calling the misbehaved student(s) to stand or to stand and reflect on their own behavior in the classroom is used often, but this might result in the student(s) feeling shamed or hurt. In Taiwan, students’ records are kept from elementary school to high school, so if a student has a demerit recorded on his or her profile, it stays with him or her. However, most teachers don’t believe that is a useful way to correct or change students’ misbehavior.

Most teachers believe that banning CP in schools can “reduce injury or abuse in children,” “respect students’ human rights,” and “give students a physically and psychologically sound mind.” However, most of teachers don’t believe that banning CP in schools can “reduce deviation behavior,” “increase students’ self-control and
management,” and “help students understand violence cannot solve problems.”. This dilemma is found in teachers’ perceptions of this study. Interviews and statistical data show that teachers support CP ban and acknowledge such law as progress on human rights and moral education. However, they still believe that CP has its function on building students’ character and can prevent majority of students from being bullied or falling victim to violence. Most teachers still considered CP as an effective discipline to solve difficult behavioral problems and think that banning CP in school would cause disciplinary problems at home or in society and would even be a factor to increased crime rates. Here, we find a gap between teachers’ perception on respecting children’s rights and the effects of CP. The result is similar to affective-cognitive inconsistency that educated people regard as the ineffectiveness of CP (Robinson et al., 2005) and confirms Jambor’s (2001) finding that CP, though abolished, is still viewed by almost 10% of the teachers as an effective means of controlling pupil behavior.

Most teachers agree that the law on banning CP in schools will “increase conflict between teachers and parents,” “increase the frequency of home discipline,” and “make home discipline more difficult.”. CP ban in school is the first step toward protecting children’s human rights, but CP at home is still allowed as long as the degree of injury doesn’t reach the level of child abuse. Some parents might react irrationally if their children are punished at school, though there are others who are rational but might find it difficult to tackle their children’s misbehavior at home because of their lack of professional training on children’s discipline.

Most teachers think that the ban on CP in schools have some effects on teachers, such as “It causes difficulty in discipline,” “It increases the frequency of using school support system,” and resulting in “teachers ignoring students’ the misbehaviors and passively discipline.”. Most teachers experienced CP in their childhood, and some of them would employ CP when they feel it necessary. They still believe that CP in some cases is an effective means for instilling discipline. Teachers are now no longer allowed to use CP in schools. It is difficult for some teachers to manage their classroom and to deal with students’ misbehavior. Some of them try to find support from school administrators or other resources. However, they still believe that the best person to tackle problematic students is the teacher him or herself. The law on CP banning marks a new era in student discipline; hence, it is necessary to change teachers’ mindset and enhance teachers’ skills in using alternative methods to instill discipline. Since the enactment of the law, some teachers have been met by shock and frustration as they faced lawsuits from parents because they used CP in school or had conflict with the parents.
Though most teachers believe that “schools will follow the laws to ban CP in school” and “schools will make more effort to set zero CP into action,” they don’t believe that “school administrators can help teachers on student discipline.” Since the legislative change, teachers have begun to adapt to the transition from reasonable CP to no CP. Some teachers feel they need assistance to help them strengthen classroom management, such as behavior modification techniques, extinction, distraction, rewarding appropriate behavior, and so on. They need more staff or facility to help them to tackle problematic students. Schools should have peer-support programs that utilize techniques such as Rap Group to encourage acceptable behavior and build student self-governance (Society for Adolescent Medicine, 2003). However, most teachers in Taiwan don’t believe school administrators can offer a lot of help to solve behavioral problems.

Suggestions

According to the findings, we provide some suggestions for law and policy makers, teachers, and school administrators; we also share our experience with those who are interested in this research topic.

To the Government

Clearly define the meaning and the scope of CP. There are still some disputed definitional difficulties between appropriate discipline and CP, such as requiring a child to remain in an uncomfortable position for an extended period of time or shaming a student in front of his or her classmates. Since many teachers express their concern and besetment explicitly on this problem, our government should define the red line as clearly as possible.

Reduce the class size. The government has made a lot of effort to reduce the class size and ratio of students to teaching staff for all elementary schools since 2000. The legal limitation of a class size is now 30. However, the teachers’ ideal class size is 25 students or less, and the elementary school class size of most of the OECD nations is around 20 to 25 (OECD, 2006). So it is reasonable to reduce the number of students in each class, not only to relieve pressure from teachers but also for good-quality classroom management.

Hold more conferences on discipline. The best professional development for in-service teachers is to participate in conferences or workshops on some important topics or professional skills. Since banning CP in schools may cause some difficulty in discipline and teachers expressed the need to renew their classroom management knowledge and skills, conferences on school discipline should be held more often.
Establish standard procedure for addressing and resolving conflicts between teachers and parents. When misbehavior is reported, parents might make irrational requests, which might end up with teachers feeling frustrated. When this happens, it would be advantageous if schools and teachers have a standard procedure they can follow to overcome the conflict between teachers and parents, especially when a lawsuit is involved. Establishing a standard legal procedure is important for teachers and schools when they encounter serious conflicts. The standard can be drafted by lawyers and representatives from the government and schools.

To Schools and Teachers

Participate in more conferences and courses on discipline. Teachers and school administrators need to participate in more conferences or courses on discipline to enhance their capacity in handling the challenge of banning CP and the goal of zero CP in schools.

Experience sharing and cooperation among teachers and administrators. School-based development program or workshop is another channel to empower teachers’ classroom management ability and to exchange experience in order to not only tackle discipline problems but also build up a good learning environment.

Cooperate with parents for children’s discipline. Many feel that the lack of discipline in the schools and the home is a causal factor behind violence and vandalism (Ciminillo, 1980). Therefore, both teachers and parents need to cooperate on children’s discipline. Schools and teachers can propose some plans to help bring teachers and parents’ relationship closer.

To Future Researches

Observe the real situation to correct misbehavior. Most of the data are gathered via surveys, and our analysis is based on teachers’ understanding, perceptions, and opinions. All of the results can be referred when policies are put into action. However, real-time school and classroom situation need to be observed over a long period of time so that first-hand information can be gained. The context of a problem and its possible solution could also be found under such context.

Case study for more details. The complexity associated with the task of disciplining children and the potential causes behind misbehavior tell us that the elements that form part of an event are an worthier option to study than relying on a set of principles. Therefore, it is worthwhile for future researchers to look into specific cases and make in-depth observation to find the causes behind misbehavior.
Focus on some of the best discipline methods in practice. Verbal correction has been identified by teachers as the most frequent and useful method. It is needed to acquire more verbal or communication techniques between teachers and the misbehavior students. Furthermore, it is worth exploring some of the extensions and practical situations on correcting students’ misbehaviors. There are some other discipline methods that teachers regard as useful or as used often (e.g., positive reinforcement and home contact) can be investigated in more detail in school settings. The ultimate goal is to share more information with those who care about the problem of CP in school, home, and in our society.
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