IRBAS www.irbas.academyirmbr.com October 2021
International Review of Basic and Applied Sciences Vol. 9 Issue.4

Impact of Corporal Punishment on Personality of Secondary School Students

SAIMA TAJ
Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar Pakistan.

Prof. Dr. ERUM IRSHAD
Ph.D (Clinical Psychology)
Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar Pakistan.

Dr. RUQAIA GUL
Ph.D (Clinical Psychology)
Department of Psychology, University of Peshawar Pakistan.
Email: ruqaia_gul@hotmail.com / ruqaiagul@uop.edu.pk
Tel: 03339776484

Abstract

*This research focused on finding the impact of Corporal punishment on personality development of students at secondary level and also to explore the student's view of corporal punishment. Correlational study design was used to analyze the variables. For data collection, different Public schools of district Peshawar, khyber pakhtunkhwa (kpk) were approached. The research variables were linked to find out the relationship with a total sample of 200 secondary school students, including equal no of boys and girls, between ages 10 to 16 years (from class 6 to 10). For the purpose of data collection, all the students were given Corporal punishment questionnaire and big five personality questionnaire and data were collected through Random sampling technique. Findings indicated negative correlation between Corporal Punishment and Extraversion -.348** which shows positive correlation between Corporal punishment and introversion traits. Whereas up to .470** positive relation was found between Corporal Punishment and Emotional Instability. Findings also indicated positive relation between corporal punishment and Conscientiousness .073. Thus in conclusion findings of the research showed that corporal punishment has negative effects on development of extroversion abilities. Furthermore, the implications of corporal punishment were found to cause emotional instability and conscientiousness in school children.*

Keywords: *Corporal Punishment, Emotional Instability, Conscientiousness, Introvert, Extrovert.*

Introduction

Discipline in schools requires arrangements and strategies by school administration to control the undesirable behaviors, important of which are issues related to security, school conduct problems, and suspension from school (Cameron, 2006). To maintain discipline many effective practices have been proposed but the most debatable issue is the use of corporal punishment and in many countries across the globe is used as a primary discipline method (Scarre, 2003; Flynn, 1996).

Corporal punishment is defined as inflicting pain on bodies for modifying the behavior of which spanking is the most common type and is frequently used by both parents and teachers. Spanking is to hit to hurt on the backsides usually with open hand (Gershoff & Bitensky, 2007).

Corporal punishment is an attack on an individual's self-respect. The Prohibition of Corporal Punishment Act, 2017 defines "physical" or "corporal" punishment a kind of punishment that involves physical energy purposely done to cause discomfort and suffering, how little it might be, which may comprise hitting, beating with open hand, stick or belt or kicking or pushing a child (Ritchie & Ritchie, 1981).

Literature Review

Countries and schools who practice corporal punishment faces more problems in youth or student management, there the ratio for antisocial behavior and murderers are found to be high (Arcus, 2002). The practice of unforgiving discipline will result in violence and hostility until and unless cautiously controlled and go along with positive reaction (Skiba, 2010). This inflicts hatred in them e.g. hatred towards school or school property, teachers, fellows and can lead to harm them (Dupper & Montgomery, 2008). In reaction to corporal punishments many children develops negative behaviors, frequently tells lies, make irrational excuses to protect themselves from punishment. The most challenging part is that this practice is more dangerous for students who are known as obedient in their schools (Johnson, Agbényiga & Bahemuka, 2013).

Additionally, use of punishment resulted in mental clutter in children. They feel humiliation that lowers their creativity, cause poor problem solving ability and become disobedient, aggressive and more difficult (Hyman Jr, Husband & Billings, 1995).

Receivers of continuous corporal punishments at home or at schools loss their interest in studies and show no or little concern in academic success leads to underachievement and even some may get involved in prostitution. Positive correlation has been reported between corporal punishments and low cognitive abilities. According to Gershoff (2010) many of the students who receive corporal punishment were found to have lower levels of intelligence as compare to students who do not receive extreme disciplinary punishments.

Allport (1996) defined personality as person's internal psychophysical systems on which person's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors are based. According to Child (1968) Personality is the combination of factors that leads to individual differences as a result person behave differently at different times.

Allport (1961) highlighted a very important factor that personality is pattern of behavior within a person. According to this consideration our behavior, thoughts and feelings make our personality and it makes one person different from other. He emphasized on both physical and psychological aspects of personality and said that personality is a psychophysical phenomenon. According to Child (1968) people don't change dramatically, their behavior can be predicted, and their day to day behavior is identifiable. He also mentioned in his definition, the consistency in individual personality and differences between individuals.

In an investigation conducted by Naz, Khan, Daraz, Hussain & Khan (2011) a sample of high school students was assessed to study the effects of corporal punishment on personality development up-to secondary level education. It was found that corporal punishment has multidimensional effects on students and confirmed the assumption that personality development and academic performance/career of the students are affected by it use.

Methodology

Sample

The sample of the study was selected through randomized sampling procedure from different Public schools of District Peshawar, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. Students between age10-16 years, with no psychological/psychiatric or serious medical history were included in the sample.

Procedure

After taking formal Permission from concerned heads of the schools, students were approached. In order to collect data, different Public schools of district Peshawar were contacted. Personality of the students was measured by the Big Five Questionnaire-Children (BFQ-C) developed by Barbaranelli, Caprara, Rabasca & Pastorelli (2003) is a 65-item questionnaire, containing 13 items related to each of the five factors of Energy/Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Instability, and Intellect/Openness. Reliability of the BFQ-C was established using Cronbach's alpha: Conscientiousness (.87), Extraversion (.77), Openness (.82), Neuroticism (.77), and Agreeableness (.71).

Furthermore Corporal Punishment Questionnaire developed by Khan (2005) was used to measure the frequency of Corporal punishment among students. It is 10 items questionnaire containing 5 items (1,2,3,4,5) for assessing severe punishment and 5 items (6,7,8,9,10) for assessing mild punishment. The Cronbach's alpha reliability of the questionnaire is .75. The questionnaire was used with proper permission from the developer.

For this study, sample was selected through simple random sampling technique. Semi structured interview was conducted before administration of questionnaire to assess inclusion criteria. Consent form was given to them for permission purpose. After participation students were thanked for their cooperation.

Results

Table 1: Alpha reliability of Corporal punishment scale
Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Corporal Punishment Scale

Scale	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability
Corporal Punishment Scale	10	.750

The table above is the Reliability Statistics table. This gives you Cronbach's alpha coefficient. We are looking for a score of over .75 for high internal consistency. In this case, $\alpha = .75$, which shows the questionnaire is reliable.

Alpha reliabilities of sub-scales on Big-five questionnaire for children (Extraversion, Conscientiousness, Emotional instability)

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Extraversion Scale

Scale	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability
Extraversion Scale	13	.770

The table indicates that Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Extraversion Scale is 0.77, which means that the scale is internally consistent and reliable.

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Conscientiousness Scale

Scale	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability
Conscientiousness Scale	13	.870

The table indicates that Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Conscientiousness Scale is 0.87, which means that the scale is internally consistent and reliable.

Table 4: Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Emotional Instability Scale

Scale	No of items	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability
Emotional Instability Scale	13	.770

The table indicates that Cronbach's Alpha Reliability of Emotional Instability Scale is 0.77, which means that the scale is internally consistent and reliable.

Table 5: Correlation between scores on Corporal punishment scale and Extraversion scale

Correlations		
		Extraversion
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	-.348**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	200

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a negative correlation between Corporal Punishment and Extraversion scale between both the genders i.e. -.348** which indicates that there is positive relation between Corporal punishment and introversion traits, when corporal punishment increases the introversion traits also increases among all participants.

Table 6: Correlation between scores on Corporal punishment scale and Emotional instability scale

Correlations		
		Emotional Instability
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	.470**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	200

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive correlation between Corporal Punishment and Emotional Instability between both the genders i.e. .470** which indicates that when Corporal Punishment increases, the participant emotional instability also increases.

Table 7: Correlation between scores on Corporal punishment scale and Conscientiousness scale

Correlations		
		Conscientiousness
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	.073
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	200

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive relation between corporal punishment and Conscientiousness between both the genders i.e. .073 which indicates that person who is corporally punished is also Conscientious.

Table 8: Correlation between scores on Corporal punishment scale and Big-five personality sub scales for each gender.

Boys

Table 8: Extraversion

Correlations		
		extraversion
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	-.444**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a negative correlation between Corporal Punishment and extraversion scale between male i.e. -.444** which indicates that there is positive relation between Corporal punishment and introversion traits, when corporal punishment increases the introversion traits also increases among all male participants.

Table 9: Emotional Instability

Correlations		
		Emotional Instability
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	.537**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive correlation between Corporal Punishment and Emotional Instability i.e. .537** which indicates that when Corporal Punishment increases, the participant emotional instability also increases.

Table 10: Conscientiousness

Correlations		
		Corporal Punishment
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	0.123143
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001
	N	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive relation between corporal punishment and Conscientiousness between boys i.e. 0.12 which indicates that person who is corporally punished is also Conscientious.

Girls

Table 11: Extraversion

Correlations		
		Extraversion
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	-.048
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a negative correlation between Corporal Punishment and extraversion scale among females i.e. -.048 which indicates that there is positive relation between Corporal punishment and introversion traits, when corporal punishment increases the introversion traits also increases among all female participants.

Table 12: Emotional instability

Correlations		
		Emotional Instability
Corporal Punishment	Pearson Correlation	0.192276
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.055
	N	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive correlation between Corporal Punishment and Emotional Instability between girls i.e. 0.19 which indicates that when Corporal Punishment increases, the participant emotional instability also increases among girls.

Table 13: Conscientiousness

Correlations		
		Corporal Punishment
Conscientiousness	Pearson Correlation	0.51119
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	100

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

There is a positive relation between corporal punishment and Conscientiousness between females i.e. 0.51 which indicates that person who is corporally punished is also Conscientious.

Discussion

Results of the study revealed negative correlation between corporal Punishment and extraversion which indicates that there is positive relation between corporal punishment and introversion traits, when corporal punishment increases the introversion traits also increases among all participants. The findings are in line with previous studies such as Noll and Shenk (2010) found that children behavior of school avoidance was positively related to corporal punishment and they were also found to avoid help seeking behavior. There are some studies that do not support current results as Straus & Stewart (1999) found no significant modification in behavior or isolation in children who experienced corporal punishment. Study conducted

by Mathurin, Gielen, & Lancaster (2006) also support gender differences and was found that females become more emotionally unstable and easily became aggressive or hostile because of childhood experiences of physical punishments.

Present study found that with the increase of corporal punishment emotional instability also increases thus confirms positive correlation between emotional instability and corporal punishment in both the genders. Findings by Afifi, Mota, MacMillan, & Sareen (2013) also supported that experiences of abusive stressors or childhood trauma leads to the development of severe mental health disorders and physical disabilities in addition to emotional instability and criminal behavior.

Results also show positive correlation between conscientiousness and corporal punishment. No exact literature has been found related to these factors but many studies have been found to study effects of punishment on personality development. Research by Mathurin, Gielen, & Lancaster (2006) shows that males experiences more physical punishments in childhood than females but females react more emotionally than males and became violent and destructive.

Conclusion

In conclusion there is significantly positive relationship of corporal punishment and emotional instability, negative correlation between corporal punishment and extroversion traits thus those who receive frequent punishments are more emotionally instable are less social and outgoing. Person high in conscientiousness is described as dependent persons and extremely apt to orderliness. This study also shows that corporal punishment affects the development of conscientiouness. This study also confirms that personality of both boys and girls is negatively affected by the use of corporal punishment at school level.

References

Afifi, T. O., Mota, N., MacMillan, H. L., & Sareen, J. (2013). Harsh physical punishment in childhood and adult physical health. *Pediatrics*, *132*(2), e333-e340.

Allport, G. W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Allport, G. W. (1996). Traits revisited. *American Psychologist*, *21*(1), 1.

Arcus, D. (2002). School shooting fatalities and school corporal punishment: A look at the states. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, *28*(3), 173–183.

Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., Rabasca, A., & Pastorelli, C. (2003). A questionnaire for measuring the big five in late childhood. *Personality and individual Differences*, 34 (4), 645-664. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(02)00051-x

Cameron, R. J. (2006). Educational psychology: The distinctive contribution. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, *22*(4), 289–304.

Child, I. L. (1968). Personality in culture. *Handbook of Personality Theory and Research*, 82–145.

Dupper, D. R., & Montgomery, D. A. E. (2008). Corporal punishment in US public schools: A continuing challenge for school social workers. *Children & Schools*, *30*(4), 243–250.

Flynn, C. P. (1996). Normative support for corporal punishment: Attitudes, correlates, and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *1*(1), 47–55.

Gershoff, E. T. (2010). More harm than good: A summary of scientific research on the intended and unintended effects of corporal punishment on children. *LAW & Contemp. Probs*, *73*, 31.

Gershoff, E. T., & Bitensky, S. H. (2007). The case against corporal punishment of children: Converging evidence from social science research and international human rights law and implications for US public policy. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *13*(4), 231.

Hyman Jr, I. E., Husband, T. H., & Billings, F. J. (1995). False memories of childhood experiences. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, *9*(3), 181–197.

Johnson, D. J., Agbényiga, D. L., & Bahemuka, J. M. (2013). Vulnerable Childhood in a Global Context:

Embracing the Sacred Trust. In *Vulnerable Children*. Springer.

Khan, A. (2005). An inverstigation into the causes and impacts of corporal punishment on the achievements of the students of some seelected male secondary schools of F.R Kohat. *Uni. of Peshawar*.

Mathurin, M. N., Gielen, U. P., & Lancaster, J. (2006). Corporal punishment and personality traits in the children of St. Croix, US Virgin Islands. *Cross-Cultural Research*, *40*(3), 306–324.

Naz, A., Khan, W., Daraz, U., Hussain, M., & Khan, Q. (2011). The impacts of corporal punishment on students' academic performance/career and personality development up-to secondary level education in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *2*(12).

Noll, J. G., & Shenk, C. E. (2010). Introduction to the special issue: The physical health consequences of childhood maltreatment—Implications for public health. Oxford University Press.

Ritchie, J., Ritchie, J. (1981). *Spare the rod*. Boston: Allen and Unwin.

Scarre, G. (2003). Corporal punishment. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, *6*(3), 295–316.

Skiba, R. (2010). Zero tolerance and alternative discipline strategies. *National Association of School Psychologists Communique*, *39*(1), 28–30.

Straus, M. A., & Stewart, J. H. (1999). Corporal punishment by American parents: National data on prevalence, chronicity, severity, and duration, in relation to child and family characteristics. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *2*(2), 55–70.